

Volume 1  
No 713

Register No 713  
Sheet No 846

[illegible]

157-8  
 1882-1883  
 1883-84  
 1884-85  
 1885-86  
 1886-87  
 1887-88  
 1888-89  
 1889-90  
 1890-91  
 1891-92  
 1892-93  
 1893-94  
 1894-95  
 1895-96  
 1896-97  
 1897-98  
 1898-99  
 1899-00  
 1900-01  
 1901-02  
 1902-03  
 1903-04  
 1904-05  
 1905-06  
 1906-07  
 1907-08  
 1908-09  
 1909-10  
 1910-11  
 1911-12  
 1912-13  
 1913-14  
 1914-15  
 1915-16  
 1916-17  
 1917-18  
 1918-19  
 1919-20  
 1920-21  
 1921-22  
 1922-23  
 1923-24  
 1924-25  
 1925-26  
 1926-27  
 1927-28  
 1928-29  
 1929-30  
 1930-31  
 1931-32  
 1932-33  
 1933-34  
 1934-35  
 1935-36  
 1936-37  
 1937-38  
 1938-39  
 1939-40  
 1940-41  
 1941-42  
 1942-43  
 1943-44  
 1944-45  
 1945-46  
 1946-47  
 1947-48  
 1948-49  
 1949-50  
 1950-51  
 1951-52  
 1952-53  
 1953-54  
 1954-55  
 1955-56  
 1956-57  
 1957-58  
 1958-59  
 1959-60  
 1960-61  
 1961-62  
 1962-63  
 1963-64  
 1964-65  
 1965-66  
 1966-67  
 1967-68  
 1968-69  
 1969-70  
 1970-71  
 1971-72  
 1972-73  
 1973-74  
 1974-75  
 1975-76  
 1976-77  
 1977-78  
 1978-79  
 1979-80  
 1980-81  
 1981-82  
 1982-83  
 1983-84  
 1984-85  
 1985-86  
 1986-87  
 1987-88  
 1988-89  
 1989-90  
 1990-91  
 1991-92  
 1992-93  
 1993-94  
 1994-95  
 1995-96  
 1996-97  
 1997-98  
 1998-99  
 1999-00  
 2000-01  
 2001-02  
 2002-03  
 2003-04  
 2004-05  
 2005-06  
 2006-07  
 2007-08  
 2008-09  
 2009-10  
 2010-11  
 2011-12  
 2012-13  
 2013-14  
 2014-15  
 2015-16  
 2016-17  
 2017-18  
 2018-19  
 2019-20  
 2020-21  
 2021-22  
 2022-23  
 2023-24  
 2024-25  
 2025-26  
 2026-27  
 2027-28  
 2028-29  
 2029-30  
 2030-31  
 2031-32  
 2032-33  
 2033-34  
 2034-35  
 2035-36  
 2036-37  
 2037-38  
 2038-39  
 2039-40  
 2040-41  
 2041-42  
 2042-43  
 2043-44  
 2044-45  
 2045-46  
 2046-47  
 2047-48  
 2048-49  
 2049-50  
 2050-51  
 2051-52  
 2052-53  
 2053-54  
 2054-55  
 2055-56  
 2056-57  
 2057-58  
 2058-59  
 2059-60  
 2060-61  
 2061-62  
 2062-63  
 2063-64  
 2064-65  
 2065-66  
 2066-67  
 2067-68  
 2068-69  
 2069-70  
 2070-71  
 2071-72  
 2072-73  
 2073-74  
 2074-75  
 2075-76  
 2076-77  
 2077-78  
 2078-79  
 2079-80  
 2080-81  
 2081-82  
 2082-83  
 2083-84  
 2084-85  
 2085-86  
 2086-87  
 2087-88  
 2088-89  
 2089-90  
 2090-91  
 2091-92  
 2092-93  
 2093-94  
 2094-95  
 2095-96  
 2096-97  
 2097-98  
 2098-99  
 2099-00  
 2100-01  
 2101-02  
 2102-03  
 2103-04  
 2104-05  
 2105-06  
 2106-07  
 2107-08  
 2108-09  
 2109-10  
 2110-11  
 2111-12  
 2112-13  
 2113-14  
 2114-15  
 2115-16  
 2116-17  
 2117-18  
 2118-19  
 2119-20  
 2120-21  
 2121-22  
 2122-23  
 2123-24  
 2124-25  
 2125-26  
 2126-27  
 2127-28  
 2128-29  
 2129-30  
 2130-31  
 2131-32  
 2132-33  
 2133-34  
 2134-35  
 2135-36  
 2136-37  
 2137-38  
 2138-39  
 2139-40  
 2140-41  
 2141-42  
 2142-43  
 2143-44  
 2144-45  
 2145-46  
 2146-47  
 2147-48  
 2148-49  
 2149-50  
 2150-51  
 2151-52  
 2152-53  
 2153-54  
 2154-55  
 2155-56  
 2156-57  
 2157-58  
 2158-59  
 2159-60  
 2160-61  
 2161-62  
 2162-63  
 2163-64  
 2164-65  
 2165-66  
 2166-67  
 2167-68  
 2168-69  
 2169-70  
 2170-71  
 2171-72  
 2172-73  
 2173-74  
 2174-75  
 2175-76  
 2176-77  
 2177-78  
 2178-79  
 2179-80  
 2180-81  
 2181-82  
 2182-83  
 2183-84  
 2184-85  
 2185-86  
 2186-87  
 2187-88  
 2188-89  
 2189-90  
 2190-91  
 2191-92  
 2192-93  
 2193-94  
 2194-95  
 2195-96  
 2196-97  
 2197-98  
 2198-99  
 2199-00  
 2200-01  
 2201-02  
 2202-03  
 2203-04  
 2204-05  
 2205-06  
 2206-07  
 2207-08  
 2208-09  
 2209-10  
 2210-11  
 2211-12  
 2212-13  
 2213-14  
 2214-15  
 2215-16  
 2216-17  
 2217-18  
 2218-19  
 2219-20  
 2220-21  
 2221-22

