

4) 1910 ஜனவரி 10 நாளை

Pl. 558

1 This is one of the Dammara grants in the Remission of Dammara duties.
This is a hereditary grant - $19\frac{32}$ part of the Village was not excluded from the assets of the Permanent Settlement, while the remaining $13\frac{32}$ part of
the Village was ~~excluded~~ excluded from the same - because the holders of the former were not present at the time of the Permanent Settlement, while those
of the latter were present - Hence $19\frac{32}$ part of the Village alone is brought under the settlement though the entire Village is now enjoyed by the
holders thereof as Dammara tenants - God has no reversionary right in the $19\frac{32}$ part of the Village not excluded from the assets on which the Permanent
settlement was based - No talk now about the area or about the boundaries on the part of the Rang's Taluk. Hence the area of 2988 Aers is
confirmed here as the area of the Village - Properly speaking there must be 1168 Aers of Arable Lands in the $13\frac{32}$ part of the Village excluded from the assets of
the Permanent Settlement - but there is ~~an~~ an increase of 215 $\frac{1}{2}$ Aers therein - There is 27 Aers of 8 parts below the area given in the account of 1721 -
for $19\frac{32}$ part of the Village ~~the~~ excluded from the assets of the Permanent Settlement - The Taluk of the Rang's Taluk is ~~that~~ that the excess of 215 $\frac{1}{2}$ Aers is
arable lands of the $19\frac{32}$ part ~~about~~ included in the assets of the Permanent Settlement - should be transferred to the $19\frac{32}$ part of the Village -
not excluded from the assets of the Permanent Settlement - The Deputy Collector is unable to comply with the request ~~that~~ as the account of 1721
contains 1406 Aers & 80 parts for the $13\frac{32}$ part of the Village now brought under the settlement - By mistake in the old account, $13\frac{32}$ part of the
Village is entered as not included in the assets of the Permanent Settlement - Hence the Deputy Collector took, to avoid confusion, the area of
given in the account of 1721 as his guide - Of course the $19\frac{32}$ part of
the Village had right both in Permanent

1847

Thomas Gadi W. -
 2. 21. 11
 Annual Oct 12
 Range of 12 1/2
 Lachar's Bul of
 dharma 29 2 1815
 ythor
 G. L.

Repinter B. 558

Sheet no 624

[illegible]

The Sanitation of
the village is
confirmed as
recommended
of the Deputy Col.
in no 79 or 80
2 R of No 122
exclusive of the

Handwritten: *M. Koushane Rev D*

Bayin Tarayev	5-24-11	
Bayin Kurakchi	4-11-63	90
Remanab	89-01	
	2865-64	
educt 1/2% Village not excluded from the assets of Barm. Co.		
Bayin Tarayev	104-11-17	121-44
Torayev	132-11-15	35
	117-2-1/2	136-79
Bayin Kurakchi	1497-13	1348-05
Remanab	1484-82	
	1578-32	
3/32 I Hornsacnam excluded from the assets of Barm. Co.		
Bayin Tarayev	} 30-11-2	95-98
Cultivator		
Waste	19-2-2 1/2	22-37
	49-13-3	58-35
		138-44
Bayin Kurakchi	} 5-30-4	477-4
Cultivator		
Waste	937-7	1843-47
	1487-1/8	1320-47
	1378-82	
		932-84
		1070-8

[Faint, illegible handwriting visible through the paper]

Maximum Minimum

Mr 10-13-3 a-5-9

Dr. 1-5-6

Oct 4-6-1.

Details of average income of the last 15 years of the year on wet land in the State of Connecticut in Rained Estate

From 1866	to 1870	cultivated area in acres	Gross out turn	Of which Gum is share at 40 per cent	Average prices of grains	Value of the quantity of grains given in both	Rates per acre
R R	A C	R G	R G	R R	R R	R R	R R
14873-25	66841-7-3	26738-9-4	2-11-4	72436-4-4	4-11-4		

