

in the Taluk of Thiruppuranur in the District of Madurai

REGISTRATION OF CHARGES, SALES AND OF MORTGAGES AND TRANSFER OF RIGHTS.—LAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Particulars regarding present Owner.		Particulars regarding present Owner.				REMARKS.	Signature of the local Commissioner or his Assistant.
If the land has been sub-divided, the name, etc., of each owner should be entered in these columns.		Name and age.	Time of residence.	Qualities of soil, whether irrigated or unirrigated, and whether registered or not.	Residing out of the present landholder.		
These columns are to be filled up by the surveyor, or by any intelligent person, and not by the present owner.						An abstract of the Government order in every case of dispute already reported must be entered in this column.	
						They may also state their opinion and recommendation.	
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22

* are classed as Cultivated Lands and 7 Acres and 72 Cents as waste fit for Cultivation. This is borne by the measurement account - No dry or barren lands in this village. Some of the wet lands are cultivated annually 2 or 3 times. Soil is of a Superior quality generally. The average income from this village, as per statement of the Rany's Bakil is 140 Rupees per annum. This is not fair. The Contiguous Ayar villages are Simmanur and Katapukalam. Their average wet assessment of this village calculated for a period of 15 years previous to Fasli 1270 comes to 7 Rupees per acre. The Soil of this village is not any way inferior to that of the Contiguous Ayar lands. In consideration of the fertility of Soil etc, I frame the valuation of the village as follows -

Wet 32 acres cultivated at 7 Rupees per acre, 224-0-0

Wet 7 Acres and 4 Cents waste at 1 Rupee per acre 7-4-6

Total 231-4-6

IV. One Subramaniam claims this village, by reason that his father's elder brother acquired it in gift in A. D. 1833, from the Zamindar, that the village was in possession of the member of his family for 7 or 8 years, that after which, the village was attached with the rest of the estate, at the instance of one Angamuthu Nachiyar, who was claiming the Zamindari and that the village was not restored to his family up to this day. He again argued that in A. D. 1853 he claimed this village and that upon which the Manager of the Zamindar enquired into the case, and recommended to the Collector for the restoration of the village, but in vain. He further states that he also claimed the village in A. D. 1858 without success. Though I was in this village for about 18 months, the claimant never appeared before me. He appeared after I settled the village. He produced, the father granted to his father's elder brother in A. D. 1833. The Rany's Bakil admits the genuineness of the Same. From the statement of the claimant it is clear that he had no enjoyment of the village since the last