

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT BIDAR

The States Reorganisation Commission proposed that the entire district of Bidar should be joined to the residuary State of Hyderabad (Andhra State). They observed:

“Consistently with our general view that districts should not be broken up, except when compelling reasons for doing so exist, we have recommended that Bidar should not be disintegrated merely in order that linguistic claims in the north-west or in the south may be respected. We consider that it should remain with the residuary Hyderabad State.”

3.2. This proposal met with opposition from members of both the linguistic areas, Marathawada and Kannada in the Hyderabad Legislature. There was strong agitation against it from the public of neighbouring Kannada districts of Raichur and Gulbarga and from the public of Marathawada. Ultimately it was decided by mutual agreement between all the three linguistic groups among the members of the Hyderabad Legislature that the district should be trifurcated and that out of 9 talukas, comprising the District of Bidar, two should be allotted to Andhra Pradesh, three to Maharashtra and the remaining four to Karnatak.

3.3. This unanimous agreement was communicated to the Central Government and when the States Reorganisation Bill was introduced in Parliament, it contained a provision that the four Kannada talukas, i.e., Bidar, Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur (Aurad), should be tagged on to the district of Gulbarga and that Bidar should cease to be the headquarters of a district. This proposal also created dissatisfaction. Public feeling was that Bidar should not lose its status as a district. There was consensus of opinion among all the groups on this point. An amendment was moved by the Chief Minister of Hyderabad to give effect to this agreement in the S.R. Bill. The amendment suggested by the Hyderabad Assembly received the assent of the Government of India and it was ultimately adopted by Parliament and was incorporated in the S.R. Act, with the result that the district of Bidar retained its District status and was comprised of the four talukas of Bidar, Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur (Aurad).

3.4. The Bombay Government in the year 1957 in its memorandum submitted to the Central Government laid claim to 28 villages in the taluka of Humnabad having 63% Marathi speakers. In Bhalki taluka it claimed 49 villages, Marathi-speaking population being 59%. In Santpur taluka, 69 villages were claimed, Marathi-speaking population being 60%.

3.5. Census figures show an overwhelming majority of Kannada population in each of these talukas. In Humnabad taluka Telugu was 11%, Marathi 17%, Kannada 48% and others 24%. In Bhalki Telugu was 3%, Marathi 37%, Kannada 48% and others 12%. In Santpur Telugu was 7%, Marathi 38%, Kannada 41% and others 14%.

3.6. The claim was resisted by the State of Mysore on the ground that the unanimous decision arrived at between all the linguistic groups for keeping Bidar as a district and comprising four talukas in their entirety could not be reopened and that the *status quo* should be maintained.

3.7. The matter was also examined by the Four-Man Boundary Committee. The Pataskar Report submitted to the Government of Maharashtra allowed the claim on the ground that the areas claimed were predominantly Marathi-speaking. The two Mysore members, on the other hand, said that there was unanimity amongst all the linguistic groups that the district of Bidar should be retained as a separate district with or without other areas of Gulbarga being added to it, and that if any of the members of Marathawada entertained a feeling that some villages in the talukas of Bhalki, Santpur and Humnabad ought not to be transferred to Mysore because these were Marathi-speaking, they suppressed this desire so that Bidar should remain as a separate district unit. They possibly entertained a fear that if the claim for a few villages in these three talukas was pressed forward, that would come in the way of Bidar getting the status of a district in the new State. It was stated that all the Marathi villages of the talukas of Bhalki and Santpur had facilities of communication with the respective taluka headquarters and with Bidar, the district headquarters and that there were no similar facilities of communication with the taluka headquarters of Nilanga or Udgir and with the district place, Osmanabad.

3.8. The State of Maharashtra in the statement of the case presented to this Commission stated that the district of Bidar in the erstwhile Hyderabad State was a trilingual district. It had 39% Marathi, 28% Kannada, 16% Telugu and 15% miscellaneous population. No single group had an absolute majority. The District was, therefore, trifurcated and the talukas of Nilanga, Ahmedpur and Udgir were allotted to the Bombay State, the talukas of Zahariabad and Narayankhed to Andhra Pradesh and the four talukas of Bidar, Bhalki, Santpur and Humnabad to the State of Karnatak.

