

**SUPPLEMENTARY  
MEMORANDUM ON MAHARASHTRA-MYSORE  
BORDER DISPUTE**



सत्यमेव जयते

No. MMB-2467/BDC,  
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT,  
Sachivalaya, Bombay-32-BR,  
22nd May 1967.

From

Shri D. R. PRADHAN,  
Chief Secretary to the Government of Maharashtra,  
General Administration Department.

To

The SECRETARY,  
Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary  
Disputes,  
Ootacamund.

*Subject.*—Supplementary Memorandum of the Govern-  
ment of Maharashtra on the Maharashtra-  
Mysore Border Dispute

Sir,

In continuation of this Government's Letter No. MMB-2467/  
BDC, dated the 31st March, 1967, I have the honour to send  
herewith five copies of the Supplementary Memorandum of the  
Government of Maharashtra on the Maharashtra-Mysore Border  
dispute in respect of the fresh claims made by the Government  
of Mysore in their Memorandum to the Commission submitted  
on 31st March, 1967.

Yours faithfully,

D. R. PRADHAN,  
Chief Secretary to the Government of Maharashtra.

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I : Introductory .. ..	1
CHAPTER II : Principles of Mysore Government—	
Paragraphs in the Mysore Memorandum answered—	
261-262 .. ..	3
256, 257 and 260 .. ..	4
CHAPTER III : Sholapur District—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
263 .. ..	7
264-265 .. ..	7
266 .. ..	8
267 .. ..	8
268-269 .. ..	9
270 .. ..	9
271 .. ..	10
272 .. ..	11
273 .. ..	11
274 .. ..	11
275 .. ..	12
276-277 .. ..	12
278 .. ..	12
279 .. ..	13
281 .. ..	14
282 .. ..	14
283 .. ..	14
CHAPTER IV : Sholapur Taluka—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
284 .. ..	16
285 .. ..	19
286 .. ..	20
287 .. ..	21
288 .. ..	22
289 to 293 .. ..	23
294 .. ..	24
295 .. ..	24
296 .. ..	24

	PAGE
CHAPTER V : Sholapur City—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
297 .. .. .	26
298 .. .. .	26
CHAPTER VI : Akalkot—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
299 .. .. .	29
300 .. .. .	29
301 .. .. .	29
303 .. .. .	30
304 .. .. .	30
305 .. .. .	31
306 .. .. .	31
307 .. .. .	32
308 .. .. .	32
309 .. .. .	32
311 .. .. .	33
314 .. .. .	33
315 .. .. .	33
316 .. .. .	34
317 .. .. .	34
318 .. .. .	35
320 .. .. .	35
322 .. .. .	35
324 .. .. .	36
CHAPTER VII : Jath Taluka—	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
327 .. .. .	37
328 .. .. .	37
329 .. .. .	37
331 .. .. .	38
333 .. .. .	38
334 .. .. .	38
335 .. .. .	38
337 .. .. .	38
339 .. .. .	39
340-341 .. .. .	39
342 .. .. .	39
343 .. .. .	39
344 .. .. .	40
347 .. .. .	40
348 .. .. .	40
349 .. .. .	41

# CONTENTS

iii

	PAGE
<b>CHAPTER VIII : Chandgad Taluka—</b>	
Paragraphs of Mysore Memorandum—	
351-352 .. .. .	42
353 .. .. .	43
354 .. .. .	43
355 .. .. .	43
357 .. .. .	44

## APPENDICES

<b>APPENDIX A :</b>	(i) Collector of Kolhapur's letter No. ADM-281, dated 5th September 1944 to the Commissioner, Central Division, Poona regarding splitting up of Sholapur Taluka into two talukas and reconstitution of Sub-divisions.	45
	(ii) Commissioner, Central Division's Endorsement No. A.D.M. 2/77, dated 11th September 1944.	47
	(iii) Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, Resolution No. 4378/39, dated 30th September 1944 regarding splitting up of Sholapur Taluka into two talukas and redistribution of Sub-divisions of Sholapur district.	49
	(iv) Government of Bombay Notification, Revenue Department No. 4378/39, dated 30th September 1944 notifying the distribution of villages between the two talukas.	51
<b>APPENDIX B :</b>	Relevant extracts from the proceedings of the meeting of the Sholapur Municipal Corporation held on 4th May 1967.	53
<b>APPENDIX C :</b>	Statement showing the villages from Akalkot Taluka proposed to be retained with the Maharashtra State.	55

## INTRODUCTORY

On 31st March 1967, the Government of Maharashtra submitted its Memorandum on Maharashtra-Mysore Border Dispute to the Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary Disputes. That Memorandum dealt, in the light of the fundamental basis of the reorganisation of the States in India, with the proposals made by the former Government of Bombay in 1957 for readjusting the boundary between the States of Bombay and Mysore. The Government of Bombay had then suggested that, as in the case of Belgaum and Karwar areas, the demarcation of the boundary between the Bombay and Mysore States in the Akkalkot, South Sholapur and Mangalwedha talukas of Sholapur district, in Jath taluka of the then South Satara (now Sangli) district and in Shirol and Gadhinglaj talukas of Kolhapur district should be reviewed and the boundaries adjusted so as to transfer to the Mysore State contiguous Kannad-speaking areas. According to those proposals, 260 villages in these talukas were to be transferred to the Mysore State. In paragraph 6.157 of their Memorandum submitted to the Commission on Maharashtra-Mysore-Kerala Boundary Disputes on 31st March 1967, the Government of Maharashtra have stated that they would have no objection to the boundary being readjusted in these areas on the principles suggested by them in that Memorandum provided those principles were equally applied in readjusting the boundary in the areas claimed by the Government of Maharashtra.

1.2. During the ten years in which the dispute has been pending, the Government of Mysore made no specific proposals in regard to the Kannad-majority areas included in the then Bombay State by the States Reorganisation Act of 1956. Perhaps, their proposal to make 'minor adjustments' within a 10-mile belt in the districts of the former Bombay State on either side of the present boundaries could be said to have covered the question of the Kannad-majority areas on the border of the

then Bombay State. However, in their memorandum submitted to the One-Man Commission the Government of Mysore, for the first time not only claimed the areas offered by the then Bombay Government but also laid further claims to some more areas in Maharashtra.

1.3. The question whether these claims were within the purview of the Commission was raised by the Commission itself and referred by it to the Government of India. The latter left it to the Commission to decide whether or not to consider these claims. On the 8th May 1967, the Commission asked the representatives of this Government to forward to it this Government's comments on the Mysore Government's claims by the 23rd May 1967. This Supplementary Memorandum has accordingly been prepared. It deals with the observations made in paragraphs 256 to 359 at pages 77 to 110 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum.



## PRINCIPLES OF MYSORE GOVERNMENT

In the Memorandum submitted to the Commission by the Government of Mysore, there are eight chapters pertaining to "Mysore's claims to areas in Maharashtra". In paragraphs 261 and 262 of that Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have stated as follows :—

" 261. We should note here that according to the Government of Maharashtra, there are within their State, 260 villages which are admittedly Kannada. This clear averment further implies that they are prepared to have them transferred to the State of Mysore. As this is a matter of admission, the Government of Mysore need not dilate or discuss anything about the merits of these areas, but they do claim them and are prepared and willing to take all such areas which are offered by Maharashtra.

" 262. According to the Government of Mysore, there are many more areas in Maharashtra State which deserve to be transferred to Mysore".

2.2. These areas according to that Government's Memorandum, are as follows :—

(1) The North Sholapur taluka and that part of South Sholapur taluka which the Government of Bombay proposed to retain ; in other words, the whole of the former Sholapur taluka consisting of 152 villages as it existed before it was bifurcated into the talukas of North Sholapur and South Sholapur.

(2) Sholapur City.

(3) That part of Akkalkot taluka which the Government of Bombay proposed to retain ; in other words the whole of Akkalkot taluka.



(4) That part of Jath taluka which the Government of Bombay proposed to retain ; in other words the whole of Jath taluka.

(5) The whole of Chandgad taluka.

2.3. The 260 villages having relative majority of Kannad-speaking population according to the Census of 1951 which the Government of Bombay had offered to transfer to the State of Mysore formed part of different talukas of different districts as follows :—

District.	Taluka.	No. of villages.
Sholapur	South Sholapur	... 65
„	Mangalwedha	... 9
„	Akkalkot	... 99
South Satara (now Sangli)	Jath	... 44
Kolhapur	Shirol	... 19
„	Gadhinglaj	... 24
Total ...		260

It will be seen from this that in the Mangalwedha Taluka of Sholapur District and in the Shirol and Gadhinglaj Talukas of Kolhapur District, the Government of Mysore have no additional claims to make and that the additional claims pertain to the whole of North Sholapur Taluka including the Sholapur City, the remaining 15 villages of South Sholapur Taluka, the remaining 25 villages of Akkalkot Taluka, the remaining 54 villages of Jath Taluka and the whole of Chandgad Taluka.

2.4. The Government of Mysore have made these additional claims on the basis of certain principles *vide* paragraphs 256, 257 and 260 of their Memorandum. They are as follows :—

(1) Linguistic homogeneity has to play a subordinate and a very minor role in the distribution of territories. Linguistic considerations are to be looked upon as a point leading to administrative convenience.

(2) Primary importance has always to be given to the administrative convenience, economic considerations, cultural ties and to the benefit of the people.

(3) District is the appropriate unit, but taluka has to be taken as the unit under special circumstances.

(4) A departure from these general principles is to be allowed only in respect of areas where the parties concerned agree to the same.

2.5. The Government of Mysore have observed in paragraph 260 of their Memorandum that they have been guided by the principles mentioned above which were adopted by the States Reorganisation Commission. It is not correct to say that the States Reorganisation Commission regarded linguistic homogeneity as a subordinate and very minor factor in the redistribution of territories. They have, in fact, mentioned that a balanced approach was necessary to the problem of creating linguistic States. The balanced approach of their conception recognised linguistic homogeneity as an important factor conducive to administrative convenience and efficiency but did not consider it as an exclusive and binding principle overriding all other considerations, administrative, financial and political. This cannot be paraphrased to mean that linguistic homogeneity has played "a subordinate and a very minor role" in the proposals for reorganisation of States made by the States Reorganisation Commission.

2.6. The principles enunciated by the States Reorganisation Commission which have been referred to by the Government of Mysore were evolved for the purpose of carving out new States out of the then existing States, mainly on the basis of language although they were not called linguistic States. The problem before the present Commission is not of creation of new States as in the case of Punjab and Haryana but of adjusting the boundaries of two linguistic States in order to secure linguistic homogeneity to the farthest possible extent. In that view of the matter, as has already been stated in paragraphs 2.27 to 2.30 of this Government's Memorandum submitted to the Commission on

31st March 1967, the principles adopted by the States Reorganisation Commission are not wholly relevant. The extent to which they are relevant has been mentioned in the aforesaid paragraphs of that Memorandum. It is not, therefore, necessary at this stage to discuss the merits or the suitability of the principles mentioned by the Government of Mysore.



### III

#### SHOLAPUR DISTRICT

In paragraphs 263.283 of their Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have dealt with "Sholapur District" and "Areas of Sholapur District". In these two chapters that Government have made certain observations which pertain to all the areas of Sholapur District claimed by them. It is proposed to consider here the said observations.

