Supplemental Regr of Enams in the Villages of Kinar Fasl 1290 — Madras Collectorate Taluq — Madras Dist.

Reg. No. 7

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Perumal Welcome Coop. 4-2-33-0-2	402	2-8-1	Puncha Pr. Enam	Free Hold	Pattah Known	The Enam is in Cultn. 14 4-15	Not Known	Sri Varadaraja Swamy of 1773 Pattah nama Panchayatdar Mann Enam Sri Parthasarathy Swamy Panchayatdar Mann Enam	Sri Parthasarathy Swamy Panchayatdar Mann Enam	Kasungali (1) Kandan (2) Murthyan (3) Kuppayan	N°s 3 Inhabitants 14	Kasungali Kandan 48 Ramagan 35	(1) (2) (3)	(1) Wife 1 Son 2 Daughter 1 Dr. Son 1 (2) Brother 3 (3) Son 1 Wife 1 Son 4 Daughter 2 Dr. Son 1	1 2 3	Family dwelling	To be Rent of 2 in my Rs. a. p. 2 1/2 of 1/4 agt 2 to - Rent 8 14 68	Ryotwari Settlement of 1871-72 Fasli 1281 Rs. a. p. 2 1/2 of 1/4 agt 2 to - Rent 8 14 68

Shall the 3rd Regr be 57

(1) (2)

Perumal Welcome Coop. 1938-12-2 1'05

Pani Sodi 2-2 2-2 2-2

6-12-4 Lavam's now Pattah Pay-ment Enam is wanting from the Cadastral 10 years & nothing Collected on the Enam into the 1274 according to the practice of the District —

Sworn Vide Perumal

they state that the Enam is immemorial watta; that they never knew N°s 2 to 3 as the Varadhars because they never attended in the Village; that they have been hearing reports from Panchayan Farmers very great & that they hired Pacchay 3 years ago and brought him thither as the Enamdar for my first settlement — I am inclined to believe that they were cognizant of the rights of N°s 1 to 3 but wanted basely to get the Enam to a favorite of theirs —

Pacchay admits that he is partners hereto due to N°s 1 and I cannot lay any stress on his claim —

In the Proc: connected with the sale of the Enam, Pacchay was named by the Villagers as the defendant & Remand was ordered on him —

I am of opinion that should the Commissioner decide on restoring the Enam, it should be restored to N°s 1 to 3 though they did not enjoy the Enam on account of its having been watta —

I beg therefore to recommend that the Enam may be confirmed to N°s 1 to 3 —

J.K.
26/6/68.

Vide Remarks on Page 1 Regr No. 84

Mr. Cannan as to the dispute between N°s 1 & 2 as one party and the 4 natural brothers of N°s 2 & 3 husband & brother who died in the enjoyment of a 1/3 of 4 share in the Enam —

J.K.

Assistant Commissioner

The practice of the District is to collect the Adhikaramanni tax whenever the Enams are cultivated and to collect no tax when Enam is left waste — In the Summary hereby settlement of the 1275-1276 when the Enam was waste, it was ruled that the Adhikaramanni tax should be levied as a permanent Demand irrespective of Cultivations — Enquiry does not appear that any Circular instructions from the Board or Collr's office were received altering the manner & though as I understand the Adhikaramanni tax is all the other Taluqs of the District — Adhikaramanni tax is collected for the arrears of the above two Fasli's of the Adhikaramanni tax thus viz Rs. Rs. 6-12-4 1/2 more 8-10 viz all Rs. 7-5-2 the Enam was attached on 23rd Aug 1867 and the land sold under Act II of 1864 when it was finally purchased for Rs. 12-9- Rs. 19-14-2 this I consider the Proceedings wrong, I beg to recommend that the Collr may be directed to cancel them and that the Enam may be confirmed as follows —

Sodi now enfixed Rs. a. p. 4 — —
do. Pattah at 1/8 2 12 — 12
Total Rs. 4 12 —

Sworn before me this 26th June 1868 J.K.

Assistant Commissioner

Since preparing the above Decision I come to know that Pacchay was not the rightful Adhikaramanni for the last 20 years — Vide my Letter on Cancelled Register of Mr. Cannan's Regr No. 84 — upon which the Village officers note Pacchay

Jt. Secy. to Board of Revenue Mr. Cannan's Report Mr. Secretary to Board of Revenue Mr. Cannan's Proceedings Mr. Secretary to Board of Revenue Mr. Cannan's Proceedings Mr. Secretary to Board of Revenue Mr. Cannan's Proceedings