

Register
No. 34
Sheet
No. 418

Handwritten
for
183

1. Lunkarammal & Alvelammal above alluded to appeared before me in person at the time of the settlement of this village & admitted of purchasing sold one year
for Rs 6000 to the persons N 1 & 2 of 18 on the 23rd July 1833 - & executed the Bill of sale produced before me by the purchaser on a stamp paper of 60 Paise -
The persons who attested the Bill of sale committed also the validity of the transaction - The said Lunkarammal & Alvelammal are the widows of the deceased
of the Grand son of the Original Grantee - The husband of the widows died 36 years ago or in the year "Sarvajithi" - when Lunkarammal was of about 20 & Alvelammal
of about 16 years old - The said Lunkarammal & Alvelammal inherited the lands which are sold now to the persons N 1 & 2 of 18 from their late husband -
1. With regard to 1 & 2 of 18 of a 1/8th part sold by Gulum Dastagir Sahib & others, it appears that the father of the said Dastagir Sahib & others was
in the Grand Father of Lajpat Boodulamm alias Alam Patela, Lajpat Dastagir Namam Sahib & Lajpat Boodam Thangya Sahib, purchased from the 16th July 1811
for Rs 690 from the late husband of the said Lunkarammal & Alvelammal, & 1/8th of a 1/8th part from Namam Sahib, of Kholabgaon, Nalbari, Muttalaga
Namam Sahib, Muttalagalunga Nalbari, & Namam Sahib, the persons N 7-9 of 18 - One Bill is on Stamp paper & another is on
Copper plate - Both transactions proved to be bonafide -

From Board by
the collector dated
18 Aug 1848
1. From collector
to the Board on
the 18 August 1848
1. From Board to
November 1848

It appears from the marginally noted correspondence that Lunkarammal, one of the widows above alluded to, presented a Petition to the Board in N 252 of 184
"praying for the restoration of the Lunkarammal village which had been under enjoyment previous to the interference of one Latchay Namam Sahib
In referring this Petition to the collector for report on the 18 Aug 1848, the Board requested the collector to state his opinion whether the village in question should
be awarded to the full Tenure - On his reply to the Board of the 18 August 1848, the collector among other things stated that is follows -

"No Parwana is forthcoming" for the village - "A Decree of the late Jilte Court of Namam dated the 14th February 1814 mentions the
"was known Parwana - This Decree also directed the enjoyment of the village in 3 shares, 2 shares by Latchay Namam Sahib & one by Latchay Namam Sahib
"Accordingly as terms of the former the Petitioner Lunkarammal & another woman Alvelammal are the proprietors of the share - One of these two shares
"admitted by the Petitioner to have been mortgaged to one Bider of Namam Sahib, whose son now enjoys it the other share is the subject of the present dispute
"By a decree of the District Court of Panamagorry, dated the 2nd April 1828, 1/6th of the share was awarded to Latchay Namam Sahib, for 1/6th of the share
"on a mortgage bond at the expiration of which period, it was declared to be redeemable by payment of the debt. This mortgage the Petitioner admits
"but pleads that it has been satisfied, & on the other hand contends that the debt is still unpaid - For the remaining 5/6th of the share produces no evidence
"Copies of two mortgage bonds the original of which he states to have been filed in the Courts. These bonds the Petitioner declares to be proved by several
"Whether the right of the Petitioner to the share under the above mentioned documents be well founded or not, his possession appears to be proved by several
"proceedings in the Court, the two last of which it would be sufficient to cite of the answer of Lunkarammal & Alvelammal to a suit N 8 of 1846
"brought by the Petitioner in the Subordinate Court of Madras, wherein it is allowed that the whole share was in his possession after the year 1845 & 1846
"the remainder of a subsequent date have been produced before me stating the possession to be belong to the Petitioner - It is evident that
"the only plausible evidence which the Petitioner can bring against the above as a decision by the Court in N 8 of 1846 awarding the whole share to the Petitioner
"an elder wife of the Petitioner husband 2 shares of the village. But as this was passed in a dispute between the possessor of the village, it is evident that
"unproof on behalf of the Proprietor against a mortgagee who may be supposed to have been interested in the share - The possession of the village
"appears to me to have been fully established, & I think that Petitioner had no right to resume without his consent or the Decree of a competent Court
"With regard to the right to mortgage or sell a land, the collector pleads that such alienation is contrary to the common Law of the country -
"As regards the imposition of a fine levied on the petitioner and that the imposition of a fine levied on the petitioner is not a right of the Government
"in the Court & as the fine was probably levied on the petitioner while in the hands of a person unconnected with the family of the Original Grantee
"it would appear that the fine was levied on the petitioner while in the hands of a person unconnected with the family of the Original Grantee
"the collector of alienation in regard to the fine was formerly common & unobjectionable as it is now stopped by the construction put upon it
"to be understood to exercise the power of the Government to check the fine alluded to in the Board's order
"The Board's order is as follows -