3.2. In paragraph 263 of the aforesaid Memorandum, that Government have said that formerly "Sholapur was called as Sonnalige or Sonnalapur names, which we often find used in Kannad literary works. The former of these two names is associated with the great Saint known as Sonnalige Siddharameshwar." The implication of this observation is probably that Sholapur City takes its name from the Saint Sonnalige Siddharameshwar who was a Kannad Saint, and that, therefore, it should be included in Mysore State. The implication is not correct, as can be seen from the history of Sholapur City given in the Gazetteer of Sholapur District published in 1884. Foot-Note No. 5 at page 485 of the Gazetteer states that the word "Sholapur" means 16 villages : "From *Sola* sixteen and *pur* villages. The 16 villages on whose site Sholapur was built are Adilpur, Ahmadpur, Chamladev, Fattehpur, Jamdarvadi, Kajlapur, Khaderpur, Khanderavkivadi, Muhammadpur, Ranapur, Sandalpur, Shaikpur, Sholapur, Sonalgi, Sonapur and Vaidkivadi". No further comment seems needed.

3.3. In paragraphs 264 and 265, the Government of Mysore have given two quotations from the District Gazetteer of Sholapur, which mention that Sholapur was a part of what was then called Bombay Karnatak. A close reading of the Gazetteers will show that the terms such as "Bombay Karnatak" and "Southern Maratha Country" have been used somewhat loosely. In some places, the area consisting of the present Belgaum District has

been described as Southern Maratha Country. It is not the case of the Government of Maharashtra that all such area should be transferred to Maharashtra because it was called Southern Maratha Country.

3.4. In paragraph 266 of their Memorandum the Mysore Government have quoted from H. R. Bhatnagar's 'Life of Munro' to show that Marathi speaking people in Bijapur, Sholapur, Belgaum and Dharwar were, in the times of General Munro, strangers to that part of the country and that the predominant language there was Kanarese. As the Government of Maharashtra admit that there are Kannad-speaking areas in their State and are willing to transfer them to the State of Mysore this point does not survive.

3.5. In paragraph 267 of their Memorandum, the Mysore Government have quoted Dr. Khare, Director of Bharat Itihas Sanshodhak Mandal, Poona. The Government of Maharashtra have made enquiries with Dr. Khare in the matter and he has given the following statement :—

“In paragraph 267 of the Mysore Government Memorandum to the Boundary Dispute Commission, there is a quotation of a statement said to have been made by Prof. G. S. Khare, Curator and Secretary of the Bharat Itihas Sanshodhak Mandal. The last sentence of the so-called quotation runs as follows :—

“All this territory (Sholapur District) was Kannad at that time (17th Century).

But let me clarify my position. I have never said in any of my writings that the territory in question was Kannad at any time. What I have said is that whatever may be the language (Marathi, Telgu, Kannad, etc.) spoken by the people inhabiting this territory, they had of their own accord adopted Marathi language and Modi script for all their writings, whether private, public or Government, during the Muslim rule of the 16th and 17th Centuries”.

The original statement will be produced before the Commission, if required. In support of this, the original book from which

this extract is supposed to have been taken will also be produced before the Commission if required. The name of the book is "Records of the Shivaji Period", Vol. XI, pages 53 to 56.

3.6. In paragraphs 268 and 269, the Government of Mysore have given quotations from the Sholapur District Gazetteer to show that the areas under consideration had administrative connections with the Kannad areas of Bijapur District. It will be seen from page 303 of the Gazetteer that before 1869 when the district of Sholapur was formed, its sub-divisions were frequently transferred from one district to another. Of the 7 sub-divisions included in the district in 1884, Pandharpur and Sangola were in Satara until 1864 and Malsiras until 1875. Before 1838, the northern sub-division of Karmala was in Ahmednagar and the central sub-division of Mohol was in Poona and the eastern and southern sub-divisions of Barsi and Sholapur more than once passed from Ahmednagar to Poona and from Poona to Ahmednagar. In 1838, the sub-divisions of Sholapur, Barsi, Mohol, Madha, Karmala, Indi, Hippargi and Muddebihal formed a collectorate styled Sholapur which was abolished in 1864. In 1869, the sub-divisions of Sholapur, Barsi, Mohol, Madha and Karmala together with Pandharpur and Sangola were formed into the district which in 1875 received from Satara the addition of Malsiras. Foot-Note No. 3 at pages 303-304 gives the details of the various changes which occurred in the administrative set-up from 1819 to 1884. They clearly show that from the point of view of administrative connections, Sholapur had greater affinity with the districts of Poona and Ahmednagar than with the district of Bijapur.

3.7. In paragraph 270 of their Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have stated that Sholapur Taluka has recently been divided into two, viz., Sholapur North and Sholapur South, both having their headquarters in Sholapur City. This statement is factually incorrect. The division of Sholapur Taluka into Sholapur North and Sholapur South took place in 1944 i.e., 23 years ago and not recently.

3.8. It has further been stated in paragraph 270 that both the talukas, viz., Sholapur Taluka as it existed prior to its division

and Akkalkot Taluka are mainly Kannad-speaking. This statement is also factually incorrect. The former Sholapur taluka which constituted of the present North Sholapur and South Sholapur Talukas had only 20.01 per cent. Kannad-speaking population according to the Census of 1951. A considerable part of the Akkalkot Taluka is predominantly Kannad-speaking and it is for this reason that the then Government of Bombay had proposed to transfer 99 out of 124 villages of Akkalkot Taluka to the Mysore State.

3.9. The Government of Mysore have further stated in the same paragraph that in their Memorandum presented in 1957 even the Government of Maharashtra had practically conceded that most part of this area may be transferred except for the City of Sholapur and for the town of Akkalkot and a few villages near about. The Memorandum of 1957 was presented by the Government of the then bilingual State of Bombay and not by the Government of Maharashtra. In that Memorandum, as pointed out above, a majority of the villages in South Sholapur and Akkalkot Talukas were offered for transfer to the Mysore State on the basis of the 1951 Census. It was not conceded then, as alleged by the Mysore Government, that any part of the North Sholapur Taluka was Kannad in character. Similarly, the City of Sholapur and the town of Akkalkot had, according to the Census of 1961, relative majority of Marathi speaking population and therefore there was no question of proposing their transfer to the Mysore State, in the light of the principles for readjustment of boundaries proposed by the Government of Bombay.

3.10. The purport of paragraph 271 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum appears to be that because Saint Siddharameshwara who hailed from Sonnalige or Sholapur, was a Kannad Saint and because for the benefit of the local people, he built a big lake which is still known by the name of Siddeshwara or Siddarameshwara Tank, Sholapur City of today should be transferred to the Mysore State. As already explained, our purpose here is to secure the maximum convenience of the present population in these areas. Religious or historical connections of ancient times have, therefore, little or no relevance. Further it is a common

occurrence in this country for saints born in one part of the country to have followers in other parts of the country.

3.11. In paragraph 272 of the said Memorandum, the Mysore Government have referred to the cult of Basava. It is stated that "it is but natural that places like Akkalkot and Sholapur must have come within the sphere of these activities. The areas where the present talukas of Akkalkot, Sholapur or Omerga are located were not only full of Lingayats but they abounded in Kannad writers as well. Since those times, if not earlier, they have been pure Kannad-speaking areas". It has already been pointed out that the areas which are actually Kannad-speaking have already been offered by the Government of Maharashtra for transfer to the Mysore State. It would be wrong to describe any other areas as "pure" Kannad-speaking areas.

3.12. In paragraph 273 of the same Memorandum, reference has been made to several Kannad inscriptions said to have been found at the villages of Kumbhari, Limbi Chincholi, Mandrup and Aurad. All these villages are among those proposed to be transferred to Mysore and therefore admittedly Kannad places. There is no need, therefore, to stress their Kannad character.

3.13. Mention has also been made in the said paragraph 273 of reference to the temples etc. in Sholapur in old inscriptions found in certain far off places in the heart of Karnataka. Reference has been made to inscriptions of 1264 and 1256 A.D. As already observed, historical connections have no relevance for our present purpose. Further, Marathi inscriptions are also to be found in Kannad areas.

3.14. It is stated in paragraph 274 of the Mysore Government Memorandum that because Kannada formed a small minority in the district during the British regime, it came to be ignored that consequently "these circumstances not only diminished the normal currency of Kannad but stunted its growth almost completely in Sholapur and its neighbourhood. What is really surprising is that though stifled in this manner Kannada language still persists and has held up its head in the said areas." The reference obviously is to the British time and there is no reason to suppose that the British had any particular bias for



Marathi at the expense of Kannada. To them both the languages were same and if Kannada languished, the reasons must be other than those alleged. Further what is to be considered by the Commission is the relative prevalence of these languages at present times and not the reasons which led to the present state of affairs.

3.15. In paragraph 275 of the Memorandum of the Government of Mysore it has been stated that, although the Talukas of Akkalkot and South Sholapur were eligible to be treated as bilingual under the circular issued by the Government of Bombay on the 15th October 1949, no action in that respect has been taken till now. It is true that there has been delay in this matter which the Government of Maharashtra regrets. But the delay can be easily explained. The question of reorganisation of States on the basis of language has been under consideration since 1953 when the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed. It was expected that this Commission would transfer these areas to the Kannad-speaking State to be formed after the reorganisation. But this did not happen. Immediately after the reorganisation of States in 1956, the then Government of Bombay offered these areas to the State of Mysore and the matter has been pending since then first with the Zonal Council, then before the Four-Man Committee and finally with the Government of India. It was expected during all these years that these areas would be transferred to the State of Mysore any time and the necessity to declare them bilingual would not survive. If, in these circumstances, delay has occurred, it would only be natural and no sinister motive, as alleged by Mysore Government, can be attributed to it.

3.16. Paragraphs 276 and 277 of the said Memorandum contain comments on the States Reorganisation Commission's report. It is not necessary for this Government to offer any remarks thereon.

3.17. In paragraph 278 of the said Memorandum, mention has been made of public holidays observed in Sholapur, Akkalkot and the other areas in question on the occasion of Basava Jayanti and "Karahunive". Similarly, it has been mentioned

that the portrait of Basava is hung in the Office of the Municipality of Sholapur. These facts show that although these linguistically different areas have been in Maharashtra, due consideration has been given to the sentiments of the linguistic minority. This does not, however, mean that the whole area is Kannad in character. Wherever the Kannad character of the population is established by the Census figures, it has been proposed to transfer the areas to the Mysore State.

3.18. In regard to the allegations made in paragraph 279 of the said Memorandum to the effect that Kannad people and Kannad language have been suffering under the domination of the Marathi people, that their legitimate grievances go unheeded and that the elementary right of Kannadigas to have their children educated in their mother tongue is denied, it would be worthwhile to refer to the Sholapur District Gazetteer which says about Lingayats "Most speak Marathi both at home and abroad and some speak Kanarese at home" (page 75). "Lingayat Vanis send their children to school but do not keep them at school for any length of time. The boys learn to read and write Marathi and to cast accounts and the girls learn to read Marathi and Kanarese at home" (page 85). It is also stated with regard to Jangams or Lingayat priests that "their home tongue is Marathi" (page 184). This will indicate that the Lingayats as a class have taken to Marathi and given up Kannad and this is the position since before 1884. Naturally there is no demand for Kannada schools. Even then the fact that there has been no denial of the elementary right of the Kannadigas to educate their children in Kannad can be seen from the following figures :—

	No. of primary Marathi schools	No. of pupils	No. of pupils per school	No. of primary Kannad schools	No. of pupils	No. of pupils per school
Sholapur City ..	136	43,468	319·6	15	1,976	131·7
Akkalkot Taluka.	121	17,214	142·6	82	8,919	108·7
South Sholapur Taluka.	89	15,962	179·3	12	1,297	108·1

It will be seen from this that better facilities have been provided for education of Kannad-speaking pupils than for the education of Marathi-speaking pupils.