3.9. Some areas of Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur talukas having a preponderance of Marathi speakers and contiguous to the State of Bombay thus came to be included in the State of Mysore. No adjustments of these areas could be made between the Marathi and Kannada members of the Hyderabad Assembly. The people of these villages have been agitating since the reorganisation of States in 1956 for their inclusion in the State of Bombay.

3.10. It was said that the convenience of these people lay in their being put in Maharashtra. In Appendix V of the memorandum, the difficulties and hardships suffered by the Marathi speakers of these areas have been mentioned in detail. The memorandum mentioned that in the general elections held in 1957 both the candidates from Bhalki double-member constituency of the Samyukt Maharashtra Samiti won by a large majority. In Hulsur constituency, the Samiti candidate captured the seat by a majority of 4,600 votes against the President of the District Congress Committee, who was a candidate of the Joint Front of the Congress and the Karnatak Ekikaran Samiti. In 1962 elections, the Samiti could only win the seat from Hulsur and narrowly lost the seats from Bhalki and Santpur. In the Panchayat elections of 1959, the Samiti won a majority of 42 out of 64 Village Panchayats of Bhalki taluka. In the year 1960, the Taluka Board elections were held in Bidar district. In Bhalki taluka the Samiti won 11 seats out of 19 and in Santpur taluka, it won 11 seats out of 15.

3.11. The statement submitted to this Commission by the Government of Mysore resisted the claim and said that there were no substantial grounds for allowing it. Most of the villages claimed by Maharashtra had trade relations with Bhalki if not with Kalyan. Apart from the administrative links it has with Bidar as a district place, Bhalki is also connected with Bidar by trade relations. The residents of the disputed villages in this taluka are not prepared for the transfer of their villages without the town.

3.12. As regards the taluka of Humnabad, it was said that on 10th November, 1965, the Government of Mysore formed a new taluka Basavakalyan by attaching to it 85 villages of Humnabad and 22 villages from Bhalki. Basavakalyan is the headquarters of the taluka. Out of 28 villages claimed by Maharashtra, 27 have gone to Basavakalyan. The percentage of Kannada-speaking population is 48 and Marathi-speaking 17, 20% speaking other languages. Linguistic complexion of any place or area is never stable and it is capable of fast changes under stress of circumstances. If the villages claimed by Maharashtra are transferred, the economic links between those villages and Basavakalyan will be cut off resulting in great economic dislocation.

3.13. Santpur and Aurad are two principal towns in Santpur taluka. Aurad is the headquarters of the taluka. The population of 69 villages claimed here is 46,669. Percentage of Kannada is 41 and that of Marathi 38. Both the towns are connected by road to Bidar. The distance between Bidar and Santpur is 28 miles. There is no road connecting Santpur to any other near about important town in Maharashtra. Administratively, it is more convenient that the areas claimed and the taluka remain in the district of Bidar. Facilities of communication of this taluka are with Bidar, the district headquarters. There are no similar facilities with Nilanga, Udgir and Osmanabad. This circumstance overweighs the consideration of linguistic homogeneity.

3.14. The Mysore Government contended that in view of the agreed division of the district of Bidar and of the allotment of the talukas by mutual consent to the three linguistic groups in Hyderabad Assembly, the matter should not be reopened. It was:

said that the Government of Maharashtra does not deny that the trifurcation of the district of Bidar and the apportionment of the taluka as above said between the three linguistic regions was a matter of common consent. What they seem to urge is that Marathawada Members of the State Assembly of Hyderabad were not in agreement in respect of some of the villages which were parts of the talukas that were allotted to Mysore State. When it was agreed that the four specific talukas should remain in the district of Bidar which was to go to Mysore, it was implicit therein that all the villages constituting these talukas were also agreed to be allotted to the new State of Mysore. It is difficult to understand the distinction that is sought to be drawn by Maharashtra Government when they say that the Marathi members agreed that the four talukas be allotted to the Mysore State, it did not mean that they agreed to the transfer of all the villages comprised in them.

3.15. A reference was made to the letter of Shri B. Ramakrishna Rao, Chief Minister of Hyderabad, dated 3rd May, 1956, addressed to Shri G. B. Pant in which he said:

“As you are aware, the four Kannada talukas of Bidar District were proposed originally by the Bill to be merged with Gulbarga District. It is the unanimous desire of the Kannadigas and others of the State that Bidar District should be retained as a separate unit and those talukas should not be merged with Gulbarga as proposed in the Bill. There was complete unanimity in the Assembly regarding this matter.”

