Arromanbatt

Sheet No. 306

Forfeit [illegible]
of the 259
[illegible]

127-15-6

of 1774 Male
Wanie 2 [illegible]
152-0-0 Andeli 3 [illegible] aged 15
3 [illegible]
Dead of [illegible] Mudali
1210 [illegible]
Mudalee
No 2
in the
& 1 Daughter
& 1224 1 Wife

Rinwon

the village
in the enemy
were renewed

of Nattam
Service for
which it was
originally
granted

case. The Collector held the necessary investigation and reported in his letter No 8 of the 31st July 1833 establishing his right for ½ share in the village and recommending the registry of the entire village in his name with that of the several ~~[illegible]~~ Coheirs. The Board in their order of 24th March 1834 confirmed the collector's recommendation alleging that the petitioner Pattavari Mudali is the descendant of the eldest brother [illegible] Mudali to whom the village was granted as Nattakshirum by the former Govt. and to whose brother ~~[illegible]~~ by Lord Clive in 1802. Pattavari Mudali the petitioner appears to ~~be in~~ have been in evident enjoyment of his half share and in the management of the entire village up to 1268 by the Collector's letters to the Board dated 9th February 1856 regarding the ~~[illegible]~~ arrears of [illegible] the [illegible] No. 1908 of 1856 of the Ponnamallee [illegible] [illegible] with Board [illegible] that [illegible] of the Principal Sadar Amin [illegible] in Appeal Suit No. 49 of 1857 and the Collector's

condition of service by the
present Govt. [illegible]
[illegible] Mudali
a [illegible]
just named [illegible]
Col. 15.
The grant [illegible]
personal and its validity
established by the Govt.
[illegible]
One [illegible] Mudali
brother's grant [illegible]
for the [illegible]
was confirmed by the
[illegible] Govt. in 1802 [illegible]
that his name was
checked under the terms
[illegible] mentioned after the
name of the [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] register of 1224
On the registry of the
village in the names
of the incumbents [illegible]
Col. 6 after the death of
the father the [illegible]
[illegible] Mudali
in 1831 the [illegible]

village

[illegible] for his own [illegible] belonging to the family of [illegible]

[illegible] now requests me to register [illegible] in the settlement

[illegible] a careful perusal of the Collector's letter and the Board's order above referred to, Puttarow Mudali's claim for [illegible] is good and [illegible] right for [illegible] the village inseparable as that of the parties in col. 11 for the village confirmed in 1802 to Andyappa Mudali who was the paternal [illegible] claimant's grand father and the paternal uncle of the father of the present holder Puttarow Mudali the petitioner [illegible] appears to have brought the usurpation of his share by the parties in col. 11 to the notice of the Collector Magistrate of the district at that time. He however says he lodged a complaint to the Thasildar and before [illegible] up on the subject of a compromise with the parties in col. 11 which does not however appear to have been effected.

The parties in col. 11 without sufficient proof state that the [illegible] extant in the Collector's office, the petitioner [illegible] the Collector's recommendation for the Board's order above mentioned to register the [illegible] share in his name putting him in possession of the management of the village [illegible] never enjoyed his share at any time and he is not as stated by him a descendant or great grandson of Ramodas [illegible] Mudali the original grantee to whose brother Andyappa Mudali the Govt. Cowle was granted for the village. In support of the allegation they could not produce any documents or [illegible] evidence, whereas the correspondence with the Board, the Collector's letter to the Petitioner establish his [illegible] I recommend the registry of his [illegible] share in his name with those of the parties in col. 11 for the [illegible] of a joint title deed should the Commissioner [illegible] by the petition, are no [illegible] [illegible] to leave the petitioner Puttarow Mudali to Court as he is already engaged in civil litigation [illegible] [illegible] has already stated that he would bring a separate civil suit for the village at [illegible] [illegible] mentioned in col. 11 without prejudice to his claims at

448

[illegible]

April
25/1863

[illegible]

[illegible] wells

Tank [illegible]

7-6

not known

No accounts

Mahammi
Venkatesier

No Remarks
[illegible] of F 1186

Register

Tirumalliar
Mahammi

[illegible] great grand son

1 wife
1 son

his name [illegible] in the accounts [illegible] the name of one Venkata Varadayya except in Collector's register of F. 1190 in which it was registered after enquiry in the [illegible] of the [illegible] in favour of the name