[illegible] Village of Kutanendal No [illegible] Varar Village in Madura District Ramnad

Kutanendal

All [illegible]

No 1 enjoying ½ Village
No 2 do ½ do

Register No 314

Sheet No 321

I This is one of the Darmasanams in the Zemindary of Ramnadpurum. This was granted by the Zemindar [illegible] to the person No 13 — for subsistence [illegible]. There is uninterrupted possession of the holders since the date of the grant. There was no Potta — It was lost. The Village is supported by the [illegible] accounts of 12. Now the Village is enjoyed as shown in the margin — But there is much defect in the title of the holders of the Village as it will be seen from the undermentioned remarks.

II The person No 1 pdb (Poonabcutnayen) [illegible] is enjoying half Village & sold the remaining half of the [illegible] to one Samaveen — in A D 1857 Bill of sale [illegible] stamped paper leaf. The person No 1 admits the transaction. The purchaser made an endowment [illegible] to the Temple in A D 1853. The [illegible] witness died 5 years ago. Now the main point in for consideration is whether the person — No 1 [illegible] or the legal successor of [illegible]

III The person No 1 pleads that in the year [illegible] corresponding to A D 18[illegible] one Venkatachellumien the Husband of younger sister of his father — gave the entire Village [illegible] gift [illegible] at the same time a deed of gift on a plain Cadjan paper — or leaf. The [illegible] the donor transferred all his real & personal property to the person No 1 pdb 16 as his [illegible]. The person No 1 [illegible] the document [illegible] without any evidence that the transaction is bonafide & that he is enjoying the Village since the last 30 years. The genuineness of the document is much doubted. The person No 1 pdb when he executed a Bill of sale to Samaveen disposing half of the Village, he never made mention of this transaction nor of the document in the said Bill of sale though it was necessary to do so. Again, the purchaser of [illegible] portion of Village the deed of gift ought to have been taken by him if it were then really existing. This was not done. Again the Bill of sale is on stamp paper [illegible] paper a long [illegible]. Again the person No 1 pleaded that he is [illegible] years old & that he was 15 years old when he received the gift — he does not seem to be above 35 or 36 years old. Again he says that Kuttey Ayen of 15 as the name of person who gave the Village in gift to him & he is termed here as Venkatachellumien that the donor has two names. Again the person No 1 pdb when [illegible] never mentioned of the [illegible] been called by two names. Again in this part of the country as [illegible] in other parts which I had traversed [illegible] noted for forgeries & perjuries. Under the above circumstances I strongly say that the deed of gift is not a genuine one. But [illegible]

Dharma [illegible] son [illegible] 17-3-10

Keelunadha Setupathi [illegible] Soloraka nasacam 1587 / 1665

Act of [illegible] 1911
Act of [illegible] A D 1815

[illegible] 1911 Musastri Dharma sasam Kutanendal Village (Varayedi) 16 [illegible] A [illegible] Varayedi 10-5 Karabam
58-50
Total
77-68

A D 1815 Dharma sasam Kutanendal Nanja (Varayedi) 18-1-3 A C 21-14 Kattu Ayen

Salumarangur

1 Ponnu Kristnayan 45
Remnad Sheo Viswanadhaswami
Prastie Viswanathayen 25
Equal shares

A C 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter

[illegible] 1911
[illegible] 8-58
23 [illegible] 27-76
[illegible] 58-50
86-26
Deduct [illegible]
[illegible] (Vara) 6 12 8-2
[illegible] 16
7 8-18
Remainder [illegible]
13 3 15-42
16-11 19-58
(Varakam) Cultivat 21 18-90
Waste 44 39-66
65 58-50

Reduced from the [illegible] by the [illegible]

App. per [illegible] 27 Octr 185[illegible] No 95 from Rutnoo Kristnayen (by post) complaining of the charge of ½ [illegible] alleging that [illegible] witness [illegible] the [illegible] Kutnayen [illegible] 15 [illegible] but that [illegible] order.

Refer [illegible] whether Venkatachellumien [illegible] & whether he is [illegible]

91

Tahr Reply dated Decr 1863 No 219.