To be confirmed under  
 Rule V II -  
 Common in case of a defective title of the  
 holder the selling  
 enfranchised on  
 1/4 the payment  
 2 R Rs 540  
 8/3/65 WMS  
 7. 68  
 761.  
 5 100  
 18-1864  
 1864

Average rates of Government Salaries per Annum

|       |       |
|-------|-------|
| Secy  | 1-5-6 |
| Offce | 1-6-1 |

Details of average income of the last 15 years of the Government  
cult land in Annamketa Taluq of Kannad District

| From 1256 | Cultivated       | Grass     | Of which<br>gambou's   | Sacrae<br>prices | Value of the<br>quantity of | Notes<br>per<br>Shu |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| To 1270   | area in<br>acres | cutten    | Share at<br>40 percent | of grain         | grains shu<br>in 100        |                     |
| R Ind     | A C              | R Ind     | R Ind                  | Net              | Net                         | Net                 |
| 2169-13-5 | 2476-            | 1076605-5 | 430642-0               | 2-12-0           | 123426-8-0                  | 5-""                |

1848 rates prevailing in January 1849 of Romanekatai  
 Maximum Minimum  
 11-3

Salway Cultivation in Komon Kotai

*F1261 8512*  
*F1267 10839*  
*F1252 2052*  
*F1259 2784*  
*F1260 11352*  
*F1261 4427*  
*F1262 8942*  
*F1263 6284*  
*F1264 1117*  
*F1265 6257*  
*F1266 4349*  
*F1267 1327*  
*F1268 8506*  
*F1269 10680*  
*F1270 5055*

A-  
1693-80  
Patet  
2015-97

II The person #1 of 16 pleads that his late father Thiruv. Ragoona  
Muttar Pella Ten purchased the entire village as shown below on 3 occasions  
-15001 from Muttammel, Nagammal, Ravannaga Narku & Raminam only. He has  
in AD 1837-1842 & 1844-45. He again pleads that he purchased in AD 1853 & 1859 for 1/4 of the  
304-88 - AD 73-80 parts from one Muttarven to whose ancestors the descendants of the 1/4  
Grantee granted the lands in gift sometime ago & purchased the title of sales. There are on display in  
Lopar Rames & one is on plain paper leaf -  
The person #2 of 16 pleads that he purchased the entire village as shown below on 3 occasions  
-15001 from Muttammel, Nagammal, Ravannaga Narku & Raminam only. He has  
in AD 1837-1842 & 1844-45. He again pleads that he purchased in AD 1853 & 1859 for 1/4 of the  
304-88 - AD 73-80 parts from one Muttarven to whose ancestors the descendants of the 1/4  
Grantee granted the lands in gift sometime ago & purchased the title of sales. There are on display in  
Lopar Rames & one is on plain paper leaf -

