Register of Dharmasanam Village of Kachattanellur in the Taluq of Tirumeneswaram of Sivaganga zamindari Estate in Madura District

Kachattanellur

	Patrimony	Acquired by purchase &c supported by documents	unsupported by documents	Total shares
No 1 to 22 inclusive	5/8	—	—	5/8
No 23	1-3/16	—	—	1-3/16
No 24	1-7/32	17/32	—	1-3/4
No 25	1-9/16	9/16	—	2-1/8
No 26	1-11/16	11/16	—	2-3/8
No 27	1-3/4	3/4	—	2-1/2
No 28	1-13/16	13/16	—	2-5/8
No 29 and 30 and 31	2-3/16	3/16	—	2-3/8
No 32 to 35 and 36	1-3/4	—	—	1-3/4
No 36	39/64	25/64	—	1-1/2
No 37	39/64	25/64	—	1-1/2
No 38	3/4	—	—	3/4
No 39 and 40 and 41	9/16	—	—	9/16
No 42	1-3/16	1-3/16	—	2-3/8
No 43	2-1/4	2-5/16	—	4-9/16
No 44	7/16	7/16	—	7/8
No 45 to 46 and 47	1/2	—	—	1/2
No 48	1/2	—	—	1/2
No 49	1/2	2-5/16	—	3-3/16
No 50	1/8	1	—	1-1/8
No 51	1-7/16	7/16	—	1-7/8
No 52	1-3/16	10/16	—	1-13/16
No 53 and 54 and 55	—	—	1 1/8	1-1/8
No 56	4	—	—	4
No 57 and 58 and 59	—	—	5/16	5/16
No 60	2-3/16	—	—	2-3/16
No 61	3-9/16	—	—	3-9/16
No 62	3/4	—	—	3/4
No 63	1-9/16	—	—	1-9/16
No 64	3/8	—	—	3/8
No 65	1-7/32	2-1/32	—	3-1/32
No 66	3/16	—	—	3/16
Total	29-7/64	64-4/64	10-1/4	104

If this is one of the Dharmasanams of the Zemindary of Sivaganga. It was granted by the Zemindar of the Village to the person for subsistance. This is a hereditary grant. It is in uninterrupted possession of the holder since the date of the grant. No alienations any- but the Patta of the Village is engraved on a stone in the Village. They produced copy of the same- I cannot state the copy is a genuine one or not

In the English account of A.D 1815, the Patta of the Village was registered said that the Patta of the Village was under Regulation XXXI of 1802-

(Vide next sheet)

Is the confirmed one Sole V (confirmed as Fl 3 dated Sole VII recommended in Fl Dona 2 Kl of Ja abeim Zemindari Dist. 371-36. ds 203. 2/3/65 1594

Gold 20 1/8 - 203 Rupees Two Hundreds & Three Rupees

A. Sivasankara Rao

Register No. 515

Sheet No. 680

1908

2-4

Rates of Government Taluq per Acre

	Max	Min
Dry	3-9-9	—7
Wet	11-12-2	—5-9

Average Rates of Government Taluq per Acre

Dry 1-5-6

Wet 4-6-1

Average Value of grain of the Inaam or wet land in Yemmiseveram Mahanam Consisting of Ayen Villages in the Taluq of the same name for a period of 15 years & all

From Fl 1256 to Fl 1271	Cultivated areas in Acres	Gross out turn	Of which Zamindar's share at 45 per Cent	Average price of grain	Value of quantity of grain given in Col 4	Rates per Acre
Ms M P	A — O	Ms M P	Ms M P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P
9398 — 8 — 5	6579. — 04	56317 — 5 — 11	23668 — 1 — 4	1 — 8 — 6½	36298 — 8 — 11	5 — 8 — 3

II This Village is supported by all the Accounts of 12 — No Pakam about the Area or about the boundaries on the part of the Rayis Vakeel. The boundaries surveyed & Plan in the Account of Taluq 1246 — Hence the Area of this Village is confirmed as 692 Acres 63 Cents is confirmed Hereafter the Area is a matched out But it is situated within the proper limits of the Village —

III This Village consists of 104 equal Portions they are enjoyed as shewn in the margin (The remaining are) The Lands are divided & they were exchanged about 40 years ago — From the Account of Fasli 1223 it appears that this Village was granted to the person of 13. From the Patta it appears that this Village was granted to Nana Gotra & Nana Sutra or Brahmins of various families. It is probable that such large Villages are always granted to the Brahmins of various families — The persons No 1 & 27 of 16 are descendants of the persons of 13 & the persons against whose name the word Shareholder are marked down or descendants of the Co-partners of the Original Grantees —

