Chokkamadrippu village
Pirangam Zemindary
Madura District

Sheet No 18 A.

Register of Inams in the village of Chokkamadrippu — pt

Name of the Inamdar with his residence and caste	Nature of the Inam whether Service or Quit rent	Extent	Amount	Remarks	Original Grantor	Description of Land	Quantity	Assessment	Nature and quantity of the Service to be performed	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Ramasamy Ayyan Brahmin	Service	Irrigated	297-62	167-62	Ramalinga Swami	Irrigated	297-62	167-62	1. To attend at certain festivals at the Chokkanadha Swami Temple and to perform the duties of Archaka therein. 2. To perform certain daily services in the Chokkanadha Swami Temple. 3. To attend at the Car festivals of the Chokkanadha Swami Temple and to perform the duties of Archaka thereat. 4. To perform certain daily services in the Ramalinga Swami Temple. 5. To attend at the Car festivals of the Ramalinga Swami Temple and to perform the duties of Archaka thereat. 6. To perform certain daily services in the Vishnu Temple. 7. To attend at the Car festivals of the Vishnu Temple and to perform the duties of Archaka thereat.	Inam Title Deed granted by the Zemindar on the 28th March 1877 Fasli 1286 and confirmed by the Collector on the 9th April 1877 Fasli 1286
		Unirrigated	214-00	97-62						
		Total	511-62	265-24						
		Deduct Waste Tank Bed	100-00	50-00						
		Tank Bed	8-00	4-00						
		Village Site	4-24	2-24						
			112-24	56-24						
		Assessable	399-38	208-38						
		Deduct Quit rent		18-19						
		Net Assessment		190-19						
		Deduct Remissions		18-19						
		Assessment		172-00						
		Irrigated	172-00	66-00						
		Unirrigated	17-00	12-50						
		Total	189-00	78-50						
		Ground Rent	50-00	28-13						
		Water Rent	20-00	11-25						
		Total	70-00	39-38						
		Ground Total		18-19						

Remarks: Sanad granted on the 28th March 1877 Fasli 1286 by the Zemindar. Area assessed at Fasli 1286 Rs 223-10-3. Area assessed at Fasli 1287 Rs 172-00-0. Decrease Rs 51-10-3. Reason for decrease: Land taken up for Railway.

Ramasamy Ayyan Brahmin

Ramasamy Zemindar

Rs 1784

The Taluk of Tirupavanum, in the Zemindari of Sivaganga in the District of Madura

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the Register prepared according to Regulation XXXI of 1802 [illegible]	Name entered in the Survey or in any subsequent account and relationship to present [illegible]	Name and relationship of original grantee & subsequent & present holders. — Length of possession & particulars regarding present owners, if the Inam has been subdivided the name of each share should be entered in these columns: Name and age	Place of residence	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holder	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders possession how acquired and in what year	Remarks:— An abstract of the Government Order in every case of lapse already reported must be entered in this column.— Deputy Collector's opinion and recommendation.	Decision of the Inam Commissioner or his Assistants:—
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
As per account of Fasli 1225 [illegible]		None	Subbasami Rao (45)	Madura	None	(1) Mother (2) Wife (3) Three sons (4) Three daughters	By purchase (vide Column 12)	See below	Confirmed as recommended vide G.O. No 1101 dated 5th Nov 1884. [signature] Inam Commr. June 25th 1885. T.D. No 1962

This hamlet together with 7 others were settled as one village by the Inam Commissioner and two title deeds were issued by him Nos 1911 and 1912 on 10th December 1869 the former for the Dharmasanam half share and the latter for the Devastanam half share of the village. On 10th December 1872 the Collector Mr McQuhae first brought to the notice of the Inam Commissioner at the instance of the Inamdar in Column 16 (Subbasami Rao) that the valuation of this hamlet by the Inam Department had been made on a wrong basis, that the highest years income of the hamlet was only Rs 203 while the valuation given by the Inam Department was Rs 785 and that for purposes of Road Cess the income of the village was estimated at Rs 60. He therefore recommended the issue of a separate title deed for this hamlet. The Inam Commissioner replied (his letter No 98 dated 17th February 1873) that the hamlets had been settled together that there was no reason to believe that the valuation of this hamlet was excessive and that unless that was the case no revision could be made in the settlement. Since then, Subbasami Rao has addressed several petitions to Government the Inam Commissioner and the Collector which led to much correspondence between this office and the Inam Commissioner. On one of the petitions Mr McQuhae was called on to report & he reported (Vide his letter No 3027 dated 19th December 1876) that he still adhered to his former opinion of 1872 i.e. that the valuation was excessive and furnished a statement showing the income of the hamlet for 15 years. In his decision dated 25th May 1877 the Inam Commissioner observed that the quitrent of Rs 814 imposed on the 8 hamlets together was not excessive and that it should be apportioned among the several sharers equitably with reference to the actual annual value of the lands held by them & if that be found impossible, the remedy for the petitioner is to apply to the Collector for subdivision of quitrent under Standing Order 136. On 22nd March 1882, the Collector reported that the Inamdars refuse to come to terms as required by Standing Order 122 & 123 and do not consent to subdivision of quitrent and that the only course to be adopted in the circumstances was the one suggested by Mr McQuhae. After some further correspondence the Inam Commissioner informed the Collector that Subbasami Rao can only get his remedy by addressing Government (vide No 147 dated 2nd June 1883). The Government considered that the Inamdar had prima facie substantial grievance (vide their order No 4156 dated 15 October 1883 on his petition dated 28th June 1883) and called for information as to by what authority Rs 90-14-7 are charged as quitrent on this hamlet and whether petitioner Subbasami Rao put in a separate statement at the time of settlement protesting against the valuation of this hamlet as excessive. The information called for on the two points was furnished in this office letter Nos 265 and 738 dated 7th February and 1st April 1884 respectively viz (1) that the sum of Rs 90 was fixed neither by Government Officers nor by private arrangement and that it is impossible to ascertain the date on which the subdivision has been made and (2) that Subbasami Rao put in a separate statement at the time of settlement in which he gave the valuation of this hamlet as Rupees 125.