3.16. The fact remains that in the Hyderabad Assembly, the Marathi members did agree to and did vote for the transfer of the said four talukas to the State of Mysore and it was thought that if the four talukas would be too small to form a separate district, certain areas from the neighbouring district of Gulbarga may be added to it.

3.17. The present claim of the State of Maharashtra extends to 146 villages, out of the total 451 comprised in these three talukas. The claim amounts to claiming a whole taluka. Thus, instead of the allocation of four talukas to Mysore in the agreed division of the District of Bidar, the allotment would be reduced to three talukas. It would not have been possible then to give Bidar the status of a separate district. It is just possible that members of Marathawada might have thought it fit not to press their claim for a few villages in the three talukas of Bidar district lest that claim might come in the way of the latter retaining its position and status of a district. It might also be that they were well aware that if claim for a few villages in a taluka was pressed, that claim would not be accepted by the other members. The Central Government also would not agree to such a claim as it would involve transfer on the basis of village units. Knowing the weakness of their demand, they must have thought that discretion was the better part and thus agreed to the transfer of the entire four talukas to Mysore. Having gained one step by a common agreement and having thus made their position secure, they now turn round and

advance the present claims. The parties should not be allowed to trifle with their agreements and to go back on the decisions thus brought about on the basis of the understandings reached.

3.18. The Government of the State of Maharashtra denied that any such agreement was arrived at. The claim to the villages having Marathi majority in the three talukas was never given up. Several members from the Marathawada in the Hyderabad Assembly made this demand in very clear terms and as a result of it, a clause was added to the States Reorganisation Bill to the following effect:

“That the Union Government may appoint a Boundary Commission to settle the boundaries of the States to be formed in a satisfactory manner.”

3.19. This amendment having been unanimously agreed to in the Hyderabad Assembly, the amendments regarding transfer of various areas to Maharashtra were withdrawn. The matter was left to be considered by a Boundary Commission.

3.20. The amendment regarding appointment of a Boundary Commission did not find favour with the Government of India. The Union Home Minister in his speech in the Lok Sabha on 31st July, 1956, said that he was not enamoured of the idea, and pointed out that the scope of the Zonal Councils had been enlarged and two things, which had been specifically mentioned for the consideration of the Zonal Councils were the settlement of boundary disputes and safeguarding of the interests of linguistic minorities. In view of this assurance, the question of appointment of a Boundary Commission was not pressed. The letter of the Chief Minister of Hyderabad referred to by the the State of Mysore was written to stress particularly the amendments suggested in the States Reorganisation Bill by the Hyderabad Assembly and to point out that it was the unanimous desire of the Kannadigas and others of the State that Bidar should be retained as a separate unit. In the opinion of the State of Maharashtra, the purpose of writing this letter was to make the Union Home Minister and the Select Committee accept the Hyderabad Assembly's recommendation in respect of Bidar district, as it was an important deviation from the original Bill. It would have been positively harmful to his case if mention was made about amendments moved in the Hyderabad Assembly about transfer of certain areas of the three talukas to Maharashtra. There were already misgivings as to whether four talukas would be considered sufficient to constitute a district. If it had been mentioned that there were demands for transfer of portions of those talukas to another State, the case for constituting the four talukas into a separate district would have been further weakened. It was, therefore, prudent on the part of the Chief Minister of Hyderabad not to mention those demands in that letter. But the absence of such a mention cannot be construed, in the face of the proceedings of the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly to mean, as has been considered by the Mysore representatives in their report, that there were no such demands or that the demands were withdrawn in the larger interests of retaining Bidar as a district. The speeches made by Marathawada members for transfer of some areas of Bhalki,

Humnabad and Santpur to Maharashtra show that they were also among the persons who supported the demand for continuing Bidar as a district. These two things were not in their mind mutually exclusive.

3.21. Number of memoranda have been received for or against merger of these areas in Maharashtra. During the Commission's two-day sittings in Bidar, a large number of persons interviewed it and also presented memoranda. These are contained in Annexure IV, Volume II.