3.19. The question about the facilities to be given to the language minorities in the areas concerned has already been dealt with in paragraph 3.15 above. It may, however, be mentioned that as far as Court languages are concerned, that is a matter falling within the jurisdiction of the High Court.

3.20. It is contended in paragraph 281 of the said Memorandum that the cotton mills in Sholapur have to depend upon the cotton grown in the districts of Bijapur, Belgaum, Dharwar, Raichur and Gulbarga for the supply of cotton and that therefore the industry has much better prospects of growth and development in Sholapur if that area is again joined to the Mysore State. In the first instance, Sholapur was never a part of the Mysore State and there is therefore no question of "again" joining it to that State. Secondly, cotton is an essential commodity, and its production, supply and distribution have been under the full control of the Central Government since the Second World War. The needs of the cotton industry and the places from which cotton should be supplied to any particular mill are matters within the control of the Central Government authorities. It is not correct to say that the Sholapur cotton industry will prosper only if Sholapur is included in the Mysore State.

3.21. In paragraph 282 of the said Memorandum, it has been contended that for its foodgrains and milk supply also Sholapur City has to depend on the Kannad areas "to the Southern and Eastern and to some extent of the North-Eastern parts". The Maharashtra Government consider that this is no reason for transfer of Sholapur City to the Mysore State.

3.22. In paragraph 283 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have observed that in matters of trade not only Sholapur but a large portion of that District has dealings with Karnatak since before a century and a special mention has been

made about the trade in 1840, of Vairag, a town in the Barsi Taluka. For one thing, the trade position of 100 years ago is not relevant to the present dispute ; for another, it is obvious that normal trade connections are not affected by reorganisation of States or their boundaries.

\* \* \*



## IV

### SHOLAPUR TALUKA

Paragraphs 284 to 296 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum deal with the former Sholapur Taluka, i.e. the area covered by the present North Sholapur and South Sholapur Talukas.

4.2. In paragraph 284 the Government of Mysore have observed :—

“About 20 years before, when the question of linguistic provinces was being seriously considered, the Taluka of Sholapur was divided into two unequal parts. North Sholapur consists of 44 villages and South Sholapur consists of 80 villages. The Head-quarters for both is the City of Sholapur itself”.

It is further observed—

“It is obvious that the division has been so effected as to include all the Kannad-speaking areas into South Sholapur Taluka and consequently the Marathi-speaking villages together with the city of Sholapur into the North Sholapur Taluka. It is alleged that this was deliberately done so that when the linguistic States would be formed, it should be easy to allocate the South Sholapur Taluka to Karnataka and to retain Sholapur City as a part of the Marathi portion, viz. the North Sholapur Taluka. If there was no such partition and if the Taluka was one, the City of Sholapur would easily be included with the Kannad-speaking area and it was this likelihood that the designers of the division wanted to forestall. It is needless to say that this design was the work of Ministers in the Bombay State, who were more interested in Marathi”.

4.3. It is first necessary to correct some factual errors in the Mysore Government's above statements. The division of the former Sholapur Taluka took place in the times of the British in the year 1944 and not after 1947 as implied by the Mysore

Government. In the year 1944 the question of creation of linguistic provinces was not even thought of and even the question of Indian independence was far from settled. The former Sholapur Taluka consisted of 152 villages including Sholapur City and not 123 villagers as stated by the Mysore Government. 52 villages and Sholapur City were included in the North Sholapur Taluka and 99 villages were included in the South Sholapur Taluka.

4.4. It has been alleged by the Mysore Government that if there was no such partition and if the Taluka was one, the City of Sholapur would easily be included with the Kannad-speaking area and it was this likelihood that the designers of the division wanted to forestall. According to the census of 1951, which was the census taken into account by the States Reorganisation Commission in determining the areas of each new linguistic State, the position of North and South Sholapur Talukas was as follows :—

		Total	Marathi	Kannad
North Sholapur	..	3,24,874	1,45,419	38,764
South Sholapur	..	93,484	30,147	44,967
		4,18,358	1,75,566	83,731
			41.9%	20.01%

It will be seen from this that even if the former Sholapur Taluka had not been bifurcated, the Kannad population was too small (20.01 per cent.) for its inclusion in the State of Mysore. The States Reorganisation Commission had decided not to break up a district unless the percentage of any particular linguistic group in a taluka was 70 per cent. or more. In view of the fact that Kannad-speaking people accounted for only 20 per cent. of the population of the former Sholapur Taluka, it is not clear how the Mysore Government say that if there was no partition of the Taluka, the City of Sholapur would have been included in the Mysore State as a part of Kannad area by the States Reorganisation Commission.

4.5. The Mysore Government have also referred to an allegation (the authors of which are not mentioned) that the division

of the Sholapur Taluka was deliberately done, so that when the linguistic States would be formed, it should be easy to allocate the South Sholapur Taluka to Karnatak and to retain Sholapur City as a part of the Marathi portion, viz., North Sholapur Taluka. That Government has, however, itself alleged that this design was the work of Ministers in the Bombay State who were more interested in Marathi. It has already been pointed out above that Sholapur Taluka was divided in 1944 when India was still under British rule. There was no popular Ministry then in the Province of Bombay. There was an Advisers' regime. As there were no Ministers then, the allegation that the division was the design of the Ministers, who were more interested in Marathi, is totally baseless. As for the other allegation that the division was deliberately done so that when the linguistic States would be formed, it should be easy to allocate South Sholapur Taluka to Karnatak and to retain Sholapur City in Maharashtra, it has already been pointed out that the question of the formation of linguistic States was totally beyond the horizon in 1944. The proposal to divide the taluka was mooted by the then Collector of Sholapur, supported by the then Commissioner, Central Division and approved by Adviser (Revenue) and Adviser (Finance), all of whom were Englishmen who were members of the Indian Civil Service. Copies of (i) the Collector's Letter No. ADM-281, dated 5th September 1944 (without accompaniments), (ii) Commissioner's Endorsement No. ADM-2/77, dated 11th September 1944, (iii) Government Resolution, Revenue Department, No. 4378/39, dated 30th September 1944 and (iv) Government Notification No. 4378/39, dated 30th September 1944 are given in Appendix "A". It will be seen from these documents that the only reason which prompted the division of Sholapur Taluka was that it was too large for efficient administration by one Mamlatdar, the more so in view of its land development, supply and other problems. The Adviser (Finance) observed in this connection as follows :--

"Certainly the new taluka containing Sholapur City must be far less in extent than the other new Taluka and also the belt running along the southern border of the Taluka from

east to west is very largely homogeneous, Lingayat, troublesome and fertile and differs considerably from the north of the Taluka ”.

Thus although the South Sholapur Taluka was considered to be very largely Lingayat and troublesome, it was in nobody's mind then that it should be carved with the purpose of including it in a Kannad-speaking State.

4.6. In the same paragraph 284 of the Mysore Government Memorandum it is also stated that the area covered by the South Sholapur Taluka is almost completely Kannada and touches the very fringe of the city and that this corroborates the fact that Sholapur was formerly a Kannada City. How the conclusion follows from the statement is not clear. The admission that Sholapur was 'formerly' a Kannada City implies that it is not now a Kannada City and that it should be transferred to Mysore because it was formerly Kannada. As pointed out earlier, ancient history is not relevant in solving the present question.

4.7. In paragraph 285 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore State that to the North of Sholapur City, there were only about 30 villages which were Marathi-speaking and which could be included in the North Sholapur Taluka and that in order to make up the shortage some more villages from beyond the old Sholapur Taluka, were added to make 44 villages, in North Sholapur Taluka. In the same way about 27 villages, from the remaining part of the Sholapur Taluka were transferred to Mohol Taluka of the same district leaving 80 villages to form the South Sholapur Taluka. It will be seen from the Notification No. 4378/39, dated the 30th September 1944, reproduced in Appendix "A", that the old Sholapur Taluka consisted of 152 villages including Sholapur City, of which 53 including Sholapur City were constituted in North Sholapur Taluka, and 99 in South Sholapur Taluka. Thus no villages from beyond the old Sholapur Taluka were added to make up the North Sholapur Taluka, and no villages were transferred to reduce the size of the South Sholapur Taluka.

4.8. It has further been stated in the same paragraph that although Kannad-speaking population of South Sholapur Taluka



is 48.1 per cent. and Marathi-speaking population is 32.2 per cent., and although most of the remaining 19.4 per cent., Urdu-speaking population and the Marathi-speaking population know Kannada as well, the Maharashtra Government proposed to transfer only 65 villages as Kannada-speaking and to retain 15 villages on the ground that they have Marathi majority. It is contended by them that 8 villages form pockets inside the Kannada-speaking villages, and that on their own showing the Maharashtra Government cannot claim anything more than 12 villages. In the opinion of the Mysore Government the Maharashtra Government are not entitled to claim even these 12 villages as that would mean splitting up of the taluka. The Government of Maharashtra had made it amply clear that the fresh line of demarcation suggested by them was based on the village as unit, and relative majority as between Kannada and Marathi in each village according to the 1951 Census. Consequently, the percentage of the Kannada-speaking and the Marathi-speaking populations in the whole taluka of South Sholapur was not relevant for determining the number of villages to be transferred to Mysore. The Maharashtra Government have not proposed to retain 8 Marathi majority villages which form pockets within the Kannad majority villages. Besides those 8 villages, there are 15 villages in South Sholapur Taluka which had a relative majority of Marathi-speaking population and which were contiguous to the Marathi majority area of the State, and therefore it was proposed to retain them in Maharashtra.

4.9. In the same paragraph 285, the Mysore Government have stated that the Government of Maharashtra are not entitled to claim 12 villages in the South Sholapur Taluka as that would mean splitting up of the Taluka. In the next paragraph 286 also they have stated that there should be no breaking up of a Taluka under any circumstances. In view of these statements it is not clear how the Government of Mysore are claiming the 9 villages in Mangalwedha Taluka, 19 villages in Shirol Taluka and 24 villages in Gadhinglaj Taluka which were offered by the Government of Maharashtra. In paragraph 261 of their

Memorandum the Government of Mysore have stated that they claim all the 260 villages offered for transfer to Mysore State by the Government of Maharashtra. This is inconsistent with the principle of not splitting up a Taluka as mentioned by them in paragraphs 285 and 286.