A 1 - In 1837 half bullock was purchased by the father of the person D 1 of 16 -  
- for Rs 7500 - 8 - from Nagammal, Muttammal, Ramaraja -  
- Nallan & Ramaswamy Nallan Bill of sale is on a stamped paper leaf -

B 1 Purchd 1842 -  $\frac{1}{4}$  Village was purchased by the father of the present owner of 46.  
- for Rs 3750 - 4 - from Muthammal & Ramaswamy Naicken.  
Bill of sale is on stamped paper - 12 annas - 4 -  
- 3750 - 4 -

C 1 - In 1844 - 1/4 Village was purchased for \$3750 -  
- from Nigamul & Ramasaya & Narkur by the father & the p. 16 -  
Bill of sale on the stamped paper -  
- In 1844 - 1/4 Village was purchased for \$7300 + 807

P / In April 1853, the father & the person who purchased  
- of Dry for paper - .35 from one Muttewager - But I will write a plain Cassin leaf -  
- "Done were purchased for paper -

P.

- of Dry for paper - 35 - from one shell widge  
E 1 In Oct 1859, the 4<sup>th</sup> of 73 shews 80 fads of Dry were purchased for paper -  
- 154 - from <sup>the</sup> ~~Messrs~~ Messrs Ramon & Kibben by the firm  
- 7076 - Bill of sale is on a stamped paper leaf -

- 7066 - Bill of sale is on a stamped paper  
 of 1859-60 of the 73 and 80 cents. They were purchased for paper 388-  
 from one Heenatchy Padine - Bill of sale is on a stamped paper

G 1 - Dubd 1854 - 7/8 of the 73 born & 80 feet of Dry were purchased for \$4  
- 77 - by the person of 88 from one Sub-annual - Bill of exchange on a stamped paper -

III On the 12<sup>th</sup> February 1852, James Patrick Tennant a dependant of the King of Raimona Remuoy sent a Petition by express, at a cost of  
- 87 Rupees to the Commissioner complaining as follows -  
All children of the  
land near the village was granted originally as Larva Inam died without issue -

10<sup>th</sup> That - Permitted Martin Pellet to choose the Village was granted original of the Village to them -

2<sup>d</sup> That the Widows of the Ogle Grantees & their heirs sons & transferred the Village  
to the then manager, Martin Pelland Trench, father of the present M<sup>r</sup> Trench.

3<sup>d</sup> - That the aforesaid were endeavouring to mortgage the Village, the Farm Manager, Matthew Sullivan Esq, father of the present owner, prevented them from doing so & took agreements from the Widows of the Oge Grantees that they will not mortgage nor sell their shares -  
(This must rise)

(Fire meat side)

9 proceed now all these points, seriatim, in the following manner

4<sup>th</sup> That the same Manager purchased half of the Village from the widows & their adopted sons & the rest from the adopted sons in contravention to the provisions of Regulations IV & VII of 1831 & of the Notification published by Govt on the 16 March 1846 -

5<sup>th</sup> That after the Manager was thrown out of employ, the Ginnam attacked the Village on the ground that the Manager purchased the Village in contravention of the above Regulations & that the Village should revert to him (Ginnam) that upon this, when the Manager complained of this to the then collector Mr Parker, he issued orders to the Ginnam on the 17<sup>th</sup> January 1848 of 1835 & on subsequent dates directing to restore the Village to the Manager, who purchased it & stating that he will enquire & pass final orders on the subject & that Govt have right in the Village & not Ginnam.

Sheet 847

6<sup>th</sup> That the purchaser also is the late Manager of the Ginnam is enjoying the Village as the matter was not brought again to the notice of the Collector & as the Ginnam was prevented from interfering <sup>with</sup> the matter & that the same Manager, who since died, is enjoying the Village receiving levying certain extra cesses on the cultivators of the Village.