Dry rates prevailing in secondary Sales of
 Maximum Minimum
 1-8-4 { 9-7

Saloon Cultivation of

$\sqrt{12584686}$

71257 4838

7
F 258 2084

File 59641

82607412

Feb 29 22

- 12626571

F12639698

57264 4942

F12655696

71266, 751

Feb 7, 1993

Fr 1268 2466

72693918

Strážný 8

13 Sabranouin }
Lyon 10 } No. 11

14 Venkato } (14)
Chalanigayam } 20 1 Another

15 Dundas } 10 W. p.
may 50 } 2 Lams
1 Aug 1850

16 Keranap
Kayan 62

17 - Tuma Cargoon.
62 - } all (17)
1 wife 1 son

18 Rangeley 50th (118)
16th 16th

~~The~~ Mr. Hagan says that in A.D. 1788 or in the year Telokas the Village was measured -
- & the area of 2980 square feet found to be within the proper limits of the Village
- & that the excess of 63 acres is ~~not brought to account~~ ^{the} as it is ^{containing} in
ⁱⁿ-variable lands - The entire Village has a Patta cut on a copper plate - The existence of this
document is mentioned in the Rajan Account of A.D. 1815 - This Village is omitted from
Boon's Account of A.D. 1815 - The Patta shows that several Villages were granted before 1st 3
Now only this is in Lary & others were incorporated with Ayer land previous to the Permanent
Settlement.

Settlement -
 III There are serious Talk wars in the Village regarding Trillick or shares, which are as
 - below -
 10. The persons M-2 & 3 & 16 plead that the ¹²/₃₂ part of the Village excluded from the
 assets of the Permanent Settlement is their sole property & that the persons M-4 to 17 have no shares
 it - & that the ¹²/₃₂ part of the Village is in their sole possession & enjoyment. In proof of
 they produced the following documents -
 The River was granted to the H^o 17th part

- See they produced the following documents -

- 1 Copper plate Patent of the Village shewing that the entire Village was granted to the H^o 17th Feb^r
- 1 Register, dated 22 February 16 bearing the signature of the King on the Seal showing
that the Village is in the name of Van Katoe Subbein, Great Grandson of the person N^o 13. ---
- 1 Unauthenticated copy of a Deed signed in April 1669 of 1836-
^{at appeal of}

The person N^o 45 ~~is~~ one brother of the person N^o 6 is the father younger brother of the persons N^{os} 4 & 5 / 16
The person N^o 4 pleads for himself & on behalf of the persons N^{os} 5 & 6 / 16 that they have in this
Village 1 ~~Village~~ ¹⁵/₁₆ of a Village; that of the 1-7/16 of Village were acquired originally from the Original
& by gift from one Rammer one of the shareholders in the Village, in A.D. 1807 by his Grand Father
& that they are now young these lands uninterrupted by - In proof of this they produced - the deed of gift
- A.D. 1807 - (See enclosure)

(From Vankata Subbar from the natural father of the person N 38 grand father of the person N 39)
from 1829 & 1830 papers 202 & 203

XI - One Rangam Selly of the 3/4 truth on the ground that he is Father & Elder Brother purchased the land in 1829 & 1830 from the natural father of the person N 38 grand father of the person N 39 & that he is enjoying them ever since without interruption - In proof of this he produced the bills of sales which are on plain Cogan leaves in the form of agreements & the two Bills of sales given to him by the seller which were executed to him (Father) by the person from whom he purchased them previously -
Of the latter Bills of sales one is on Stencil Cogan & another is on plain Cogan leaves -

Now I proceed to decide the claim of the several parties concerned -

XII - Of the documents produced by the person N 1 & 2 & 3 of 1816 ^{the father of the person N 3} to show the father of the person N 3 & the register of the name of the person N 3 in the village -
to prove that the entire Damasanam portion ^{is situated} is situated from the permanent settlement is in possession of the person N 3 & that the person N 3 has no share in the Village -
It is known fact that the former rules generally used to grant whole Villages in gift to one individual who distributed the portions of it to several other persons -
It is also usual to Register the gift in former days in the names of one or two individuals -

XIII - With regard to the Decree in appeal suit N 46 of 1836, the Deputy Collector on perusing it carefully finds no name of the Village to which it relates -
Again even if it were relating to the 1/2 part of the Village in now known settlement, it does not relate to the whole portion of the land 1/2 part of the Village -
It was founded on a claim presented by the father of the person N 3 of 1816 to the effect that the collector of the father of the person N 3 of 1816 admitted to him -
certain lands in the Village - It was decided that the widow had no authority to make the alienation & thus the transaction was nullified -
Thus the Decree is of no use to the matter in dispute - The admitted times being occupation of the Village not admitted from the assent of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged

XIV - With regard to the claim of the person N 4 & 5 & 6 of 1816 - for 1/16 of the Village - The person N 3 of 1816 who is also Father of the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 engaged -
does not produce any document to prove that there is a fabricated document & nor to produce any other document -
The names as Rangam Selly & Vankata Subbar are affixed to it - He failed to prove that there is a fabricated document & nor to produce any other document -
bearing the real signatures of the person N 3 or his adopted & natural father - The fact is 40 years old - The document is of 56 years old - The person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
naturally are unable to prove the genuineness of the document as it is of 57 years old - But I find no reason to doubt its genuineness - It is well known that the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
in Telugu character - The person N 3 or his friends cannot naturally admit the genuineness of the deed of gift - because it is said there is a fabricated document -
The person N 3 of 1816 engaged - is admitted to the Deed - The person N 3 of 1816 engaged - because of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
the Village on the Village, half truth is admitted to the Deed - The person N 3 of 1816 engaged - because of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
the claim falls to the earth at once - The person N 3 of 1816 engaged - because of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
Century ago. Rangam Selly younger brother of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged - because of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
30 years & that he is enjoying the land - The person N 3 of 1816 engaged - because of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
Under the above circumstances, I register the 1/16 of the Village in the names of the person N 4 & 5 & 6 of 1816 & refer their opponents to find fault -

XV - The person N 3 of 1816 engaged - because of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
that there are 1/16 Village in the Village - The document is of 56 years old - The person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
The person N 7 & 8 are unable to prove the genuineness of the documents produced by them - but the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
genuine one as it is on a Stencil Cogan leaf & is a few years ago several of the Damasanam Villages tendered their papers -
as security for Rangam Selly & Rangam Selly - who had temporary charge of the Damasanam Villages -
the transaction - The lands are in possession of the person N 7 & 8 of 1816 - The person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
Village - Under these circumstances, the Deputy Collector registered the Village in the name of the person N 7 & 8 of 1816 & refer their opponents to find fault -
XVI - The person N 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 of 1816 engaged - because of the person N 3 of 1816 engaged -
the one Village is registered in the name of the person N 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 of 1816 engaged -

Conr's remarks on Box No 558 of the
Village of Inuimannigpartota —
Box No 25 amindari —

the Village is entered as ¹³slaves and ³²the extent
of it is given as 1406.80 acres. According to the
last one

7800 Anna, full watered annually
at 1-0 per Ann
This is including both the Tunnel & Level -

1200 acres, but the ² spring of 1822
was registered 1379 acres as the area of the ^{estate}
as it is stated to be the actual ^{estate}
of 1822. I was the intent is less than that in
1821. He believes that the actual is but 200
acres at present more than 1200 & 200

Dr 70 Pence = partly a note & partly a stubbed at 100 per ann
led
the entry of 13 & 70 is simply an error.

152 6
~~260~~

Nov 11 1863

952-8-0
~~1067-0-0~~
~~1198-0-0~~

Humboldt Nov 2

Nayan — 106-8-274
Dharmasaram — 51-10-3 — 1496
158-5- $\frac{3}{4}$ -3036

Resides the Nayan & Dharmasaram are independent villages having their own boundaries - the one being connected with the other in 1211 along the road which they had been so. Hence it is supposed at the first portion of 19th or 18th were completely recognized as areas which did not agree in point of area with one another because the division of land was made with reference to the quality & approximate amount of the lands which were taken in the two sections. As the land was divided & assigned for periods of 50 years from AD 1738 common among them after to have been divided & assigned for periods of 50 years from AD 1738. The Nayan & Dharmasaram area appears to have been divided & assigned for periods of 50 years from AD 1738. The Nayan & Dharmasaram area appears to have been divided & assigned for periods of 50 years from AD 1738. The Nayan & Dharmasaram area appears to have been divided & assigned for periods of 50 years from AD 1738.