4.10. In paragraph 287 of their Memorandum, the Mysore Government have referred to the book entitled "History of Sholapur City" by Rao Saheb V. N. Jakkal and a quotation from the book has been given in the foot-note in which according to the Mysore Government it is stated that till very recently 85 per cent. of the Sholapur population was speaking Kannad language and also till recent years even accounts were kept in Kannad by the merchants of Sholapur. The foot-note gives details about Rao Saheb Jakkal probably to show that he being a Telugu person, his statement regarding the population and accounts of the merchants of Sholapur should be accepted as impartial. In the first place, the quotation given is from Part VII of the book where it is clearly mentioned at the outset that the information given in that part was obtained from Shri Mallikarjunappa Apparao Patil. It is clear, therefore, that the correctness of the information quoted is not vouched for by Shri Jakkal. Secondly, the quotation in Marathi does not use any words meaning "till very recently" or "till recent years". On the other hand, it says that the merchants used to maintain their accounts in Kannada *till 1825-30* and the reference to the percentage of people speaking Kannad as also to the dominance of Lingayats in trade pertains to the same period. Thirdly, the year in which the book was published is not given in the book, but enquiries made by the Government of Maharashtra reveal that it was published in or about 1926. It is stated in the Foreword to the book by the Author that he had written the book about 15-16 years earlier and that 60 pages of it had even been printed, but that due to some circumstances, printing could not be completed. All this means that the information given in the book pertains to the period around 1910. Even if, therefore, it is assumed that the statements quoted in the Mysore Government's Memorandum are factually correct, they pertain to a period

more than 50 if not 100 years ago, and, therefore, it would not be correct to base any conclusion about the present character of Sholapur City on that information. Besides the Gazetteer of 1884 contradicts the statements made in this book.

4.11. In the latter part of paragraph 287 of the Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have observed that apart from the outside population coming in with the growth of trade, there has been influence of Marathi as the official language and of Marathi people as officials at the District Headquarters, that there was a super-imposition of the Marathi language on the substrata of Kannada whose sphere of activity has receded to the realms of domestic talk. Apart from other things, this is a clear admission that at present Kannad is neither the dominant language nor the dominant culture of Sholapur City and therefore the Mysore Government claim for inclusion of that City in the Mysore State cannot stand. The question whether the substrata is of Kannad speaking population or of some other language group is not important for our present purpose. The population figures available from 1881 show that the Marathi-speaking population has always been predominant in Sholapur City. In 1881, out of 1,49,539 people, 1,25,538 or 83.9 per cent. were Hindus whereas 9,906 were Lingayat-Vanis. In 1901 out of 75,288 people, 55,988 were Hindus and out of 8,006 educated persons, 6,665 were Marathi and 184 Kannad. In the 1931 Census, the Lingayats numbered 12,000 in a population of 1,35,574 (pages 47-48 of Sholapur Municipality Centenary Volume). According to the 1951 Census, the population of the City was 2,76,510 of whom 1,07,253 (38.8 per cent.) were Marathi-speaking and 35,643 (12.9 per cent.) were Kannad-speaking. It is not, therefore, clear how the Mysore Government says that on the substrata of the Kannad-speaking people Marathi was super-imposed.

4.12. In paragraph 288 of their Memorandum, the Government of Mysore have alleged that as there are only Marathi schools, Kannad people had perforce to learn reading and writing in Marathi, with the result that most of the people speak

Kannad at home and in personal talk but use Marathi for most of the formal transactions. Because of this, in the view of the Mysore Government in the later enumerations of the census, such people have come to be reckoned as Marathi-speaking and this accounts for the increase in language percentage of Marathi and decrease in the Kannad percentage. These allegations are not supported by facts. In Sholapur City for 43,468 Marathi-speaking students, there are 136 primary schools whereas for 1976 Kannad-speaking students, there are 15 primary schools. This means that there is one primary school for about 320 Marathi-speaking students whereas there is one primary school for 132 Kannad-speaking students. In this state of affairs, to say that the Kannad people have perforce to learn reading and writing Marathi is contrary to facts. It is also stated that in "later" enumerations of the Census, Kannad-speaking people have come to be reckoned as Marathi-speaking. From the population figures at different Censuses mentioned in the preceding paragraph it will be seen that the Marathi-speaking people have consistently been in substantial majority from as far back as 1881, language-wise break-up of population since when was readily available. It is not, therefore, true that originally there was a large number of Kannad-speaking people and that through wrong enumeration in later Censuses Kannad-speaking people were enumerated as Marathi-speaking people resulting in a higher percentage of Marathi-speaking people and lower of Kannad-speaking people.

4.13. In paragraphs 289 to 293 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum reference has been made to the religious and cultural links of Sholapur City with Kannad. Reliance has been placed for this purpose on the book "History of Sholapur City" by Rao Saheb V. N. Jakkal. A perusal of pages 41 to 46 and 46 to 48 of that book will show that there are a number of temples of Hindus (as opposed to Lingayats) and a number of masjids also. It cannot, therefore, be said that Sholapur City has any predominantly Kannad character. In fact it cannot have such character because of the small percentage of Kannad-speaking people in the City throughout the recorded period. Consequently

historical and religious connections of Sholapur with Kannad area cannot become a reason for transferring the city to the Mysore State.

4.14. In paragraph 294 of the Memorandum, reference has been made to the temple of Maruti. It is contended that it was formerly known as "Modala Maruti Temple", but that due to the impact of Marathi it is now known as "Madhala Maruti". Even supposing the contention of Mysore Government to be true, the point is too trifling to make out any case for transferring Sholapur City to Mysore State.

4.15. The same is the case with the incident mentioned in paragraph 295 of the Memorandum regarding the sacrifice of a Lingayat Wani woman at the foot of the tower of the fort of Sholapur. Such instances will at the most establish nothing more than the presence of some Kannadigas in Sholapur City in former times.

4.16. Paragraph 296 of the Memorandum deals with Kannad literature and trade. It has been said that the seat of Saint Basava's activities was Kalyan. Sholapur and Akkalkot Talukas being within a radius of about 50 to 60 miles from Kalyan, the influence of Kannad was very strong in these areas. Saint Basava flourished in the 12th century and it is of academic importance now to determine the extent of the influence of Kannad in these areas in those days. What we are concerned with is the linguistic composition of the present population of the area, and it cannot be said that the City can today form a homogeneous part of a Kannad tract. According to the 1961 Census, the Kannad-speaking population of Sholapur City is only 12.77 per cent., whereas the Marathi-speaking population is 39.08 per cent., Telugu 25.05 per cent. and Urdu 17.33 per cent. Speakers of Kannad, therefore, form the fourth largest group in the City. There is, therefore, no case whatever for the transfer of Sholapur City to Mysore on the grounds mentioned by the Government of Mysore.

4.17. The Karnatak Ekikaran Maha Samiti never contested any elections during the past 10 years on the issue of transfer of South Sholapur Taluka, Sholapur City or any other area to Mysore or on any other issue. On the other hand, the Taluka Panchayat Samiti of South Sholapur Taluka has passed a resolution on 12th April 1967 unanimously for retention of the taluka in Maharashtra. Besides, a number of Village Panchayats have also passed resolutions and forwarded them to the Commission informing the Commission that the development of their villages will be facilitated by retaining them in Maharashtra and urging the Commission not to transfer them to the Mysore State. It is thus clear that the people of the area do not desire to be transferred to the Mysore State.



\* \* \*

## SHOLAPUR CITY

In paragraphs 297 and 298 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum, some more arguments have been advanced to show the Kannad character of the City of Sholapur. In paragraph 297 it has been stated that the City of Sholapur is a cosmopolitan one and that in spite of its being linked up with a large portion of Marathi area and the official influence of Marathi, Marathi has not made serious inroads on the linguistic complexion of the city. In support of this argument, it has been stated that while the percentage of Marathi-speaking people is 38.8 according to the 1951 Census and that of Kannad-speaking about 13, the remaining 48 per cent of the population, which consists mostly of Telugu-speaking and Urdu-speaking people, is conversant with Kannad and is in favour of transfer to Mysore State. On this basis, it has been said that the linguistic gravity of the town is more in favour of Karnatak. No evidence has been brought forward to support the contention that the Telugu-speaking and Urdu-speaking people are in favour of transfer of Sholapur City to Mysore State. It has been said in the same paragraph that since centuries Sholapur has been a completely Kannad area and that its present growth and development is of a comparatively recent date. However, the figures of different Censuses given by the Mysore Government in this paragraph do not show that there was a preponderance of Kannad-speaking people at any period of time. On the contrary, the figures given in paragraph 4.11 above show that there has been a preponderance of Marathi-speaking people since 1881, if not earlier.

5.2. In paragraph 298 of the Memorandum, it is stated that in the Sholapur City Municipality there have all along been several Kannad representatives ever since its inception in 1852, and even in the very first Committee nominated by the Government there were Kannad representatives. Many of the Presi-

dents of the Municipality since then are said to have been Kannad people. Even in the present Municipal Corporation of Sholapur, out of 59 members who are elected, 27 are stated to be Kannad-speaking and 12 Marathi-speaking and the remaining 20 are said to be speaking other languages. It may be pointed out that out of the 9 members nominated by Government in 1852 to the first Committee, only one Shri Dharmarao Thobade was a Lingayat and he used to read and write Marathi and sign in Marathi only. There have been 40 Presidents of the Sholapur Municipality during its life of 115 years. Out of these 40, only 9 were Lingayats and the total period of their regime was 12 years. Among the 59 existing Corporators of the Sholapur Municipal Corporation, only 8 are Lingayats. Most of the remaining are those whose mother-tongue is Marathi or who have adopted Marathi for all day-to-day activities outside their home. It will thus be seen that the Government of Mysore have not made out any case for transferring the City of Sholapur to Mysore.

5.3. It needs to be added that the people of Sholapur have expressed their desire to remain in Maharashtra. The Sholapur Municipality passed a resolution by a majority of 52 to 2 (2 remaining neutral) on 14th August 1954 for retention of the city in Maharashtra. Another resolution was passed on 19th April 1961. The latest resolution which was passed unanimously on 4th May 1967 stated that the Mysore Government's claim to Sholapur City is wrong and irrational, and is not supported by any fact. This resolution is reproduced in Appendix "B". Similar resolutions have also been passed by other institutions such as Co-operative Societies.

\* \* \*



# VI

## AKALKOT

Akalkot taluka consists of three towns and 121 villages. According to the 1951 Census the total population of the taluka is 1,49,438. Out of this 34,871 are Marathi-speakers and 82,913 are Kannad-speakers. The former constitute 23·3 per cent. while the latter constitute 55·5 per cent. According to the 1961 Census the total population of this taluka is 1,75,333. Out of this 39,525 are Marathi-speakers and 99,872 are Kannad-speakers. The former constitute 22·5 per cent. while the latter constitute 56·9 per cent.

6.2. According to the earlier proposals, the Government of former Bombay State had proposed that the demarcation of boundary between the Bombay and Mysore States in the Akalkot Taluka wherein there is a majority of the Kannad-speaking people over the Marathi-speaking people and where such areas are compact should also be reviewed and adjusted so as to transfer to the Mysore State contiguous Kannad-speaking areas. In paragraph 6·157 of its Memorandum on the Maharashtra-Mysore Border Dispute submitted to the One-Man Commission on the 31st March 1957, the Government of Maharashtra have indicated that it would have no objection to the boundary being re-adjusted in the Akkalkot Taluka on the principles propounded by it in the said Memorandum provided those principles are equally applied in re-adjusting the boundary in the areas claimed by the Government of Maharashtra. The Government of Maharashtra have accordingly proposed to retain the Akalkot town and 28 villages (*vide* Appendix C) and to surrender 2 towns of Maindargi and Dudhani and 93 villages. The Government of Mysore have now proposed that the entire taluka may be transferred to that State.