3.22. Shri Sen and Shri Misra appearing for the State of Maharashtra and the Samiti, emphasised the view point of the State of Maharashtra. It was argued that there was really no agreement between the members of the Marathawada and the members of Karnatak in the Hyderabad Assembly on this point and even if there was such an agreement, the State Government of Maharashtra was not bound by it. On the merits of the demand the contention was that according to the village unit formula and the principle of linguistic homogeneity, these villages should be included in Maharashtra and that this would be in accordance with the wishes of the people as evidenced by the election results of 1957 and 1962 to the State Assembly as well as the election results of the various Panchayats in these areas. The people of these areas have been agitating from 1956 onwards to get their claim accepted by the Central Government etc. They were experiencing great hardships because Kannada language had been made compulsory by the State of Mysore. The education of their children is suffering and in the matter of employment they are discriminated, even their complaints are not being heard by officers because all of them are speakers of Kannada language. The only solution for removal of these hardships was by merging these villages in Maharashtra.

3.23. Shri Nambiar while strongly supporting the case of the Government of Mysore, said that it was the unanimous wish of all linguistic groups in the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly that Bidar should be given the status of a district by the inclusion of these four talukas in Karnatak. The draft S. R. Bill had included these talukas in the district of Gulbarga. A strong opposition was raised against this clause and after considerable agitation, this provision in the Bill was amended and in accordance with the unanimous wish of the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly, Bidar was given the status of a district by including these talukas in it without any reservation. He said that it was implicit in this decision that these talukas were permanently attached to the district. If it was intended that any portions of these talukas on the ground of language were to be taken out from the Karnatak State, then Bidar could not have been given the status of a district as it was already one of the smallest districts in the State. The demand to exclude 146 villages from the three talukas in question and to include them in Maharashtra was a demand which was inconsistent with the unanimous decision to give Bidar the status of a district. He, therefore, contended that it must be held that according to unanimous views of all language groups, the Parliament accepted the suggested amendment and incorporated it in the S. R. Act giving Bidar the status of a district and no opposition was raised

against it in the Parliament. It seems clear that the Marathawada members did not raise any opposition because to do so would be inconsistent with Bihar being given the status of a district. He argued that the 1967 elections in which no candidate of the Samiti was elected showed the mind of the people and the public opinion. Moreover, the linguistic complexion of these villages was not so grave as to make it obligatory on the Commission to include these villages in Maharashtra. These areas during the last ten years had become an integral part of the district and everybody was happy with it except a few politicians and language fanatics. Most of the difficulties mentioned during the enquiry were exaggerated. The Mysore Government was doing its best to develop these areas and to remove all hardships that the Marathi-speaking people in these areas were experiencing.

3.24. Having given due considerations to the arguments addressed to the Commission by the Governments concerned, I am unable to accept the claim made by the State of Maharashtra for reasons given below.

3.25. It was not denied that all the linguistic groups in the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly unanimously decided that Bidar should be given the status of a district. A provision was accordingly incorporated in the S. R. Act to give effect to this decision. This was passed by Parliament without any opposition and without any reservations and limitations. In the opinion of the Commission that decision must be respected. If the members of the Marathawada in Parliament were of a different opinion, they should have insisted for incorporating the amendment for a Boundary Commission suggested by the Hyderabad Assembly in the Act or should have moved amendments for inclusion of these areas in the State of Maharashtra. The statement of the Home Minister about the powers of the Zonal Councils was no substitute for a Boundary Commission. It seems to me that if such an amendment was moved, it would have been thrown out, it being inconsistent with Bidar being given the status of a district comprised of full four talukas. If 146 villages are excluded from this district, it would not be possible on administrative grounds to maintain it as a district.

3.26. It is implicit in this unanimous decision that these four talukas in their entirety must be kept in Bidar so that it maintains its old status of a district. The linguistic considerations seem to have been outweighed by administrative considerations. To give Bidar the status of a district was a compelling reason against linguistic consideration.

3.27. Shri Ramakrishna Rao, Chief Minister of Hyderabad State in the letter referred to above said as follows:

"I wish to stress particularly the amendments regarding territorial adjustments and regarding Bidar district.