The Government have at last passed orders for the separate enfranchisement of this hamlet (Vide their order dated 5th November 1884 No 1101 on Subbasami Rao's petition No 811 of 1884).

The soil of this hamlet is of a very inferior quality and the lands are situated within the water spread of Peramanur tank and although the extent is large only a very small portion is brought under cultivation and the rest appears to be submerged and consequently unfit for cultivation. I therefore frame the valuation as follows:—

	Rs as p
Wet 66·46 acres at 4 Rs	265 - 13 - 6
Do 12·35 Do at Rs 0-8-0	6 - 2 - 9
Dry 39·38 Do at Rs 0-4-0	9 - 13 - 6
	281 - 13 - 9

To be confirmed under Rule V, class 3

Government quitrent Rs 35-3-8.

Confd [signature]

[signature]
Collector 576

Chokkanadiruppu village
Sivaganga Zamindary
Madura District

Sheet No 18 A.

Register of Inams in the village of Chokkanadiruppu

Class, extent and value of Inam.							Description, Tenure and documents in support of the Inam.				
1. In case of entire cessation of the Inam right of the village	2. General claim to exemption of the Inam Land	3. Name, number and situation of the field or fields, and the nature of the tenure	4. Extent. Local Measure. Number of the Inam when the Inam consists of several fields, or of fields in different villages	5. Measure.	Survey assessment	Revised or present assessment	Description of Inam	Tenure.	10.	11. Inam granted and in enjoyment of	Written documents in support of the claim. Original Sanad, all Muttalamas, agreements and other papers affording information. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, and the general effect of the documents produced or held by the Inamdar.
					Where no Survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government the sum paid by the proprietor of the Inam to Government as an equivalent for the land tax							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Nunjah Viruppatti	219-6-3	157-62							1. A Stamped cadjan sale deed dated 5th September 1841 executed by Sabapathy Pillai by Raja Iswar alias Gowri Vallaba Iswar. This document is made out to the present owner Subbasami Rao by endorsement on its back by the said Sabapathy Pillai.
		Punjah Kuruhan	244-8--	157-54							
			Total	295-16							
		Deduct Pramboke									
		Bed of Tank	100-0--	56-24							
		Footpath	0-8--	-30							
		Implements of Village	4-0--	2-24							
			104-8--	58-78							
		Remainder		236-38							2. A Stamped Cadjan deed executed to the said Subbasami Rao by the Mullaviya Kaumathy Muttu Vadugapoorija Velanjathevar on 17th February 1842.
		Particulars									
		1/2 of the Village Deducted	Inam	118-19		Rs 281-13-9	Remainder	Free of tax	Hereditary	Inam granted by the Raja for Kaliyuga Varusham 4325. Muttu Vadugapoorija Velanjathevar	3. A Stamped and cadjan dated 25th February 1842 executed to the said Subbasami Rao by Muttuvenkatasamy Nattha Iswar this mother Maganoor Nachiar
		Remainder		118-19							
		Nunjah Viruppatti Cultivation	192-4-1	66-46							4. A Pre-sigiled deed of division executed on 19th March 1877 between Subbasami Rao & his mother Rukmiyakka Nachiar by which Subbagami Nachiar became the sole owner of the village
		Waste	17-9-1/2	12-35							
		Total	209-13-1/2	78-81							
		Punjah Kuruhan	50-0--	28-13							
		Waste	20-0--	11-25							
		Total	70-0--	39-38							
		Grand Total		118-19							

Examined
Sivaganga Zamindar

Recommended
Rs 1952

The Taluk of Tiruppavanam, in the Zemindari of Sivaganga in the District of Madura.