6.3. The Akalkot State before it was merged in the former Bombay State, had 106 villages and an estimated area of 498 square miles. Its population in 1881 was 58,040. It had 7

villages detached from the compact area. Of these 7 villages 6 were in the Malsiras Sub-division of Sholapur and the village of Kurla in the Khatav Sub-division of Satara. Out of the total population of 58,040, 20,000 were Lingayats.

6.4. Akalkot Taluka is bounded on the North by the Osmanabad District of the Maharashtra State, on the east as well as on the south by Mysore State areas and on the west partly by the Bijapur District and partly by the South Sholapur Taluka of the Maharashtra State. It is relevant to point out that the Government of Mysore have sought for transfer of the former entire Sholapur Taluka also which consisted of the talukas of North Sholapur and South Sholapur. Even according to the proposals made by the Government of Bombay (Maharashtra), a substantial part of the South Sholapur Taluka would under certain circumstances be surrendered to the Government of Mysore. Even if that surrender takes place, the Akalkot Taluka would have contiguity with the Maharashtra State from the North, i.e. from the Osmanabad District. The contention of the Government of Mysore in paragraph 299 of its Memorandum that on the North also lies Kannad area is not therefore correct.

6.5. The contention of the Government of Mysore in paragraph 300 of their Memorandum that the Government of Maharashtra have conceded that 99 villages are Kannad-speaking and that they may be transferred to the Mysore State is not wholly true. The actual offer of transfer is only for 93 villages and 2 towns. Similarly the contention of that Government that the Government of Maharashtra's claim is to retain 25 villages including the town of Akalkot is not wholly correct. This Government have claimed to retain 28 villages and the Akolkot town.

6.6. With regard to the allegation in paragraph 301 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum that the former rulers of Akalkot discouraged or stifled Kannad, this Government state that they have no knowledge of the same and it is not clear on what basis the allegation of the Government of Mysore is made.

6.7. It is contended by the Government of Mysore in paragraph 303 of their Memorandum that even on linguistic grounds there is no justification to retain Akalkot town or the other villages by the Government of Maharashtra. The claim of the Government of Maharashtra for Akalkot town and the 28 villages (*vide* Appendix C) was based on the 1951 Census figures and the principles enunciated in the Memorandum of 25th June 1957. According to the principles of relative majority, contiguity and village as unit the Mysore Government's claim for Akalkot town and the said 28 villages is clearly untenable.

6.8. The Government of Mysore have in paragraph 304 of their Memorandum enunciated a new principle. That is that the former princely States which were "autonomous, organic, administrative units" should be treated on par with districts and hence as units for the purpose of re-organisation. In propounding this new principle the Mysore Government have relied on States Reorganisation Commission's following observation :—

"Districts have developed an organic and administrative unity and economic life of their own."

According to the Mysore Government the Indian States, like the British districts, had developed an organic and administrative unity and economic life of their own.

6.9. The question under consideration is regarding demarcation of the boundaries in the disputed areas between the two States of Maharashtra and Mysore. The charter of the One-Man Commission is linguistic homogeneity. The linguistic homogeneity cannot be achieved to the maximum extent by adopting either a district, a taluka or a princely State as a unit but it can be achieved only by adopting a unit smaller than any of these three. The inevitable conclusion is therefore that a village should be the unit for demarcation of the boundaries between the two States as proposed by the Government of Maharashtra. In view of this position, the principle enunciated by the Government of Mysore that a princely State should be adopted as a unit is untenable.

6.10. In connection with the new principle enunciated by the Mysore Government as above, it must also be pointed out that factually the territory of many an Indian State was not compact, but was scattered, British areas intervening between parts of the Indian State. It is thus that we find that various British districts in Maharashtra had enclaves within themselves of Indian State territory. It is not necessary to give any example because, as stated already, the Indian State of Akalkot owned some villages in Malsiras Taluka of the Sholapur District and one village in Khatav Taluka of Satara District. In these circumstances it would not be correct to talk of any organic, economic or administrative unity within the former State of Akalkot. The Mysore Government's contention about the organic unity of the former Akalkot State has therefore no factual foundation.

6.11. In paragraph 305 the Government of Mysore have stated that the Akalkot State would have been added to the Kannad District of Bijapur or Gulbarga if the reorganisation of States had taken place simultaneously with the merger of Indian States in the Union of India. This is purely guess work on the part of the Government of Mysore.

6.12. In paragraph 306 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have argued that the question of joining Akalkot to Karnatak did not receive any consideration at the hands of the States Reorganisation Commission because Akalkot was at that time only a taluka of the Sholapur District. That Government have therefore requested (*vide* also paragraph 309 of their Memorandum) the One-Man Commission specially to consider this issue and have opined that, on the basis of the Indian State being adopted as a unit, Akalkot State should be transferred to Mysore State. The merger of the former princely States took place as far back as 1948-49. If all Indian States were such organic, economic, administrative and independent units as they are now made out to be by the Mysore Government in their Memorandum and if it was necessary to ignore the processes of history between 1948 and 1956, surely the States Reorganisation Commission and Parliament would have noticed the importance of the subject and given due consideration to it. The Mysore

Government's contention that the processes of history should be ignored and that the One-Man Commission should consider their claim on a 1948-footing has no substance in it. These observations would dispose of the contentions in paragraph 309 also of the Memorandum.

6.13. Further, the present Akalkot taluka comprises villages not only from the princely Akalkot State but also villages from the princely Kurundwad State and villages of the old Sholapur taluka. Even assuming the princely State of Akkalkot had organic, economic and administrative unity as contended by the Mysore Government it is not clear how that unity is to be linked to the villages from the Kurundwad State as well as the villages from the old Sholapur taluka. The Mysore Government's claim to the present entire Akalkot taluka is therefore hardly consistent with the various arguments made in their Memorandum from time to time. This meets the arguments in paragraph 313 also of the Mysore Memorandum, in which it is contended that the components of Akalkot and the components of Kurundwad can be joined together and together considered as a unit.

6.14. In the first part of paragraph 307 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have continued the argument referred to above and then given the analogy of Coorg. The analogy of Coorg is however not on all fours with the case of Akalkot and Jath States. The important point of difference is that while Coorg was a part 'C' State under the Constitution when the States Reorganisation Commission considered its case, the Akkalkot and Jath States were not so.

6.15. In paragraph 308 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have stated that the States of Akalkot and Jath could as well have been included in the District of Bijapur immediately after their merger but the Government of former Bombay State summarily included them in the two Marathi districts of Sholapur and Sangli, respectively, without giving any consideration as to whether from the view-point of language, linking would be proper or not. It is pertinent to point out here that in 1948 the Bombay State was a trilingual State, the

languages being Marathi, Kannad and Gujarati and the Government of the State came from the areas of all these three languages. If it was administrative considerations which prevailed with the then Government and if even now the Mysore Government think of language as a subordinate and minor factor (please see paragraph 256 of their Memorandum) it is not clear how it can be contended that the linguistic considerations were not given sufficient weight in 1948 by the then Government. To describe the 1948 decision as a "summary" decision, as the Government of Mysore have done is therefore not correct.

6.16. In paragraph 311 of their Memorandum the Government of Mysore have stated that there has been little development in the taluka of Akalkot after its merger till now. It is also pointed out that there is not even now a good road from Dudhni to Akalkot even though on the way lies the other and bigger town of Maindargi. The statement that there has been little development in this taluka is too vague to answer and as regards road between Dudhni and Akalkot via Maindargi, there is a murum surface road at present.

6.17. In paragraph 314 the Government of Mysore have stated that Akalkot has as much trade relations with Gulbarga as it has with Sholapur and that Gulbarga is 50 miles by road and 45 miles by rail from Akalkot. Firstly the trade relations are not affected by the State boundaries. Secondly the Government of Mysore themselves have admitted that Akalkot has trade relations with Sholapur.

6.18. In paragraph 315 of the said Memorandum it is stated that in the population of Akalkot State in 1881, there were 20,000 Lingayats in a total population of 58,040 and that the social and cultural ties of these Lingayats were either with Kalyan or with people who are to be found in Bijapur, Raichur and Gulbarga. The linguistic percentages in any area are no doubt relevant in the present proceedings, but the same clearly cannot be said about the historical ties referred to by the Mysore Government. There are Lingayats in other parts of Maharashtra also, and all Lingayats are not Kannad-speakers.

6.19. In paragraph 316 the Government of Mysore relying on the 8 Kannad inscriptions available in the palace of the Maratha Chief, Akalkot, have concluded that there was Kannad language as also the influence of Kannad culture in this taluka. The answer to this kind of argument is that Marathi inscriptions are also available in the predominantly Kannad-speaking areas, and that the inscriptions do not prove the present language position.

6.20. In paragraph 317, the Government of Mysore have stated that the case of Akalkot town should be considered as on par with that of cities in the disputed areas. The Government of Mysore state that the linguistic complexion of a town will have to be determined not merely by the percentage of the people speaking one language or the other in the town itself but by the language spoken in the villages in the neighbourhood and under the influence of the town. According to the Census Map, Akalkot town is surrounded by Akalkot non-municipal area. According to the 1951 census figures, the population of the Akalkot municipal area was 18,112 and that of the non-municipal area was 785. Considering the small population of the non-municipal area, the reasonable course would be to take the municipal and non-municipal area together. If they are so taken, the percentage of Marathi-speaking people in the two areas was 45.8 and these two areas are surrounded by Marathi-speaking villages on the north-east, north and the west. The percentage of the Kannad-speaking people, on the other hand, in these two areas was only 23.5. In the 1961 census the percentage of the Marathi-speaking people has no doubt dropped to 36.7 and the percentage of the Kannad-speaking people has risen to 32.9. But their relative position remains unaltered and the two areas continue to be surrounded by Marathi-speaking villages to the north-east, the north and the west. The claim of the Government of Maharashtra for retention of the Akalkot town as well as its non-municipal area is, therefore, fully justified on the basis of the principles propounded by them. Further, all the 11 villages mentioned in paragraph 317 of the Memorandum of the Government of Mysore as surrounding

Akalkot town on its three sides, namely, east, south and west, have not been claimed by the State of Maharashtra. Out of them, only three are claimed, namely Naganhalli, Bagehalli and Dodyal, and they have been claimed on the ground that Marathi-speaking people have a relative majority in them. According to 1961 census, however, the Kannad-speaking people have acquired relative majority in Naganhalli and the Government of Maharashtra will have no objection to its transfer to the State of Mysore provided 1961 census figures are uniformly adopted as the basis for such transfers. It appears that the Government of former Bombay had claimed the village Itage through mistake. It need not be included in the State of Maharashtra now.