The Daughter of Kattu Ayen is alive & deposes to the truth of the alienation to the parties now holding the Inam — He himself [illegible] the Panchayat [illegible] the old [illegible] also speaks to the fact of Venkatachellum being the [illegible] of Kattu Ayen — [illegible] the [illegible] these circumstances [illegible] in this case should be [illegible]

Confirmed 1/9/63

No 3513 of 1866 from Ponnoo Kistnayen complaining of the attachment of the Village in consequence of his appeal [illegible] not having been [illegible] Endorsed [illegible] decision 15 Decr 66

21/1/66

Vide [illegible]

178

Tasdik [illegible] VII
[illegible] Rs 17-3-10

Govt [illegible] ½ — 37 Rupees

Ramnad 14 7 63

[illegible] Rao

[illegible] of [illegible] Pulagy per Acre

Maximum Minimum

Dry 2-9-9

Wet 16-13-10

Average rates of Govt Pulagy per Acre

Dry 1-5-6

Wet 4-6-4

Statement of average in course of the ~~last 15~~ years of the Zemindar on wet

Cult in the Pulagy of Vorur in Ramnad

From Fusly 1266 to 1277	Cultivated area in acres	Gross outturn	Of which Zemindar's share at 40 per cent	Av. Prices of Grain	Value of the quantity of Grain in Rs	Rates per Acre
A. C.	[illegible]	M. M. 6	M. M. 6	Rs As P	Rs As P	Rs As P
[illegible]-10-5	31422-22	1,88311-6-4	59552-9-0	2-8-6	150142-12-0	5-0-0

Dry rates prevailing in Zemindary Pulagy of Vorur —

Maximum Minimum

~~2-8-1~~ 0-15-9

Furnished

Appeal Pn 23d July 1867 Bd No 2252 / Rev No 663 from the Trustee asking for the Village being released from attachment & an amended T.D being passed stating that the amended T.D was stated in the Endorsement on the 2 Pn 35 B of 1866 to have been sent but that was not the case —

It was by a mistake that the T.D was stated in the above Endorsement to have been sent in stead of "will be sent" —

Now the Tiruvadanay Sub Magte will be directed to comply with the order sent him by this Dept dated 1st ~~[illegible]~~ July 1866 No 19 & send the T.D for amendment —

The Pn will be endorsed accordingly —

T. R.
1/10/67

Recorded
Colr. Cutch
1-2-68

28-5

(X) of course the person No 1 of [illegible] has been allowed to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Rast
– 15 or 16 years – Hence I ~~also~~ record my opinion that the deed of gift is not genuine & the person No 1
– [illegible] is not rightful owner of the Village – after all the person No 1 [illegible] says that he was
– [illegible] years of that he had no relatives when he died. The person No 1 [illegible] is not any way
– related to the Donor under Hindoo Law – He is neither Dayadee, ~~[illegible]~~ Samanodaka or
Sapinda of the deceased [illegible] – However as he is enjoying the Village since the last
= 15 or 16 years; ~~[illegible]~~ and as he is a ~~blood~~ connection of the Donor I recommend to confirm
[illegible] on the person No 1 [illegible] on the purchase of half Village on half [illegible].
[illegible] was a rightful owner of the Village
I do not [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] Stream – Wet lands are [illegible]
Wet lands depend upon a tank – [illegible] [illegible] Dry [illegible] as waste are
annually – [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
7 or 8 years cultivated annually [illegible] [illegible] as [illegible]
[illegible] – Wet lands are [illegible] from
the [illegible] – Sort of [illegible] [illegible]
– extent of lime occasionally – No Punsey is raised – [illegible]
[illegible] of the Govt [illegible]
property – Average profits of the Village on 7 or 8 [illegible]
= is deducted the net profits are 20-6 – This is not fair – The average [illegible]
– as rates of the Zemindary Pulagy are given in the margin – Wet [illegible]
– [illegible] are high & not suited to this Village [illegible]
– Dry lands are not fertile [illegible] the average rates are high [illegible] of 16, [illegible]
After entering into much details about the [illegible] [illegible]
– the valuation as follows = [illegible] I apportion my valuation [illegible] the average rates [illegible]
= [illegible] [illegible] according [illegible] [illegible]
rates proposed & sanctioned for several Districts by the Settlement Dept –

Wet 19½ Acres at 2-8-0 per acre	48-12-0		
" 4 Acres at 2 Do Do	8-0-0	56-12	
Dry (Kallu) 20 Acres at 10 As per	20		
" Waste 38 Acres at 6 As per	14-4-0	34-4-0	
		91-0-0	

[illegible] Dy.
[illegible]/67