Name of original shareholder.	Grand-father's name & Village & Pargana (if known) & Whether he was a Sarvakarar or Ryot & Whether he was entered in the Survey accounts and Settlement papers as Proprietor or Shareholder	Name and relation of subsequent & present holders — Particulars regarding the present holder's title as has been submitted to the Inam Collector in these proceedings	Name and age.	Place of residence	Relation to original grantee or subsequent holder	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent.	If unmentioned in the original holder's petition how & when it arose	Remarks: — An abstract of the Government Orders in every case of lapse — already reported must be entered in this column — Deputy Collector's opinion and recommendation.	Decision of the Inam Commissioner or his Assistants: —
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21.	22.
As per account of Hoods 1225		Vide Inamdar's Rs (165)	Vide	Ibid	Vide	(1) Mother (2) Wife (3) Three sons (4) Three daughters	By purchase (vide Column 12)	This hamlet together with 7 others were settled as one village by the Inam Commissioner and two titledeeds were issued by him viz 1911 and 1912 on 1st December 1869 the former for the Devastanam half share and the latter for the Devastanam half share of the village. On 14th December 1872 the Collector Mr McLuhac first brought to the notice of the Inam Commissioner at the instance of the Inamdar at Column 16 (Subbiesami Rao) that the valuation of this hamlet by the Inam Department had been made on a wrong basis, that the highest 6 years income of the hamlet was only Rs 203 while the valuation given by the Inam Department for purposes of Road Cess the income of the village was Rs 785 and that was estimated at Rs 60 - He therefore recommended the issue of a Separate title deed for this hamlet. The Inam Commissioner replied (his letter No 78 dated 17th February 1873) that the hamlets had been settled together that there was no reason to believe that the valuation of this hamlet was excessive and that unless that was the case no revision could be made in the settlement. Since then, Subbiesami Rao has addressed several petitions to Government the Inam Commissioner and the Collector which led to much correspondence before this office and the Inam Commissioner. On one of the petitions Mr McLuhac was called on to report & he report -ed (Vide his letter No 307 dated 19th December 1876) that he still adhered to his former opinion of 1872 viz that the valuation of the hamlet for 15 years was excessive and that the Inam Commissioner's decision dated 15th May 1877 that the hamlet was not excessive and that it should be apportioned among the several Ryots equitably with reference to the actual annual value of the lands held by them & if that be found impossible, the remedy for the petitioner is to apply to the Collector for a Sub division of Jodi rent under Standing Order 186 - On 22nd March 1882, the Collector reported that the Inamdars refuse to Consent to a Sub division of Jodi rent and that the only Course to be adopted in the case let was as sequenced by Standing Order 122 & 123 and to ask Government to Sub division of Jodi rent and that the only Course to be adopted in the case of this was the one suggested by Mr McLuhac - After some further correspondence the Inam Commissioner informed the Collector that Subbiesami Rao can also get this remedy by addressing Government (vide No 147 dated 2nd June 1883) The Government Considered that the Inamdars had prima facie established grievance (vide their order No 1456 dated 15th October 1883 on his petition dated 28th June 1883) and called for information as to by what authority Rs 20 - 14 - 7 are charged as Jodi rent on this hamlet and whether petitioner Subbiesami Rao put in a separate Statement at the time of Settlement protesting against the valuation of this hamlet as excessive. The information called for on the two points was furnished in this office letter Nos 245 and 738 dated 9th February and 15th April 1884 respectively viz (1) that the sum of Rs 20 was forced neither by Government Officers nor by private arrangement and that it is impossible to ascertain the dates on which the Sub division has been made and (2) that Subbiesami Rao put in a separate Statement at the time of Settlement in which he gave the valuation of this hamlet at Rupees 125 - The Government have at last passed orders for the separate enfranchisement of this hamlet (Vide their order dated 5th November 1884 on Subbiesami Rao's petition No 811 of 1884). The Soil of this hamlet is of a very inferior quality and the lands are situated on the west of Pramanieri tank and although the extent is large only a very small portion is brought under Cultivation and the rest appears to be submerged and Consequently unfit for cultivation. I therefore frame the valuation as follows: — Wet 66-46 acres at 4 Rs — Rs 265 - 13 - 6 Do 12-35 Do at 1/2 a - 8 - " — 6 - 2 - 7 Dry 39-38 Do at Re - 4 - " — 9 - 13 - 6 281 - 13 - 9 To be confirmed under Rule V, class 3 Government quit rent - Rs 35 - 3 - 8.	Confirmed as recommended vide G O No 1171 dated 8th Nov 1884 Chedambaram Inam Commr dated 28th Nov 1885 I D No 1962

Collector 5/6

Compared
Mdu