6.21. In paragraph 318, the Government of Mysore state that the cases of the villages Itage, Bagehalli and Banasgol are all on par. This statement is totally incorrect. According to 1951 census, while Itage had a relative majority of Kannad-speaking people, both Bagehalli and Banasgol had a relative majority of Marathi-speaking people. According to 1961 census, Itage has an absolute majority of Kannad-speaking people and Bagehalli and Banasgol have absolute majority of Marathi-speaking people. It will thus be seen that Itage will have to go to the State of Mysore and the villages Bagehalli and Banasgol will have to remain in the State of Maharashtra.

6.22. In paragraph 320, the Government of Mysore have stated that the town of Akalkot should be kept amidst its natural surroundings of Kannad areas and that no special consideration exists for its detachment by carving for it a narrow corridor on the north. The town of Akalkot can be detached only if it is a pocket. But as it is not, being surrounded by Marathi-speaking villages on the north-east, north and west, it will have to remain in the State of Maharashtra.

6.23. As regards the failure to declare Akalkot taluka as bilingual mentioned in paragraph 322 of the Memorandum of the Mysore Government, the fact of the matter is that a major part of the Akalkot taluka was offered by the Government of former



Bombay for being included in the State of Mysore immediately after the re-organisation of the States in 1956 and it was expected that this would take place soon and there would be no necessity to declare it as bilingual. It was, however, because of the attitude taken by the Government of Mysore that the major part of the Akkalkot taluka has still remained in the State of Maharashtra. Had they accepted the offer when it was made, the question of declaring it bilingual would not have survived at all.

6.24. The recommendations of the One-Man Commission will be determined mainly by the principle of linguistic homogeneity. It is however necessary to say a few words here about the public opinion in this taluka. There are two Maharashtra Assembly Constituencies which are relevant here. One is the Akalkot Constituency covering some villages from Akalkot taluka only, and the second is Akalkot-South Sholapur constituency, for the remaining villages in the Akalkot taluka and the whole of the South Sholapur taluka. There was no candidate sponsored by the Kannada Ekikaran Maha Samiti or any other Kannad body in any of the three General Elections of 1957, 1962 and 1967. As regards village panchayats almost all of them have passed resolutions expressing a desire to continue in the Maharashtra State. The municipalities of all the three towns namely, Akalkot, Maindargi and Dudhni, have also passed similar resolutions. The Taluka Panchayat Samiti also has passed a similar resolution. This position effectively proves the strong desire of the people to continue to remain in Maharashtra.

6.25. With regard to the allegations in paragraph 324 of the Mysore Government's Memorandum about Shri Pawate, it is enough to state that the conduct and promotion of Civil Judges are subject to the superintendence and control of the High Court and not of State Government.

## VII

### JATH TALUKA

(Sangli District)

7.1. The present Jath taluka consists of 97 villages and the town of Jath. Its population in 1951 was 1,08,280, out of which 52.1 per cent. were Marathi-speaking and 40.2 per cent. Kannad-speaking. According to the 1961 Census, the population of the taluka including the Jath town is 1,38,983, out of which 54.3 per cent are Marathi-speaking and 37.7 per cent are Kannad-speaking. Out of 97 villages, the then Government of Bombay in their Memorandum of 25th June 1957 offered to transfer 44 villages to the Mysore State. Thus, 53 villages and the town of Jath are to remain in the Maharashtra State. In accordance with the said Memorandum, as stated already, Mysore Government's claim is for the entire taluka, i.e. they claim 53 villages more and the Jath town as well.

7.2. Paragraph 327 of the Mysore Memorandum gives the total boundary line of the whole taluka as 212 miles. If one considers the portion of the taluka which is to be retained with Maharashtra according to the Memorandum of 25th June 1957, the said length of 212 miles has clearly no significance. Similarly the paragraph in question gives the distances from Bijapur and Sangli to places in the Jath taluka. These distances also have no significance in the present proceedings.

7.3. With regard to paragraph 328 of the Mysore Government Memorandum, the question of a former princely State being considered as a 'unit' for the purpose of reorganisation has already been dealt with earlier in paragraphs 6.8 to 6.10.

7.4. Paragraph 329 of the Mysore Government Memorandum states that the Collector of Bijapur was the political agent for the State of Jath. This statement is not wholly correct. At one time the political agent was the Collector of Satara. The Collector of Bijapur came thereafter only for a few years. After him, the political agent was the Collector of Kolhapur.

7.5. Paragraph 331 of the Mysore Government Memorandum states that the forest area in Jath was being administered by the Sub-Divisional Forest Officer at Bagalkot in the Bijapur District. The position was that the forest in Jath was only of the scrub type and the forest which belonged to the old Sangli State fell into Belgaum District. The forest in Jath was thus given in the charge of the Sub-Divisional Officer at Bagalkot at the time of the merger, there being no Forest Officer in Sangli at the time of the merger.

7.6. Paragraph 333 of the said Memorandum states that the State of Jath came to be artificially made into a taluka of the South Satara District now called the Sangli District in 1948. The true position is that Jath was made into a taluka of the South Satara District on administrative grounds and there is no element of artificiality about it.

7.7. Paragraph 334 of the said Memorandum states that when linguistic divisions were formed for the purpose of the Indian National Congress, the State of Jath was a part of the Karnatak Provincial Congress Committee. The Provincial Congress Committees of the Indian National Congress were, however, for the British Indian provinces, and there were separate Committees of the Indian National Congress for Indian States. Further, jurisdictions of political parties have no relevance to the present discussion.

7.8. Paragraph 335 of the said Memorandum refers to the claims made by Karnatak regarding the Jath taluka. The then Government of Bombay considered these claims and voluntarily offered the Kannad speaking villages to the Mysore State by the Memorandum of 25th June 1957.

7.9. Paragraph 337 of the said Memorandum relates to the decision of the States Reorganisation Commission, with regard to Jath. All the points made here have been dealt with previously in the case of the Akalkot Taluka and it is not necessary to go over the same grounds again.

7.10. In paragraph 339 of the said Memorandum administrative convenience in support of the Mysore claim is sought to be established from the fact that the town of Jath is 55 miles from Sangli but only 40 miles from Bijapur and also from the fact that some time the Collector of Bijapur was the political agent of the State of Jath. The position about the political agent has been stated above in paragraph 7.4 and a little difference in the two distances given is not enough to establish any administrative convenience.

7.11. Paragraphs 340 and 341 of the said Memorandum mention some trade and social contacts. The statements are very vague and it is not possible to give any answer.

7.12. In paragraph 342 of the said Memorandum it is stated that Jath is very closely linked with Karnatak because some temples and swamis in Jath have devotees in Karnatak. The existence of Kannad population in the Jath taluka cannot be denied, but the fact that some temples attract Karnad people from outside has no significance. It does not establish any regular link as alleged between Jath and Karnatak. A shrine having devotees in different parts is a common occurrence in this country and it is neither possible nor necessary to join all such parts together administratively.

7.13. In this connection, it is really not necessary to refer to certain shrines in Maharashtra, but it would be enough to refer to the shrine of Saint Sai Baba in the Kopergaon Taluka of the Ahmednagar District who has devotees in all parts of India. They include many Kannad-speaking people also.

7.14. There is a reference again in paragraph 343 of the said Memorandum to another Deity Guddapura Danamma. The observations in the preceding paragraphs apply here also. The Mysore Government have further added that although the village Guddapur has a Kannad-speaking majority, it is claimed by Maharashtra. This is true but the claim is made because it is a pocket surrounded by Marathi-speaking villages. The Mysore

Government also say that "it would be saddest day for the devotees of this deity who are mostly in Karnatak, if it were to be made over to Maharashtra." If this principle were accepted many non-Marathi speaking areas would have to be added to Maharashtra. Reference has already been made to Saint Sai Baba.

7.15. In paragraph 344 of the said Memorandum, the Marathi complexion of the Jath town and of the neighbouring areas in taluka is admitted, but it is stated at the same time that the town is surrounded by Kannad-speaking areas to its east and south. This statement is not correct. In 1951, there was only one surrounding village which was Kannad-speaking and that was to the east, being the village Walsang, and the other surrounding villages were Marathi-speaking and there were at least 9 such villages of Marathi-speaking people. In 1961, there was not a single Kannad-speaking village surrounding the Jath town.

7.16. Paragraph 347 of the said Memorandum refers to a temple of Yellama. In view of what has already been said about temples, it is not necessary to say anything more here.

7.17. In paragraph 348 of the Memorandum it is stated that the Karanatak Ekikaran Samiti mentions in its Memorandum to the One-Man Commission that "just after the merger, the rise in the Kannad Schools was from 2 to 60." The Mysore Government's own comments on this are that "Even this was due mostly to the enthusiasm of and organization by the public. That shows the popular desire for learning Kannada and for associating themselves with Karnataka". It is not clear whether this increase is in the villages proposed for transfer to the Mysore State or otherwise. On the other hand a Memorandum submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission by the Committee of the Marathi-speaking people, Jath Taluka on 27th May 1954, contains the following :—

"There are Kannad schools only in 17 villages. They are mainly in eastern part. Inspite of Kannada propaganda, this number is since decreasing."

7.18. Paragraph 349 of the Mysore Government Memorandum complains that Jath Taluka has not yet been treated as bilingual. This question has already been dealt with in paragraph 3.15.

7.19. The public opinion in the villages which are proposed to be retained with Maharashtra, is over-whelmingly in favour of Maharashtra and they should therefore be retained in Maharashtra on the ground of the wishes of the people as well.

\* \* \*



## VIII

### CHANDGAD TALUKA

It is clear that the Government of Mysore do not claim Chandgad taluka on linguistic grounds. This taluka had majority of 92.4 per cent. of Marathi-speaking people in 1951 Census and that majority has increased in 1961 Census to 93 per cent. The charter of the Commission is linguistic homogeneity and the majority of the Marathi-speaking people is so overwhelming in this taluka that there will be no alternative but to retain it in the State of Maharashtra. Even the reasons given by the Mysore Government which are dealt with below are not so compelling as to justify its inclusion in the State of Mysore.

8.2. The Government of Mysore claim that taluka on the following grounds :—

- (i) Administrative convenience (paragraphs 351-352),
- (ii) Trade links with Belgaum (paragraph 353),
- (iii) Lack of educational, medical and legal facilities only available in Belgaum (paragraph 354),
- (iv) Food deficit which can only be made good by Belgaum (paragraph 355),
- (v) It is a part of Malnad (paragraph 355), and
- (vi) Bauxite required for aluminium factory to be opened in Belgaum is available in large quantities in this taluka (paragraph 357).

8.3. As regards administrative inconvenience, there has never been any complaint from the people of Chandgad that it cannot be conveniently administered by the Government of Maharashtra. Had there been any inconvenience, there would certainly have been agitation but no such agitation has ever taken place. In regard to paragraph 352 of the Mysore Memorandum, it is stated that the nearest railway station to Chandgad

is Belgaum and that there is no good road between Chandgad and Kolhapur and Chandgad people have necessarily to go to Kolhapur *via* Belgaum. It is not true that the people of Chandgad have necessarily to go *via* Belgaum to Kolhapur. As admitted by the Mysore Government there is a road from Chandgad to Kolhapur *via* Gadhinglaj and there is a State Transport Bus Service running on the road. The people of Chandgad can also go to Kolhapur *via* Belgaum by road or by rail but that does not mean that no direct communication exists between Chandgad and Kolhapur.

