

Mambalam village
Saidapet TIC.
Chinglepet St.
T. P.

is be conformest to the Capital or largest Centre
as the service is rep. according to
the largest be formed

10-E-8 South Sea baby
 New 20, Plums same broken in dirt
 of the about
 Kelana of the
 formal front
 The service
 no. 20 of 1881
 day fulfilled
 per Remond
 dated of
 1884
 Don and
 1200
 Dugies
 1200

Personal Lib
Meyerson Lane
E. 1st Ave.
2-12-11
L 1860
St. Louis
James O
E. 1st Ave.
St. Louis
1910

Mambalau
The Priests
Personal
Paid for the time being
Kortatragdangeng

The paper is written
on a long line.

12/10/67
 77
 100

[illegible]

Bear Lake
 meadows June
 Stuart home
 1-4-2
 Stuart
 1-1-2
 The same in
 same a
 Stuart 1-1-2
 or
 1-2-10

Man, balam
Pekri
galang alim m
Pujin for the time being
Pela L. bogen

To be confirmed to
the Notary is Long is
the service is rendered 1005

[illegible]

Kagaji The
Kandakata same
Kandakata same
No 10 No 268
Cater Cater

Triplicaria Great not yet
Great
striatula West America
Great
64 *striatula* Daughters
in law
[indistinct]

The son of the present
holder died & gave
up having a small
room living with

7.
1006

T.D.
1006

father-in-law - have the same
to visit & have been made
of the southern - but the accident
has in proper - but his
is unsatisfactory of death - so that
is probable that he be injured on 7/2 ago.
has them on behalf of his son -
concerning the case of the widow by with mother & son
the party in Feb. 10 & for her right to the cable etc.
helping for work on the line on under
1/4 ad. 2/30 Parker, inclusive of travel 1/3
Recd. - Administration Dub. 27/4/12
4/1/62

1753	1754	1755	1756	1757	1758	1759	1760	1761	1762	1763	1764	1765	1766	1767	1768	1769	1770	1771	1772	1773	1774	1775	1776	1777	1778	1779	1780	1781	1782	1783	1784	1785	1786	1787	1788	1789	1790	1791	1792	1793	1794	1795	1796	1797	1798	1799	1800
1753	1754	1755	1756	1757	1758	1759	1760	1761	1762	1763	1764	1765	1766	1767	1768	1769	1770	1771	1772	1773	1774	1775	1776	1777	1778	1779	1780	1781	1782	1783	1784	1785	1786	1787	1788	1789	1790	1791	1792	1793	1794	1795	1796	1797	1798	1799	1800

Wasselton
Lange
Kroger
was in the pen for the

The notes does not appear
the Subsequent with
his High Commissioner Klege
to the President
to the President

(400) K. Pandurangam
13/11/69. Tahildar

Mambalam Village

Sheet No. 211

Saidapet Taluk

Mambalam Village
Saidapet - Taluk
Chingelput - Dist.

id/for Mammachandrasekar

The foregoing remark
is equally applicable
to this case & he
is named & charged
with full effect.

id/for Mammachandrasekar

The above remark
holds good & is applied
to this case - he
is named & charged
with full effect.

id/for Mammachandrasekar

To be comprised to
the Register by
as it is well kept
up -

Mammachandrasekar
3/6/2

S.D. 2

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

Mamhaham Reg. 1892 Case 5-

Appeal ~~from~~ made verbally in the District Office & referred for enquiry in the Order of 20th May 1862 & 107 from Patahiki alias Hyadunnidai claiming a share in the Inam -

Appeal ~~from~~ 1824 of 1864 from Subbrammania Mudaliy complaining against the registration of the Inam in the name of the party in Order 16 Fatma's Tahsilदार's Report thereon 12th June 1866 No. 65 -

Patahiki alias Hyadunnidai is the step daughter of Fatma's who under the Mahomedan law is entitled to a share in the Inam - Fatma's while admitting this deposed before the Patahiki that she derived an exclusive right against other members of the family from a deed of grant executed by her husband in her favor when he ^{married} her - she stated that in view of the strength of this deed which she produced before the D. C. Order that that officer registered her right - she further produced before the D. C. the alleged deed of which he sent a true copy to this office - It does not appear however that the alleged deed was produced before the D. C. Order. The copy of it ^{being} ~~being~~ having been found when translated in this office to relate to other parties, Fatma's Order was questioned & he proposed that there was some deed & he has not appeared again - Under these circumstances I recommend that Patahiki alias Hyadunnidai be registered as such -

As regards Subbrammania Mudaliy's claim, the former Petition of 1862 to which he refers is out to be found on the records of this office - He appears to have purchased from the Villagers the Macrafae right to the land & to have remained in possession in consequence of his claim to the Inam is not tenable - He produces a deed of sale of 1846 by Fatma's step son Subham Raju whereby he appears to have sold the Inam subject to the right of a fixed sum to the original landlord - Fatma's son who was then alive complained to the Court in 1855 against this sale and the Order of 19th March 1856 No. 690 on which the Petitioner simply treats of the invalidity of the sale, which is not distinct in its provisions Order directs a certain sum shall be paid annually to the original landlord for the Inam - His Petition is therefore rejected & endorsed accordingly -

Y. R.
13/6/67
H. S. P. S.

Y. R.
13/6/67
H. S. P. S.

Y. R.

Appeal Peta dated 29th April 1867 from Jayala Chengalaya Tamm & Mundaram Parthasarathy Chetty -

The appellants claim that the Inam may be confirmed to them on the ground of the purchase made by them in a sale by the High Court & on the ground of Fatma's having privately relinquished in their favor her right & surrendered the tickets & other documents -

These persons state that this Inam together with some other Order lands, formed a piece of ground in the possession of Subbrammania Mudaliy - From the sale certificate produced by appellants, it is not clear whether this Inam is included in the sale or not - Admitting that it is, the certificate does not give the Inam right to the purchase - I simply transfer the land to them & it seems to me that it is the Macrafae right only that is to be transferred - Peta have not produced the alleged document given by Fatma's & even if they did, they would not be valid since they are only a share in the land - Under these circumstances Peta's claim is rejected & the Peta will be endorsed accordingly -

Y. R.
13/6/67
H. S. P. S.