From the Ginnam to the Collector of the District on the 5 December 1847 1839

7<sup>th</sup> That the present holder is enjoying the Village contrary to Rule IV of the Town Rules & Regulations & that the Village should be resumed by Govt.

From the Collector to the Ginnam on the 6 December 1847

III Petitioner enclosed in the Petition above copies of the marginally noted correspondence - for perusal -

IV The correspondence shows that the Ginnam pleaded that the Village & two others named Nagayya & Kelakalai, which were granted to the Ogl Grantee should be incorporated with his Jagam lands on the ground that they were granted in <sup>the name of</sup> wages, & that the collector inserted upon the Ginnam to restore the 3 Villages to their holders on the ground that these were deducted from the amount upon which the Permanent Settlement was based & that the Ginnam has nothing to do with them. In other respects the Ginnam's communications contain the allegations in the above

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 16 December 1847

17 January 1848 Petitioner & Subbiah Tamm -

II The person of 17 of 1846 also presents a Petition to the Commissioner on the 7 October 1846 complaining that the Rang & his Manager are endeavouring to deprive him illegally from the possession of the Village. The Petitioner <sup>has been returned to</sup> the Petitioner on the 31<sup>st</sup> October 1846 with an endorsement to refer his case to the Deputy who may be deputed for the settlement of the Towns in the District -

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 17 January 1848

3<sup>rd</sup> February 1848 The Petitioner was Subbiah Tamm above alluded to has been referred to the Deputy Collector for enquiry by the Commissioner. The remarks in that

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 24 March 1848

Regular ~~man~~ will afford every information regarding the Village - more especially for which there are no many grounds -

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 27 March 1848

III The Rang's Petition filed also before me that the Village should either revert to the Rang or to the Govt. & that either the person of 16 who is the present holder of the Village, or the person who sold the Village to his father have no right in it - Again the Subbiah Tamm who -

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 27 March 1848

forwarded his Petition by an express pleaded that the Village under settlement was not sold by the descendants of the Ogl Grantee to the father of the person of 17 of 1846 & that it was sold by the alleged adopted sons of the Ogl Grantee. He also pleaded that the adoption is not valid -

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 27 March 1848

Subbiah Tamm again pleaded that he is enjoying Rangayya Yendel, a Parcel of the Village under settlement as Sarva Dama -

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 27 March 1848

from times & immemorial & that the person of 16 inherited the lands of the Parcel now with his own lands -

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 27 March 1848

I proceed now all these points, serially in the following manner -

From the Ginnam to the Collector on the 27 March 1848

17 July 1848



IX. There is serious talk about the documents D, E, F & G entered in the 2<sup>nd</sup> end of the first sheet of the Register -

Sumirah Angasawmy Narker, grand son of Nagammal, pleads that these documents are forged ones - These documents relate to the sale of Paramagalam, Hamlet of Putter, consisting of 73 acres & 80 fathoms of Dry, which is excluded from the documents marked A, B & C entered in 2<sup>nd</sup> end of the first sheet of the Register - The lands of Paramagalam were divided by the father of the Plaintiff Angasawmy Narker into 8 equal Tracts - & granted 6 of which to certain Bramins on service tenure, such as worshipping the Swamy in the Temple & reading Vedas in the Temple, having retained the two remaining Tracts in their possession - The Bramins named are Greenway, a Jagannath Shetty, Limalayengar, Shewaryengar, Muttu Shetty, Pitchayyer, & Ramayengar - <sup>(16)</sup> to whom 6 Tracts were granted on service tenure by Muttu Ammal & Nagammal to the effect that they have right -

executed on the 18 June 1825 on a stamped paper leaf to the said Muttu Ammal & Nagammal to the effect that they have right to enjoy the 6 Tracts as long as they are punctual in their service & that if they will relinquish or restore the 6 Tracts to donors when they will be found remiss in their duties - This agreement proved to be genuine - The person N<sup>o</sup> 1 of 1816 pleads that the 6 Tracts <sup>st-18</sup> were purchased by him & his father as it is seen from the documents D, E, F & G - & the cases are in his possession since the date of the purchase -

