

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
HOME AFFAIRS
LOK SABHA**

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO:1043
ANSWERED ON:06.03.2007
COMMISSION ON BORDER DISPUTE
Ahir Shri Hansraj Gangaram;Sarma Dr. Arun Kumar

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

- (a) the details of boundary dispute persisting amongst the various States alongwith the disputed areas specifying the geographical location area, date of starting dispute and the reasons, State-wise including North Eastern States;
- (b) the steps taken by the Government to solve the boundary dispute and time by which such dispute are likely to be solved;
- (c) whether the Government has constituted any Commission regarding boundary disputes among a few States of the North Eastern Region;
- (d) if so, the details indicating the mandated assignment as well as terms of reference; and
- (e) the time by which the said Commission is likely to commence its proceedings and time set for submission of its final report ?

Answer

MINISTER OF THE STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI MANIKRAO H. GAVIT)

(a) & (b): A Statement is attached.

(c) to (e): The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide their Judgment dated 25.9.2006 has appointed a Local Commission for identification of boundaries of the States of Assam- Nagaland and Assam-Arunachal Pradesh. The Court has asked the Commission to give its response within one year. The Commission has started functioning from 27.10.2006.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) and (b) OF LOK SABHA UNSTATED QUESTION 1043 REGARDING 'COMMISSION ON BORDER DISPUTE' FOR ANSWER ON 6.3.2007

(a): As per available information, there are border disputes mostly arising out of claims and counter claims over territories between

Maharashtra-Karnataka-Kerala;

The boundary dispute between Karnataka and Maharashtra relates to the claim of Karnataka for the transfer of contiguous Kannada-speaking areas in Maharashtra to Karnataka and the claim of Maharashtra for Marathi-speaking areas in Maharashtra. Karnataka has also claimed the Taluka of Kasargod in Kerala. The dispute is persisting from 1956. Kerala had not accepted the claim of Karnataka. The Governments of Maharashtra and Karnataka have taken opposite stands on the recommendations of the Mahajan Commission, which has been constituted by the Union Government with a view to settle the boundary dispute.

Punjab-Haryana

The dispute between Punjab and Haryana from 1966 pertains to the transfer of Chandigarh to Punjab and part of Fazilka Tehsil of Punjab to Haryana.

Orissa-Andhra Pradesh

Government of Orissa has reported that their boundary dispute with Andhra Pradesh relates to 59 villages in Ganjam, Gajapati, Rayagada and Koraput districts of Orissa. Government of Andhra Pradesh has reported their dispute with Orissa relates to villages in Srikakulam, Vizianagaram and Visakhapatnam districts of Andhra Pradesh. Neither of the State Governments has approached the Central Government to settle their boundary dispute.

Orissa - Jharkhand

Since 1984, Orissa has been claiming for certain villages in Jharkhand (erstwhile Bihar) namely - Neda and Nuagaon adjoining Mayurbhanj District of Orissa and from 1992, has claimed Champua, Jagannthpur, Kankadapat, Purusottampur and Limitur villages adjoining Keonjhar district. Orissa had claimed for merger of the former princely States of Seraikela and Kharsuan in Jharkhand. Neither of the State Governments has approached the Central Government to settle their boundary dispute.

L.S.U.Q.No.1043 For Reply on 06.03.2007

Orissa – Chhattisgarh

Orissa's dispute with Chhattisgarh (erstwhile Madhya Pradesh) relates to three villages namely-Bhaisadaraha, Chhotkendubahara and Sirigidi of Naupada district of Orissa since 1988. Neither of the State Governments has approached the Central Government to settle their boundary dispute.

Orissa – West Bengal

The boundary dispute between Orissa and West Bengal relates to five villages namely- Sankhabhanga of Balasore District and Bankanal, Nuhamalia, Bhurusani, Purunapani of Mayurbhanj District of Orissa. Neither of the State Governments has approached the Central Government to settle their boundary dispute.

Uttarakhand – Himachal Pradesh

The dispute relates to six places of Chakrata Tehsil of Dehradun District namely, Pandranu, Saranjungle, Kathangad:Silasukhadda, Patalajungle, Pasidhar and Lokland Pillar, adjoining Shimla district of Himachal Pradesh. Neither of the State Governments has asked for any Central intervention to settle their boundary dispute.

Andhra Pradesh – Maharashtra

As per information available from Andhra Pradesh, a dispute relating to 14 villages of Adilabad district adjoining Rajura Taluk of Chandrapur district of Maharashtra since 1990. Neither of the State Governments has asked for any Central intervention to settle their boundary dispute.

Andhra Pradesh – Karnataka

As per information available from Andhra Pradesh, a dispute relating to Obulapuram, H. Siddapuram, Maiapanagudi and H.Hoshahalli villages of Rayadurg Taluk in Ananthapur district of Andhra Pradesh and Bellary Taluk and District in Karnataka persists since 1963. Neither of the State Governments has asked for any Central intervention to settle their boundary dispute.

Andhra Pradesh – Tamil Nadu

As per information available from Andhra Pradesh, a dispute relating to the inter State boundary between Sullurpet Taluk, Nellore district, Andhra Pradesh

L.S.U.Q.No. 1043 For Reply on 06.03.2007

and Ponneri Taluk, Chengalpettu, MGR District of Tamil Nadu persists since 1997. Neither of the State Governments has asked for any Central intervention to settle their boundary dispute.

Andhra Pradesh – Pondicherry

As per information available from Andhra Pradesh, the boundary of one village named "Yanam" in the East Godavari District of Andhra Pradesh adjoining the Union Territory of Puducherry is to be demarcated. Neither of the State Governments has asked for any Central intervention to settle their boundary dispute.

Assam – Meghalaya

There is no major boundary dispute between Assam and Meghalaya and that the problem could be sorted out between the two States through mutual discussions. Neither of the State Governments has approached the Central Government to settle their boundary dispute.

Assam – Arunachal Pradesh

Arunachal Pradesh claims territory in Assam on the basis of history. Government of Assam has filed a suit in the Supreme Court of India under Article 131 of the Constitution. The Supreme Court in its Judgement dated 25.9.2006 has appointed a Local Commission headed by Justice (retired) S.N. Variava for identification of the boundary between Assam and Arunachal Pradesh.

Assam – Nagaland

Nagaland claims certain areas of territory in Assam on historical grounds. Government of Assam has filed a suit in the Supreme Court of India under Article 131 of the Constitution. The Supreme Court in its Judgment dated 25.9.2006 has appointed a Local Commission headed by Justice (retired) S.N. Variava for identification of the boundary between Assam and Nagaland.

(b): The Central Government have made efforts from time to time to resolve the border disputes involving various States, though essentially it is for the concerned State Governments to resolve their differences through discussions and mutual accommodation. The Central Government had constituted the Mahajan Commission in October 1966 to resolve the Maharashtra-Karnataka-Kerala boundary dispute. Three Commissions have so far been appointed to determine the areas of Punjab that should go to Haryana in lieu of Chandigarh. Government of India has made efforts in the past to resolve the boundary dispute between Assam and Nagaland, but

these efforts were in vain.