

Yiraghalvattapuli நாற்கல் தெத்தட்டி

Register No. 179
Sheet No. 203

8. Harris Tubwell - Hence the area of 285 Acres is confirmed here -
 11. The selling the persons No 1 & 2 of 16 purchased lands viz. AD 1802-1820-1824-1826-1832-1834-1836-1840 of 1000 acres
 1636-53 - Eight Belles are on stamped paper & 3 are on plain paper. Transaction are on of 100 - Enjoyment proved -
 1847-1849-1836 per 578

No Grand Satisfy the person N^o 5 purchased lands in AD 1811 for \$1248 - Bill is on plain paper & no genuine seal
The Grand Satisfy the person N^o 6 & 7 purchased lands from the Grand son of the Orig^e Grantee half century ago Bill of sale was lost
Nathaniel

Leche conferves and Pile
VII.
Don. 39810

Gould 20¹/₈ = 33 p per -

Attention
Family
divided
Lands are
also done
Ansell's
is received

Thomson Rob
Ramapo
4th June 63


 sent of \$100 / 12/24
 Off purchase a the
 the purchase of the
 annual of the recovery of the

Total - 199-3/4 179-26
Grand Total 262-44

[illegible]

Attention
Family
divided
Lands are
also den-
tured
P. Ma
is recor

Alfred
Kammeyer
4 June 63

to claims of
Raspartion & for
of the
village which
been in the
and of the
Purchase - the
and to the
the recovery of
the village

1 On a House Caneen claim to 1/2 Vithy out of the land situated opposite to the person
- N^o 1 of 1816 on the ground that his father sold one Pungoon Thetty in A.D. 1826 at 5 years
- previous to his birth to the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 for Rs 180 & executed a Bill of sale
- on a stamped paper, that the purchaser failed to pay half of the same & paid the proceeds of
- the half Pungoon for 9 years from A.D. 1827 to 1835 to his father & that some Panchayats decided
- verbally that the person N^o 1 of 1816 should receive 1/2 Vithy to the claimant but it was not done so
- The person N^o 1 of 1816 was sold to the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 fifteen years previous to the
- birth of the claimant. On his own statement. Bill is on a stamped paper for the half
- & another half Pungoon. The claimant admits that the Bill of sale was signed by his father
- & that the person N^o 1 of 1816 paid only for 1/2 Vithy & failed to pay the value
- of the other half Vithy included in the Bill of sale & that the purchaser paid for 9 years
- the produce of the disputed half Vithy. All this took place previous to his (claimant's)
- birth. He has no witness to prove his complaint. The land is in joint possession
- of the person N^o 1 of 1816. The claimant bases his claim on a Pungan account
- from A.D. 1827 to 1835 which shows that the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 paid some
- produce to the father of the claimant. The person N^o 1 of 1816 pleads that the account
- bears no signature of his father. The person N^o 6 who was named as witness by the
- claimant says that the signature of person 5 the said account of 1827 & 1835
- produced by the claimant, seems to be like that of the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816
- & that he cannot say the positively. On the whole as the claim of the claimant is
- not satisfactorily proved, the claim is rejected & the party is referred to civil court.
Bill of sale proved to be genuine.

1 The person N^o 3 of 1816 of claim to 1/2 Vithy out of the Pungoon situated opposite to the person
- N^o 1 of 1816 on the ground that his father sold one Thetty in A.D. 1826 at 5 years
- previous to his birth to the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 for Rs 180 & executed a Bill of sale
- on a stamped paper, that the purchaser failed to pay half of the same & paid the proceeds of
- the half Pungoon for 9 years from A.D. 1827 to 1835 to his father & that some Panchayats decided
- verbally that the person N^o 1 of 1816 should receive 1/2 Vithy to the claimant but it was not done so
- The person N^o 1 of 1816 was sold to the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 fifteen years previous to the
- birth of the claimant. On his own statement. Bill is on a stamped paper for the half
- & another half Pungoon. The claimant admits that the Bill of sale was signed by his father
- & that the person N^o 1 of 1816 paid only for 1/2 Vithy & failed to pay the value
- of the other half Vithy included in the Bill of sale & that the purchaser paid for 9 years
- the produce of the disputed half Vithy. All this took place previous to his (claimant's)
- birth. He has no witness to prove his complaint. The land is in joint possession
- of the person N^o 1 of 1816. The claimant bases his claim on a Pungan account
- from A.D. 1827 to 1835 which shows that the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 paid some
- produce to the father of the claimant. The person N^o 1 of 1816 pleads that the account
- bears no signature of his father. The person N^o 6 who was named as witness by the
- claimant says that the signature of person 5 the said account of 1827 & 1835
- produced by the claimant, seems to be like that of the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816
- & that he cannot say the positively. On the whole as the claim of the claimant is
- not satisfactorily proved, the claim is rejected & the party is referred to civil court.
Bill of sale proved to be genuine.

1 The person N^o 3 of 1816 of claim to 1/2 Vithy out of the Pungoon situated opposite to the person
- N^o 1 of 1816 on the ground that his father sold one Thetty in A.D. 1826 at 5 years
- previous to his birth to the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 for Rs 180 & executed a Bill of sale
- on a stamped paper, that the purchaser failed to pay half of the same & paid the proceeds of
- the half Pungoon for 9 years from A.D. 1827 to 1835 to his father & that some Panchayats decided
- verbally that the person N^o 1 of 1816 should receive 1/2 Vithy to the claimant but it was not done so
- The person N^o 1 of 1816 was sold to the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 fifteen years previous to the
- birth of the claimant. On his own statement. Bill is on a stamped paper for the half
- & another half Pungoon. The claimant admits that the Bill of sale was signed by his father
- & that the person N^o 1 of 1816 paid only for 1/2 Vithy & failed to pay the value
- of the other half Vithy included in the Bill of sale & that the purchaser paid for 9 years
- the produce of the disputed half Vithy. All this took place previous to his (claimant's)
- birth. He has no witness to prove his complaint. The land is in joint possession
- of the person N^o 1 of 1816. The claimant bases his claim on a Pungan account
- from A.D. 1827 to 1835 which shows that the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816 paid some
- produce to the father of the claimant. The person N^o 1 of 1816 pleads that the account
- bears no signature of his father. The person N^o 6 who was named as witness by the
- claimant says that the signature of person 5 the said account of 1827 & 1835
- produced by the claimant, seems to be like that of the father of the person N^o 1 of 1816
- & that he cannot say the positively. On the whole as the claim of the claimant is
- not satisfactorily proved, the claim is rejected & the party is referred to civil court.
Bill of sale proved to be genuine.