- 1 The document D was executed by Muttu Ammal selling one Tract - <sup>st-18</sup> The Muttu Shetty is the person who executed the agreement of 1825 -
- 2 Muttu Ammal & Nagammal to the effect that they are enjoying 6 Tracts on service tenure such as worshipping Swamy & reading Vedas in the Temple - <sup>st-18</sup> The person N<sup>o</sup> 1 of 1816 pleads that the 6 Tracts were purchased by him & his father as it is seen from the documents D, E, F & G -
- 1 The document E was executed by the father of the Plaintiff Sumirah Angasawmy Narker selling four Tracts - <sup>st-18</sup> The person N<sup>o</sup> 1 of 1816 pleads that the 4 Tracts were purchased by him & his father as it is seen from the documents D, E, F & G -
- 1 The document F was executed by <sup>st-18</sup> Meenathery Narker, the alleged bosom son of Muttu Ammal - selling one Tract & Bill of
- 1 The document G was executed by one Subbammal selling 2 Tracts - <sup>st-18</sup> Bill of sale is on a stamped paper leaf -

X. Now I will have to write the right of the seller of the 8 Tracts in the above documents -

XI. Muttu Ammal who sold one Tract & executed the document D had not a shadow of right to sell his one Tract; because he himself executed an agreement in 1825 that he has right to enjoy his one share as long as he is punctual in his service of worshipping the Swamy & reading Vedas in the Temple - <sup>st-18</sup> However it is proved that the said document of 1825 was subsequently annulled & that the father of the Plaintiff Angasawmy Narker purchased among the Tracts from those who executed the agreement of 1825 - Since I register the one Tract in the name of the Plaintiff & reject the claim of Sumirah Angasawmy Narker & register the 5 Tracts to his father -

XII. With regard to document E, the Plaintiff Sumirah Angasawmy Narker says that it is not a genuine one - & that it was not executed by his father on the 18th May 1825 - It is said in the Bill of sale that the seller of the four Tracts <sup>st-18</sup> who executed the same was the father of the Plaintiff purchased 3 Tracts from certain persons & the fourth was the one inherited to him from his adopted mother Nagammal - The person N<sup>o</sup> 16 produced bills of sale which are on stamped paper leaves - dated 1853 - 1857 & 1858 - Bill of sale of 1857 shows that these Tracts were sold to Ramayengar Narker by one Kristna Swamy Narker & that the latter purchased them previously from one Ammayappa Sairat - The Bill of sale of 1858 is shown that the said Kristna Swamy Narker sold one Tract to the father of the Plaintiff & that Kristna Swamy Narker purchased it previously from <sup>st-18</sup> (Name not clear)

one Ammayappa Sairai & Jagannada Sairai - The Dils of sale of 1853 which are 3 in number & which are our stamped Cagga leaves show that one of the  
Sairai Sairai & Bhuller & Alwarungar, who executed the agreement of AD 1825 to the effect that they have right to enjoy said 3 shares as  
as long as they may <sup>be</sup> regular & attentive to <sup>their</sup> duties of worshipping the Swamy & said 3 Pongos to Ammayappa Sairai, who sold them to  
Christiansamy Nairai & by whom they were sold to Ramayya Nairai - All these documents proved to be <sup>bonafide</sup> - It is true that the persons who  
sold 3 shares to Ammayappa Sairai had no right to sell them, because they are 3 out of 6 persons who executed the agreement of AD 1825 to  
Nagannal & Muttannal - But ultimately as Ramayya Nairai, the father of the Plaintiff, purchased them & sold them to the person #1 of 1856  
~~the~~ the sale should be confirmed - And the four shares, inclusive of one inherited by the father of the Plaintiff from his adopted mother  
are registered in the name of the person #1 of 1856 & the party is referred to Civil Court. <sup>the Plaintiff has enjoyed of the lands - It is also proved that</sup>  
<sup>the agreement of AD 1825 was annulled & void by the father of the Plaintiff</sup>  
VIII - The Plaintiff Angusamy Nairai pleads with regard to the document D that the Plaintiff's mother Muttannal  
executed the said document to the person #1 of 1856 selling out <sup>the</sup> Village which is said to have been inherited to him from her late husband Muttannal &  
had no right to sell the Village - That Muttannal did not <sup>take</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>land</sup> (Muttannal Nairai) as her husband son nor transferred him any portion of her property  
& that the said Muttannal transferred all her property, real & personal, to his father on the 29 January 1847 under a written bill on a stamped Cagga leaf  
& that his father performed the funeral rites of the said Muttannal - who died in AD 1834 - This proves the quite false the paras II to VII of the Pleading  
Nagayya regarding the details of this subject & Hence the sale is confirmed & the Plaintiff is referred to Civil Court - The Plaintiff Nairai is placed at the  
The Plaintiff Angusamy Nairai pleads again & again that the documents marked D, E, F & G are not genuine - The genuineness of the document D is proved by  
the person who executed it - & that of the documents marked D, E, F & G is proved by some of the witnesses who attested them, at an enquiry held by the Sub-Commissioner of Paramyodem  
at my request - as will be seen from the written Report taken by him - Hence the bundle of Paramyodem consisting of 8 shares is confirmed upon the person #1 of 1856  
& the Plaintiff Angusamy Nairai is referred to Civil Court - <sup>the</sup> The Paramyodem is in possession of the person #1 of 1856 with the rest of the Village.