8.4. The Government of Mysore have adduced no evidence to show that the trade of Chandgad with Belgaum has been adversely affected because Chandgad is not in the State of Mysore nor have the people made any such complaint. It is obvious therefore that the trade has gone on unaffected and it is not necessary to include Chandgad in the State of Mysore for this reason.

8.5. As regards educational, medical and legal facilities, it has to be borne in mind that Chandgad is a hilly, backward taluka full of forest. Such talukas have always to depend on nearby places wherever they are. The people have also not complained that because of the lack of these facilities they should be included in the State of Mysore.

8.6. As regards food, the whole State of Maharashtra is deficit and many places in it get their food from outside. Further the food zones are created by the Government of India over which the Government of Maharashtra have no control. If the Government of India abolish the present zones or create a single zone of Maharashtra and Mysore, these difficulties will not exist. Moreover, the zones themselves are temporary and no decision can be based on such temporary difficulties.

8.7. There are many areas similar to Malnad in the State of Maharashtra and this cannot, therefore, become a ground for transferring Chandgad taluka to Mysore. If all areas like Mysore Malnad are to be brought together, large areas from the State of Maharashtra stretching from Chandgad in the south to Thana in the north will have to be included in the Mysore State.



8.8. The aluminium factory has yet to start and it is not necessary for the areas producing raw materials to be in the same State in which the factory is situated. There are factories all over the country, which draw their material from various parts of the country.

8.9. If the arguments advanced by the Mysore State are accepted they would be grounds for including Belgaum in the State of Maharashtra rather than including the Chandgad taluka in the State of Mysore, and the State of Maharashtra has already claimed the inclusion of Belgaum in the State of Maharashtra.



## APPENDIX ' A '

(Vide paragraph 4-5)

Letter*Subject.*—Territorial changes—

Splitting up of Sholapur Taluka into two  
Talukas and reconstitution of Sub-  
Divisions.

No. ADM-281

Sholapur, 5th September 1944.

From

J. M. Corin, Esquire, I.C.S.,  
Collector of Sholapur.

To

The Commissioner, C. D., Poona.

*Reference.*—Your D. O. dated 18th July 1944.

I submit herewith detailed proposals for—

- (a) the re-organization of the Prants in this District ;
- (b) the division of Sholapur Taluka into two ;
- (c) the allotment of the City Survey Work in Sholapur City to one of the two Mamlatdars now proposed for the sub-divided Sholapur Taluka.

The proposed changes are necessary for many reasons, some of them overlapping. They are summarised below.

2. At present the Pandharpur Prant has five Talukas (Pandharpur, Sangola, Malsiras, Madha and Karmala), and the Sholapur Prant has only Sholapur and Barsi, the Prant Officer being also City Survey Officer for Sholapur City. This allocation of the work was decided upon in 1940 (*vide* G. R., R. D., No. 4378/39, dated 23rd September 1940). Conditions have since changed, and the Pandharpur Prant is now unmanageably large. If the Prant Officer is to exercise the proper degree of supervision over supply and procurement work within his charge, and to have the detailed knowledge of crop prospects and yields so essential to supply work.

3. The Sholapur Prant, moreover, is too light, particularly if the Prant Officer is relieved (as I propose that he should be see below) of the City Survey work.

4. Sholapur Taluka is much too large for efficient administration by one Mamlatdar, the more so in view of the Land Development work now in progress and likely to be extended in the near future. At present the Taluka has 152 villages, the District Headquarter town, two irrigation tanks, and and a large scarcity area. There is urgent reason therefore to divide this unwieldy area into two, and I submit alternative plans for this in Appendices B-E with a note on the relative merits of each in Appendix A.

5. At present the Prant Officer, Sholapur Division has to do the City Survey Work for Sholapur City. In these days I do not think this imposition justifiable, as I have said above, I think he must take over part of the unwieldy Pandharpur Prant, and I would therefore press for the appointment as City Survey Officer of one of the two Mamlatdars to be appointed for the sub-divided Sholapur Taluka. I understand that Mamlatdar does this work in Poona. A percentage check of the surveyor's work is his main duty, and the Huzur Deputy Collector, now that there are two Resident Magistrates, could probably find the time to check a further percentage of the work checked by the Mamlatdar (as I understand the Collector's Personal Assistant does in Poona).

6. If the above proposals are accepted, I would propose that the Prants be sub-divided as follows :—

*Northern Division.*—Karmala, Madha, Barsi and Sholapur (northern part).

*Southern Division.*—Pandharpur, Sangola, Malsiras and Sholapur (Southern eventual Taluka headquarter possibly at Mandrup).

This sub-division, which I have discussed at length with both Prant Officers, will make for greater efficiency, as communications between the three northern Talukas are much easier than they are e.g. between Sangola and Karmala, Barsi, Madha and Karmala should be in one Prant. I have added the lighter northern part of Sholapur Taluka in order to make the work less unequal than it would be if all the present Sholapur Taluka were added to either of the Prants.

7. In the hope that the proposals will be accepted earlier, I venture to submit a draft Government Resolution (Notification) on the assumption that you will agree that Plan II (Appendix C) is the best.

8. I add a brief note in Appendix F on the question of State enclaves. I banish this awkward problem to an Appendix in the hope that there it will not delay the early decision which I hope for on the main proposals.

(Signed) J. M. Corin,  
Collector of Sholapur.

Below Collector of Sholapur's letter No. A.D.M. 251, dated September 5th 1944.

---

No. A.D.M 277,  
Poona, September 11, 1944.

Submitted to Government.

The necessity of giving relief to Sholapur Taluka has been obvious for some time. The figures given by Mr. Corin bring out this clearly but perhaps a truer perspective of the situation can be obtained by comparing the position with Poona. A city of this size developing at this rate requires the entire attention of a Mamlatdar under a lightly worked Prant Officer. Poona City Taluka takes in 20 villages in the immediate neighbourhood of Poona and requires the attention of really good and experienced Mamlatdar. Even so the work is so different and complicated that we have certainly not got to the stage of efficiency here that such an area requires. There are still cases of uncontrolled development and loss of Government revenue. Omitting a similar area in the case of Sholapur there would remain a taluka completely surrounding this City Taluka as Haveli does in the case of Poona. It would consist of 132 villages and this figure itself shows the absurdity of the present position. A normal deshi taluka consists of 70 to 80 of these heavy deshi villages and when such a taluka has got other troubles—irrigation, the neighbourhood of a large city or villages dispersed at a distance in a Native State we regard it as a heavy taluka. We have in short in the present Sholapur Taluka the makings of 3 talukas.

The difficulty has been under consideration for some time and we have tried all the usual ways that would not mean an increase of expenditure to Government. It has in the first place to be emphasized that it is impossible to give relief by passing over any of the area under the present Sholapur Taluka to any of the neighbouring talukas. The very situation would make the working of any such proposal difficult. But apart from this practically all these Sholapur Talukas are on the heavy side already and our present plans for concentrated development here puts this suggestion out of consideration. In effect what may be called a long distant part of our problem is how to give relief to some of these Talukas when our development activities get really into operation. Barsi I can see no way of helping although it requires help, but the difficulties in administering the extensive areas of Sangola and Karmala particularly will certainly have to be met by the creation of another taluka possibly with Head Quarter at Mohol when our difficulties become clearer. Mr. Corin's scheme in one point goes back to the old scheme of using the Huzur Deputy Collector which was condemned very rightly by every one who has had any experience of the problem. I return to this point later and only mention it here as it was considered fully in connection with one of our first proposed solutions—that of

a City Mahal without a treasury. That was given up owing to (1) treasury difficulties, (2) the fact that this work requires an exceptionally experienced Revenue Officer in charge and (3) the Huzur Deputy Collector and City Magistrate simply could not do the amount of detailed work that the idea envisaged. This led to our present system—a Superintendent to be selected and kept here working almost directly under a Prant Officer whose charge had been lightened to allow him to do so. This was undoubtedly a makeshift arrangement particularly in that it requires far too much time of a Deputy Collector for work that should be done by a Mamlatdar. Also the work in the other Prant—always heavy has now become impossible with our supply and development activities.

Our problem therefore is plain—to divide up the present Sholapur Taluka to give the immediate assistance necessary to the Mamlatdar and the Prant Officers in such a fashion as will fit in with our Post-War Scheme for a third Taluka for this area. It seems to me that Mr. Corin's proposal No. II (Appendix 'C') offers the most hopeful solution both for our immediate purposes and our future plans.

I also agree with Mr. Corin's distribution of the Talukas among the Prants; which follows the natural lines. There is only one point that I have to disagree with basically—the suggestion to bring back the Huzur Deputy Collector and the City Magistrate as the final controlling officer over the city Revenue work. In fact Mr. Corin's whole outlook on this subject is very obviously quite out of date. His remarks at the beginning of paragraph 5 of his forwarding memorandum that the City Survey work of Sholapur is an imposition on a Prant Officer suggests a view of City Development and Revenue work that I thought was dead 20 years ago. This is a Prant Officer's duty in any City Survey area and the only difference in the case of a city of the size of Sholapur is that it requires continual attention in addition from the Collector himself. Apart from this either as Huzur Deputy Collector or City Magistrate of a city of the size and Police complexities of Sholapur this officer has got a heavier job than he can deal with adequately even now. It is quite unsound to give him any extra work and to give him back the heavy City Survey work will merely mean that the whole of the important development work around Sholapur City will again remain quite uncontrolled and our revenue work neglected. The Huzur Deputy Collector is in addition according to our present system an old gentleman who cannot be expected to give the hard physical work that this job requires. A further point which is to me almost conclusive against the proposal is that it puts the Mamlatdar under two Prants—a division that is fatal. With the Mamlatdar in charge of the City Survey (and the City Survey Superintendent under him) I consider that the Northern Prant Officer could be given this work. This will make the Northern Prant a heavy charge undoubtedly but it will not be an impossible one. Much of the detailed check (either City Survey or Development) and the bringing of our City System here upto date could be done in the off-season.

The proposal will not mean anything extra in the way of Treasury or additional cells. In fact the Kacheri can be located in a rented place until we have had time to deal with the situation at our leisure. The proposal will mean one extra Mamlatdar and Aval Karkun and about 6 clerks which in present circumstances of supply, etc., may have to be increased by an additional Aval Karkun for Treasury and Supply work and two or more extra clerks of which the cost will be as under :—

	Rs.	Average cost
		Rs.
Mamlatdar (2nd grade) ..	200—15/2—260	239·75
Aval Karkun Grade ..	85—5/2—100	96·00
6 Clerks Grade ..	25—5/2—55	40·57 × 6

I would conclude by reminding Government that in our extension of Circles, Sholapur Taluka has had to be given 8 Circles (with a super Circle in Sholapur City itself). Each of these circles is a heavy Circle in comparison with the Circles in other Districts. Our normal number of circles in each Taluka at present is 4 to 6. We do therefore want urgent help and I would request that very early orders of Government be issued.

(Signed) .....,  
Commissioner, C. D.

*Territorial changes.*

Sholapur district.

Splitting up of Sholapur taluka  
into two talukas and redistribution  
of sub-divisions of Sholapur  
district.

## GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY

### REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Resolution No. 4378/39

Bombay Castle, 30th September 1944

Read Government Resolution No. 4378/39, dated the 23rd September 1940.