"As you are aware, the four Kannada talukas of Bidar district were proposed originally by the Bill to be merged with Gulbarga district. It is the unanimous desire of the Kannadigas and others of the State that Bidar, dis-

district should be retained as a separate unit and those taluqas should not be merged with Gulbarga as proposed in the Bill. There was complete unanimity in the Assembly regarding this matter. It was also suggested in the amended resolution that if the four taluqas are considered insufficient to constitute a district, necessary area from the adjoining area of Gulbarga may subsequently be added by the successor Government. I have had a talk regarding this matter with Shri Hanumanthaiya and he has agreed that Bidar may be retained as a separate district. I think he will be writing to you shortly. As this is an important deviation from the original Bill, I hope you and the Select Committee will kindly accept it as it is based on the unanimous opinion of the people concerned.

"The other territorial adjustments have been suggested un-animously by the Assembly in view of the fact that the people of those areas would have otherwise had to face practical difficulties."

No reference whatsoever was made in this letter about the claim of Marathawada to these areas.

3.28. The State of Maharashtra in their statement of the case submitted to the Commission while referring to this letter stated as follows:

"It was not only necessary for the Chief Minister for this purpose to mention in this letter that certain amendments had been moved for transfer of some parts of the four talukas of Bidar district to Maharashtra and that they were withdrawn as a result of the proposed amendment for establishment of a Boundary Commission, but to do so would have been positively harmful to his cause. There was already misgivings as to whether four talukas would be considered sufficient to constitute a district. If it had been mentioned that there were demands for transfer of portions of those talukas to another State, the case for constituting the four talukas into a separate district would have been further weakened. It was therefore, prudent on the part of the Chief Minister of Hyderabad not to mention those demands in that letter. But the absence of such a mention cannot be construed, in the face of the proceedings of the Hyderabad Legislative Assembly, to mean, as has been done by the Mysore representatives in their report, that there were no such demands or that the demands were withdrawn in the larger interest of retaining Bidar as a district. The extracts from speeches quoted above show that the persons who demanded the transfer of some areas of Bhalki, Humnabad and Santpur to Maharashtra were also among the persons who supported the demand for continuing Bidar as a district. These two things were not to their mind mutually exclusive."

3.29. I am afraid, I cannot accept the explanation which accuses the Chief Minister of *suppressio veri* with a purpose. To my mind, the two things are not mutually exclusive. If these demands were pressed, the case for constituting the four talukas into a separate district would not only have been weakened but negated.

3.30. The Mysore Government in para 254 of their statement of the case says as follows:

"The present theory of the Maharashtra Government that even at that time Marathi people had their own claim in respect of several villages from the three out of the four talukas allocated to Bidar District is inconsistent with their attitude in the Hyderabad Assembly. Their present claim extends to 146 villages out of the three talukas of Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur (Aurad), the total number of villages of these 3 talukas comes to 451. This means that they roughly claim one full taluka. If that much area was to be reduced, the remaining area would amount to three talukas instead of four. If so, it would have been impossible for 3 talukas only to claim the status of a separate district. On the other hand, the Marathi area carved out from the old Bidar District would amount to four talukas instead of three. Hence the very claim of the status of a District for only three talukas, in preference to four talukas being allotted to Marathawada, would have looked illogical and unfair. It is just possible that members of Marathawada might have thought it fit not to press their claim for a few villages in three talukas of Bidar District lest that claim may come in the way of the latter retaining its position and status of a District. It might also be that they were well aware that if claims for a few villages in a taluka were made, that claim would not be accepted by the other members. The Central Government also would not agree to such a claim as it involved transfer on the basis of villages. Knowing these as the weaknesses of their demand, they must have thought that discretion was a better part and thus agreed to the transfer of the entire four talukas to Mysore. Having gained one step by a common agreement and thus made their position secure they now turn round and advance these smaller claims on the basis of villages. But in fact the proposal of giving the status of a District for four talukas has been found proper and reasonable in the eyes of the parties and has been not only accepted by the Hyderabad Assembly but also by the Central Government and by the Parliament. The stand now taken that they did not agree to the 146 villages being included in the District of Bidar is something which cannot be accepted."

3.31. I am in full agreement with this view. It seems to me that if the Marathawada members of Parliament raised this question of the villages in Parliament, the Kannada members would have objected to it, because to allow this claim would amount to give to

Maharashtra four talukas instead of three out of Bidar District and reduce the four given to Kannada to three. This would have seriously jeopardised the agreed trifurcation of the Bidar District. Maharashtra cannot now claim four talukas of Bidar against three allotted to it. The 146 villages claimed amount actually to a taluka.

