

Vichruntangal Village Sriperambalur Taluk, C. Singaperumal

[illegible]

To be compared to
the paper as lay
as the same is 29 No. 224
repeatedly paper? Conf

The Papera sent
from the
season

Hawaiian Islands
 No. 10.

Is he compared to J. D. No
the papers to Aug 225
as the record to the 225

The Paper has said
from your mission
unsub.

best performed. All
 Adam Langford
 1861.

[illegible]

(Pais for the time
being
this Room a
Whale
27)

to be compared to
the Nappa as before
the Nappa is
from a long time

21/6/61
 P. Reinhold and Co. 120/4
 J. G. H. 3R

To be compared to the Sidari is larger
the service is regular

performed. This is a
"Aidhamaani".

To be compared to
the present holder of F. C. No
the present holder of 228

has as the semi of
Kittling is regularly
performed.

Si lausda 3R

[illegible]

(*Thin leafed*)

The Evidence of the Volcages - and of the Cacahinton of the Lamen M^{te} establishes the fact that in Consequence of the above abandonment by the deceased & their successors, the Volcages nominated in Pangaykay (P^{te} 16th & 17th & 18th) for the service to be enjoyed by the M^{te} in question for 8 years from 1584 & 1585 did to witness the finding out, that the M^{te} was sent transferred to Sohalabaz (P^{te} 16th & 17th) as being the service as a person recommended by the above Pangaykay and approved by the Volcages. The first in Cac 16 is also the same in Law of P^{te} 16.

Rich. Pitt states without any Commentary he witnessed a very odd evidence ~~that~~ with admitting that he never enjoyed the farm from 1839
before his father's death or from 1837 - that Ranganay who held for 8 years from 1837 - was his son-in-law, and that the present holder Sopal Car Lang
was the son-in-law of Ranganay -

This statement is hardly credible -

Is it clear that Pitt had nothing to do with the Loan - Nor can he be any way entitled to a share under his father's appointment of the famous Pitt, he is in the enjoyment of the Maryland Loan that fell to his share - If he has any real claim to the Loan he must establish it before the Court & though then that is a different matter.

as he is the owner generally throughout the Madras District by the Villageagers had the Control over the Linen which they appear to have allowed in proportion to the persons they from time to time remit for the Service - But a new feature present to myself in the enquiry - I have lately observed that the Villageagers enjoyed $\frac{3}{4}$ of the Linen & allowed $\frac{1}{8}$ of it only for the remainder till I attended the Court last year - It appears that the Villageagers have since allowed $\frac{1}{2}$ to the Sotahahy, and carried the remaining $\frac{1}{2}$ to be given by Sotahahy as his fee both to the Dyahs under a though the difference between the difference of $\frac{3}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ should be paid as before - I should be greatly obliged to have however been -

[illegible]

5-70

24/3/69
Linn: 5 Feb 69

from one day to another. I can not imagine why the Potosi note was also recommended in Common with the rest of the above proposals should not have been attended to from the very beginning - viz the Potosi note should have been dropped first. I think it unnecessary to re-open the question on account of the Potosi note being opposed to us in principle. The matter is certainly different to be a question on the distribution of members of the Council for the 2nd Volume is one which I do not mean to be introduced at this time - the Potosi refers to an alleged agreement to be between him and the Potosi only. This only shows that the Potosi belongs to a party unable to discharge the duties of a member. This is known among ourselves. His statement is not supported by the evidence of the other above proposals to him alone. The only thing there is any commonality of

J-K
8/5/69

The last of the
 season was a
 with R. H. Williams
 & a horse named
 it. I have a silver
 to stop for the same
 Boston, a new horse
 to the place as soon as
 the 1st of September
 and the performance
 of the