Letter from the Collector of Sholapur, No. A.D.M. 281, dated the 5th September 1944.

Memorandum from the Commissioner, C. D. No. A.D.M. 2/77, dated the 11th September 1944.

**RESOLUTION.**—It has been found that Sholapur taluka is too large for efficient administration by one mamlatdar, the more so in view of its land development, supply and other problems. Government is therefore pleased to split up the taluka into two talukas, with headquarters at Sholapur, viz. North Sholapur and South Sholapur, with effect from 1st October 1944, and to sanction the following additional establishment till 28th February 1945 in the first instance :—

Establishment		Pay-scales	
		Rs.	
Mamlatdar (2nd grade)	.. ..	200—15/2—260.	
Aval Karkun	.. ..	85—5/2—100.	
6 Clerks	.. ..	25—5/2—55.	

2. The requisite notification showing the distribution of villages, at present included in Sholapur taluka, between the two talukas should be published in the *Bombay Government Gazette*.

3. The extra charge on this account which is debitable to the head “25, General Administration”, should be taken into consideration while submitting the revised estimates for the current year.

4. Consequent on the splitting up of Sholapur taluka, the sub-divisions of Sholapur district should be redistributed as follows:—

*Northern Prant.*

Karmala, Madha, Barsi and North Sholapur.

*Southern Prant.*

Pandharpur, Sangola, Malsiras and South Sholapur.

The Prant Officer, N. D., should also continue to work as City Survey Officer as heretofore.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

(Signed) M. J. DESAI,

For Secretary to Government.

## REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Bombay Castle, 30th September 1944

No. 4378/39.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Bombay Land Revenue Code, 1879 (Bom. V of 1879), the Government of Bombay is pleased to direct that, with effect from the 1st October 1944, the present Sholapur Taluka comprising of 152 villages in Sholapur district shall be split up into two talukas, viz. North Sholapur Taluka and South Sholapur Taluka of the said Sholapur District each containing the villages as shown below :—

*Villages in the North Sholapur Taluka.*

(1) Sholapur, (2) Banegaon, (3) Bhogaon, (4) Hiparge, (S.), (5) Pakhi, (6) Tirhe, (7) Kavathe, (8) Belati, (9) Degaon, (10) Hiraj, (11) Bale, (12) Kegaon, (13) Kondi, (14) Chincholi (Kati), (15) Sawaleswar, (16) Arjunsod, (17) Lamboti, (18) Shirapur (Sholapur), (19) Akole (Kati), (20) Mardi, (21) Gulwanchi, (22) Khed, (23) Shelgi, (24) Dahitne, (25) Haglur, (26) Ule, (27) Taratgaon (Mardi), (28) Kasegaon, (29) Takalgaon, (30) Raleras, (31) Honsal, (32) Hiparge (Mardi), (33) Vadaji, (34) Tandulwadi, (35) Vadale, (36) Darfal, (37) Boramani, (38) Ekruke, (39) Arali Bk. (40) Mangrul, (41) Kakrambe, (42) Tadawale, (43) Kalegaon, (44) Soregaon, (45) Dongaon, (46) Samshapur, (47) Nandur, (48) Mulegaon, (49) Sangdari, (50) Kumathe, (51) Dodi, (52) Pathari, (53) Telgaon-Sholapur.

*Villages in the South Sholapur Taluka.*

(1) Arbali, (2) Miri, (3) Vatwate, (4) Yenaki, (5) Korawali, (6) Gunjegaon, (7) Akole (Mandrup), (8) Kusur, (9) Khanapur, (10) Telgaon (Mandrup), (11) Bhandarkaothe, (12) Balagi, (13) Antroli, (14) Vinchur, (15) Kandalgao, (16) Vangi, (17) Mangoli, (18) Nimbargi, (19) Malkaothe, (20) Sadeapur, (21) Lavangi, (22) Karkal, (23) Kurghot, (24) Auj-Mandrup, (25) Takali, (26) Chinchpur, (27) Nandani, (28) Barur, (29) Borsur, (30) Bolkaothe, (31) Kudal, (32) Hattarsang, (33) Bandalgi, (34) Aurad, (35) Vadakbal, (36) Honmurgi, (37) Birnal, (38) Vadapur, (39) Mandrup, (40) Yelgaon, (41) Jamgaon Bk., (42) Jamgaon Khurd, (43) Irawade Bk., (44) Shirapur (Mohol), (45) Peertakali, (46) Dadpur, (47) Parmeshwar-Pimpri, (48) Shingoli, (49) Taratgaon (Mohol), (50) Kamati Kd., (51) Kamati Bk., (52) Wagholi, (53) Sohale, (54) Kotale, (55) Vaddegaon, (56) Ardhanari, (57) Ichagaon, (58) Ghodeshwar, (59) Madre, (60) Chandrahali, (61) Sindkhed, (62) Rajur, (63) Sanjwad, (64) Aherwadi, (65) Bankalgi, (66) Tilehal, (67) Borul, (68) Kanbas, (69) Shirwal, (70) Alegaon, (71) Ingalgi, (72) Auj (Aherwadi), (73) Acheagaon, (74) Shingadgaon, (75) Hipale, (76) Hotgi, (77) Hattur, (78) Valsang,



(79) Tirth, (80) Dindur, (81) Chincholi (Aherwadi), (82) Rampur, (83) Vadgaon, (84) Dhotri, (85) Musti, (86) Shirpanhalli, (87) Darganhalli, (88) Kardehalli, (89) Togarhalli, (90) Gurdehalli, (91) Hanamgaon, (92) Yetnal, (93) Kumbhari, (94) Mugali, (95) Ibrampur, (96) Hadalgi, (97) Salgar, (98) Kesarjavalge, (99) Sawalkhed.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

(Signed) M. J. DESAI,  
Secretary.

\* \* \*



## APPENDIX 'B'

(Vide paragraph 5.3)

सोलापूर महानगरपालिकेच्या स. सा. सभा (प्रथम सोमवार, दि. २० मार्च १९६७ रोजी झालेली व गुरुवार, दि. २० एप्रिल १९६७ रोजी तहकूब झालेली) गुरुवार, दि. ४ मे १९६७ रोजी दुपारी ४-०० (चार) वाजता महानगरपालिका सभागृहात भरली होती. तिच्या इतिवृत्तातील लागू-पुरता उतारा.

विषय

ठराव

(१९२) सोलापूर शहराचे महाराष्ट्राशी असलेले अतुट संबंध, भौगोलिक सलगता, बहुसंख्याकांची मराठी भाषा व लोकेच्छा या अनुषंगाने सोलापूर शहर हे महाराष्ट्राचेच आहे याबाबत मा. सदस्यांची सूचना मंजुरीसाठी.

(१४) दिनांक १४ ऑगस्ट १९५४ व दिनांक १९ एप्रिल १९६१ रोजी सोलापूर महानगरपालिकेने सोलापूर शहर व जिल्हा महाराष्ट्रातच ठेवावा अशा अर्थाचे ठराव पूर्वीच केले आहेत. त्यास अनुसरूनच आम्ही पुन्हा ठराव करतो की, मध्यवर्ती सरकारने या प्रश्नाबाबत बराच उशीर केला आहे. याबाबत खेद होतो व आता एकसदस्य कमिशनचे काम चालू होऊन निर्णय घेणेची वेळ जवळ आली आहे. ही महानगरपालिका मध्यवर्ती सरकारकडे आग्रहपूर्वक मागणी करून अशी विनंती करित आहे की, आता हा प्रश्न निकालात काढावा व खेडे हे घटक, भौगोलिक सलगता, बहुसंख्याकांची भाषा व लोकेच्छा हे प्रमाण मानून हा प्रश्न निकालात काढावा.

माजी न्यायमूर्ती ना. मेहेरचंद महाजन यांचे एकसदस्य कमिशन मध्यवर्ती सरकारने नेमले आहे. या एकसदस्य कमिशनसमोर आपल्या महानगरपालिकेच्या वतीने (१) मा. महापौर, (२) मा. उपमहापौर, (३) मा. भोगडे, (४) मा. कारमासे, (५) मा. होनपारखे, (६) मा. येवलेकर, (७) मा. बुर्गूल, (८) मा. सौ. ठोकळ, (९) मा. तुळसे, (१०) मा. मुनाळे, (११) मा. ई. टी. माने, (१२) मा. बनशेट्टी,

विषय

ठराव

(१३) मा. जोशी, यांनी सोलापूर शहराचे महाराष्ट्राशी असलेले अतुट संबंध, भौगोलिक सलगता, बहुसंख्याकांची मराठी भाषा, लोकेच्छा व नगरपालिकेने पूर्वी केलेले ठराव, यांच्या अनुषंगाने व या ठरावात व्यक्त केलेल्या मतास अनुसरून निवेदन द्यावे, कागदपत्रे हजर करावीत, साक्ष नोंदवावी व सोलापूर शहर हे महाराष्ट्राचेच आहे, हे कमिशनला पटवून द्यावे. सोलापूर शहर हे निर्विवाद महाराष्ट्रातीलच आहे याचा ठाम पुनरुच्चार ही सभा करित आहे. या शहरावर म्हैसूर सरकारने सांगितलेला हक्क चुकीचा, दोषास्पद व अवास्तव आहे, व त्यास कोणताही, कसलाही आधार नाही हे कमिशनपुढे निवेदन रूपाने सादर करावे.

सदर ठराव एकमताने पास झाला.

सत्यमेव जयते

नगरसचिव कार्यालय :  
सोलापूर महानगरपालिका,  
दिनांक ४ मे १९६७.

श्री. आ. पुंजारी,  
नगरसचिव,  
सोलापूर महानगरपालिका.

खरी नक्कल

(सही)

नगरसचिव  
सोलापूर महानगरपालिका

## APPENDIX C

(Vide paragraph 6·2)

*Statement showing the villages from Akkalkot Taluka proposed to be retained with the Maharashtra State.*

Serial No.	Name of the Village/Town	Code No. (1951 Census)
1	2	3
<i>Towns</i>		
1	Akkalkot Municipality .. ..	16-VI
<i>Villages</i>		
1	Akkalkot Non-Municipal Area .. ..	1
2	Naganhali .. ..	3
3	Itage .. ..	7*
4	Hingani .. ..	11
5	Kalegaon .. ..	12
6	Bagehalli .. ..	18
7	Hasapur .. ..	22
8	Dodyal .. ..	25
9	Karjal .. ..	28
10	Dahitane .. ..	69
11	Barhanpur .. ..	70
12	Pitapur .. ..	71
13	Akatnal .. ..	75
14	Arali .. ..	76
15	Dombarjavalge .. ..	78
16	Motyal .. ..	80
17	Shindkhed .. ..	81
18	Basavgir .. ..	82
19	Chungi .. ..	83
20	Sultanpur .. ..	84
21	Kurnur .. ..	85
22	Kajikanbas .. ..	86
23	Shirwal .. ..	87
24	Saphale .. ..	88
25	Shirsi .. ..	89
26	Badole (Bk.) .. ..	91
27	Sangavi (Bk.) .. ..	93
28	Sangavi (Kh.) .. ..	94
29	Banasgol .. ..	95

\*Village Itage which came to be claimed in 1967 is proposed to be surrendered by the Government of Maharashtra to the Government of Mysore.