(True must be)

XIV --- The flamed Pinch Angerowing Nicker place the Libanum

[illegible]

Sheet No. 849

Sheet no 879

XV No Talk was about the Area or about the boundaries on the part of the Range Val Keel - The boundaries now inserted in the memorial statement correspond to those in the Account of 1724.6 - Hence the Area of 2058 Acres & 11 parts is confirmed here - The incups now brought on the Register is ~~the~~ below per page in

Valentine

XVI. Wet lands depend upon 3 Tanks - of these one is large & others are small - The Tanks are in repair But it appears that some repairs are still wanting - for these Tanks such as strengthening & raising the bund & enlarging the Tanks - The Tanks are fed by Jungle Streams & by the Waste Water of the adjoining Villages - These Tanks are filled annually in full Plenty of Water is not felt for the lands that are usually under cultivation - Out of 308 Acres of land in this Village, the Valuer of the person No 1 of 16 says that generally 120 Acres are cultivated annually & that there was not a single year in which more Wet lands were fully watered after the Village having been purchased by his client; The Valuer again says that 193 Acres of land are planned as waste & are ~~not~~<sup>are</sup> some 15 years & other 20 years <sup>& are the</sup> fallow lands - But these Waste lands are fit to be cultivated; <sup>the most of the</sup> these Waste lands have red soil; & that the Wet lands are fit to be cultivated this day if his client takes some pains about the Village - The Valuer further says that 400 Acres of Dry-lands are fallowed annually; that 120 Acres planned as waste are of 15 & 20 year uncultivated lands - & that these waste lands may be brought under plough within the next 5 or 6 years - The Valuer also says that the lands are thus kept waste from serious quarrels between his client & the Range Manager Ponnayya Pillai - The Valuer says that the Manager is instigating the cultivating ryots not to cultivate lands & not to remain in the Village with a view to subject his client to serious loss. I don't think that the statement of the Valuer of the person No 1 of 16 regarding Waste lands is true - The Valuer himself admits that all the lands are fit to be cultivated within the next 5 or 6 years - I would, as appears from the reports of several ryots, that the Village is not in <sup>such a</sup> ~~fallowing~~ state as it ought to be - from the enmity of the M.anager - Nayab & Punjab Lands are of a superior quality generally. I saw some of the lands situated in the vicinity of the Village under settlement. The adjoining Village is Valamand. I saw this myself on my way from Ramanad to Ramnagar - Soil is of a very superior quality - In framing the valuation of this Village I will have to keep in view, the prospective income of the Village - The Valuer admits that the soil of this Village is of a superior quality - The average income of the Village as per statement of the Valuer of the person No 1 of 16 is 677 Rupees per annum. This is not true - One Pirividi Angaswamy Nair, <sup>a</sup> descendant of the Ryot Grantee of this Village & who fought for a Rowllet of this Village known by the name of Paramoelam, presented some recent Petitions & at least gave the following among Hyderabad that this Village is yielding 5000 Rupees now annually - & very unfair - He is an officer of the P. H. O. 16 of 16.