Following
the Collector's
reply to the
Board dated
18 August 1848

Handwritten
for
183

Tabuabon

Apple, and
in the vicinity of the First and -

Oct 16/1882 at 12 1/2

[illegible]

Dry 8000 feet ————— 131-11
 Dry 3000 feet ————— 120-6

Day 300 Annual - 3 As per acre
Day 681 Annual - 4 As per acre ——— 120-6 ———

563-8

701-8-

1265

Harshana Ray

Lambert

3-4

[Faint handwritten notes, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.]

Grand Total 1742 42

[illegible]

Appeal from 221060 of 1864 from
Kishitaraaya Namik & 3 others
Collaterals of the Jantarai Desendants
in Vol 16 objecting to the recognition
of the alienation made by widows
of the late Kishitaraaya Jantarai to
Namik rejected & ended by saying
that the Village may be confirmed
on present terms rejected &
ended —
to the Jantarai Service for
which the same record is made

5. Table of average income of the last 15 years of the zemindar on
met. land in the Parg of Pondonij Pannab Estate

A

8	8.50	Cultivated	Grass seed	Of which	Average	Value of the	Notes
9	9.25	area in acre	turn	Secundo's value at 10 per cent	price of grain	quantity of grain given in bush	per Acre
8	8.5	A. C.	R. H. O.	R. H. O.	R. A. O.	R. A. O.	R. A. O.
48	3-3	12237 "	53898 1-4	2,359-3-	2-9-	5,17328-	4-7-6

& Temperatures prevailing in Admiralty Palace of London
 Maximum Minimum
 " 9 " " " " "

Salvor Attribution of Pandour Seluys
F2562161

F12562161
 F125710969
 F1258705
 F12591535
 F12607161
 F1261818
 F12623285
 F12633311
 F12645293
 F12651376
 F12661066
 F12676836
 F12683881
 F12696360
 F12704279

(Continued from p. 100) The persons No 1 & 2 of 18 are Vakeels & alias Handi
The King's Court in Ponnore having taken the Manager of = Tumbachy
- the permission of Ramana as purchase 2 Vakeels & 1/2 of 18 fully from Naya Kani 42
- Meer Gahar Dastager Sah, Larged Badaralam alias Glean Palcha,
- Larged Marutya Boosamine Sahab, Larged Badina Manager Sah, &
- Muranna, Sah Bi Bi & from one Sahab and Annal & Gleanclammal.
- Wives of the late Achuturaya Tumbachy Vakeel in the names of =
- the Vakeels No 1 & 2 of 18. The Manager never purchased the lands directly in his name -
- because he is pleading himself in one of the Tumbachy Vakeels which is held by his enemy that,
- because he is pleading himself in one of the Tumbachy Vakeels which is held by his enemy that,

[illegible]

1. Kachha } Grand (77)
 Linga Lumb } Grand 1 (Opif)
 Shinayakun } the 1 (Kerid)
 do } 603 } 1 (Laythe)
 } } 1 (Am 2 do)

8 Kuttala } (8)
ghaumbo } 1 wife
Chinayakun } 2 sons
58 } 8 aupts

9 Mutter (9)
3 Samstringe 1 Son
1 Sambalehi 1 Tochter
1 Naya Kaur 1 Beddion
70

10 Muttala Great (10)
Gha Lumbas Bay 10 wife
Chinayakam of the 10 son
50 May 2 March
daughter

11 Sam & Lumbos
Shinazjaken } Y 3rd (10)
alia Kamo } Son 1 Que Tan
sam Lumbos } 1 Pope
Chenayaken } 16 Sons.
 } 1 Que si.
 } Daughters

120 Miras	(12)
Land	1/2
Water	1/2
Other	2/2
	Daughter

13 Horosans.	(13)
Waya Kan	1 Wife
Alias Foveti	3 Sons
Tumtatachi	1 Grand
Waya Kan	Daughter
42	

is no longer required, the whole Bill has been
confirmed to prevent Holders as persons whose
Petitioners can not therefore expect some to
suppose, against the abolition, having recognized
They are however at liberty to establish
the illegality of the abolition & their
Remedy which thro' a Bill in the
House

(iv) Appeal Petn No 904 of 1860 from Senkaran. He pleaded animal objection to the validity of sale made by their family to Yed. Sadracham Sahib rejected vendors

WMS
23/10/65

File
25/10/65

D.D.D. } the preceding are
in
H.D.