3.32. Apart from the unanimous decision which should be respected, on administrative grounds, these four talukas in their entirety should be included in Mysore in order to give Bidar the status of a district which status it had enjoyed for a long time. The old District of Bidar was comprised of nine talukas and was an important city in the erstwhile Hyderabad State. To deprive the city of Bidar of this status would not have been a correct decision because of Marathi speakers majority in a few villages. I hold that the demand of the State of Maharashtra cannot be allowed merely on principle of linguistic homogeneity.

3.33. I have carefully scrutinised the linguistic complexion of the villages claimed. This complexion has changed from Marathi to Kannada in several of them. The total population of Humnabad taluka of the villages claimed comes to 21,393 out of which 13,630 are the Marathi speakers and the rest are the speakers of other languages. These 8,000 people have been enjoying happily the privileges in the unilingual State of Mysore. They will lose all these privileges if they are transferred to Maharashtra. The wishes of a substantial minority have also to be given due weight. It is much better to provide full linguistic privileges to about 14,000 Marathi-speaking people in villages of Humnabad than to deprive 8,000 people of their privileges by transfer to Maharashtra. Similarly, in the taluka of Bhalki, the population of the villages claimed comes to 41,184. Out of these about 27,000 are Marathi speakers and the rest are the speakers of other languages—about 14,000 odd. On similar grounds, as given in the case of Humnabad, I do not recommend that this substantial minority should be transferred to Maharashtra for the benefit of 27,000 Marathi speakers. In Santpur taluka the population of the villages claimed works out to 50,000 odd. The Marathi speakers are about 24,000, below 50 per cent and on similar grounds, I would not recommend the transfer of a substantial minority who are opposed to such transfer to Maharashtra. Taking an overall view of these areas, the population is 60 per cent Marathi and 40 per cent others. The minority is substantial and their wishes have to be respected. They are against merger. I would, however, recommend that these areas should be made bilingual and the Marathi speakers should be provided with same privileges as they would get by being included in the unilingual State of Maharashtra so that they may not suffer any hardships. The integrity of the district should be maintained and should not be broken up.

3.34. The wishes of the people, as evidenced by the 1967 elections, are a pointer against the demand of the Maharashtra State. In the earlier elections of 1957 and 1962, the candidates of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti won the elections with heavy majorities not only in the Assembly and Parliament but also in the various Village Panchayats and Development Boards, but in 1967 elections not a single candidate of the Samiti succeeded. All were

defeated. Quite a number of Marathi-speaking persons from these Marathi majority areas and a number of Panchayat Sarpanches interviewed the Commission and requested for maintaining *status quo*. However, most of the Marathi speakers of these villages and Panchayats expressed a wish to be merged in Maharashtra. In the vitiated atmosphere of linguistic emotion, this was bound to be so. The existing facilities of communication between the claimed villages and the Taluka and the District headquarters and the absence of such facilities with Maharashtra talukas is a matter that also supports the Commission's view. Advantage of facility of communication is an important consideration in boundary disputes.

3.35. Most of the villages claimed by Maharashtra State in Bhalki taluka have trade relations with Bhalki and the residents of the disputed villages of Bhalki were not prepared for the transfer of their villages to Maharashtra if the town of Bhalki was not transferred to it. The economic relation of these villages is with the town of Bhalki.

3.36. It may be mentioned that the State of Bombay in its original claim did not demand the transfer of Bhalki to Maharashtra. In the statement presented to this Commission, the State of Maharashtra said that the composition of Bhalki (urban) is Kannada 39 per cent and Marathi 25 per cent whereas that of Bhalki (rural) is Marathi 75 per cent and Kannada 23 per cent. Bhalki (rural) consists of about 12 'wadis' around Bhalki. As these 'wadis' have a high percentage of Marathi population, the people feel that these 'wadis' along with Bhalki (urban) should be transferred to Maharashtra notwithstanding the fact that the latter has a Kannada majority because Bhalki (urban) is an island among the Marathi 'wadis'.

3.37. I am afraid, I cannot accept this contention. These 'wadis' have very small populations of working class people, who have settled there for the benefit of the urban area.

3.38. The result, therefore, is that the claim of the State of Maharashtra about the villages claimed in the three talukas of Humnabad, Bhalki and Santpur (Aurad) is not allowed and it is recommended that the *status quo* be maintained.