Here are shewn 16 —

V The persons No 58-59-60 & 64 of 16 produced Pattas & Cowles of A.D 1827-1842-1846-1847-1849-1852-1853 & 1860 for Rupees 526 — from certain shareholders in the Village — Three Pattas are on stamped paper & 6 are on plain paper for Inam Lands — The persons No 3-4-6-11 & 12 of 13 & 14-19-20-21-22-23-24-34-36-37-42-43 & 44-48-49-50 & 51 produced some of their Lands in A.D 1780-1805-1806-1808-1809-1813-1815-1816-1817-1818-1820-1827-1832-1836 & 1844-1845-1846-1847-1849-1850-1851-1852-1853-1854-1858 & 1859 for Rupees — The persons No 24 of 16 — [illegible] on stamped papers — The persons

Notwithstanding

11 Ramayen 65 Leo — (11) 1 Wife 1 son 3 Daughters and 1 Mother

12 Ramalinga yen 28 Do — (12) 1 Wife 1 Daughter and 1 Mother

13 Seshayen 11 Leo — (13) 1 Father 1 Brother

14 Muttusami yen 22 Leo — (14) 1 Wife 1 Mother

Sengottai

15 Appatturayen 42 Leo — (15) 1 Wife 2 Sons

16 Venguayen 35 Do — (16) 1 Wife

17 Kuppia yen 15 Leo — (17) 1 Wife

18 Viraraya mi Ayen 10 Do — (18) 1 Wife — Vide preceding side

Paramkagudi

19 Sanguayen 56 Leo — (19) 1 Wife 3 Sons 3 Daughters 3 Grand Sons 3 Do Daughters

Kachattanellais

20 Muttuayen alias subbiramani Ayen 25 Leo — (20) 1 Wife

21 Ramasamiyen 55 Leo — (21) 1 Wife 2 Sons 2 Daughters 5 Daughters and

22 Annaittu rayen 50 Leo — (22) 1 Wife 3 Sons 2 Daughters Undivided

23 Subbayen 38 Leo — (23) 1 Wife 2 Sons 1 Daughter Undivided

Paramkagudi

24 Gunnayen 28 Leo — (24) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter

(Vide numbers)

Sheet No. 2   Dharmasanam Kachattanellur in the Taluq of Tyemuneswaram of Sivagenga Zamindari Estate in Madura District

Register No. 575

purchased 5/16 Vritty in AD 1832 in public Auction by the Zillah Court of Madura — in satisfaction of a decree in suit No. 5531 of 1811. The Mahajanams say that in the persons who are enjoying lands without documents acquired the lands partly in gift & partly by purchase, partly in their days & partly in the days of their ancestors — & that documents were lost — they admit the enjoyment of these shareholders.

Sheet No. 681

II There are several Takkarars in this Village — which are described below. Most of these Takkarars are of one age — & they are false — Whatever may be the nature of the Complaints or I must give the details of the same to avoid references from the Central Office on appeal Petitions — I write here the details of all the complaints —

Takkarars

III ...... The persons No 25-26-27 & 28 of 16 Claim to 1/2 Vritty from the person No 42 of 016 by reason that the 1/2 Vritty which they are enjoying equally, is added to the Vritties of No 42 — on the ground that he mortgaged the lands to them — The person No 42 of 016 says that his ancestors mortgaged ~~the lands~~ ^(all the half Vritty & 5/16 of a Vritty all) about 50 or 60 years ago to the ancestors of the persons No 25 to 28 of 016 — & that the persons No 25 to 28 agreed to leave to him 1/2 Vritty in lieu of 13/16 Vritty — & entered the half Vritty in the vernacular statement in his name — The Mahajanams say that this half Vritty & other lands are in possession of the persons No 25 to 28 of 16 since the last one century & that they never heard of the lands having been mortgaged to the ancestors of the persons No 25 to 28 of 016. The persons No 25 to 28 of 16 say that they never agreed to give half Vritty to the person No 42 — & that the land is their patrimony — The person No 42 failed to prove the fact of the lands having been mortgaged to the said ancestors of the persons No 25 to 28 of 016 — & admits that this Vritty is not entered in the agreement of the Division of the property which was passed about 40 years ago between his father & his father's younger brother — Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court. The land is in possession of the persons No 25 to 28 of 016.

IIII. The persons of No 25 to 28 of 16 claim 10/16 Vritty from the person No 49 of 016 on the ground that though they are enjoying the lands equally from time immemorial the person No 49 entered the lands in his own name with the connivance of some of the Villagers. The person No 49 of 016 ~~admits~~ admits of his having entered the said 10/16 Vritty in his own name, which are in possession of the persons No 25 to 28 of 16 — & pleads that his adopted father mortgaged the lands 40 years ago to the ancestors of the persons No 25 to 28 of 16 & that [illegible] to enter the lands in his own name — The Mahajanams deny every [illegible] ... the person No 49 of 016 [illegible] ... [illegible] of the transaction. The person No 49 of 16 failed to prove the claim. Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court [illegible] ... who deny every knowledge of the transaction [illegible]

Tengarai 25 Kristnayen 42	Do —	(25) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter unmd
26 Muttuvayen 58	Do —	(26) —
27 Subbaraya Ayen 48	Do —	(27) 1 Wife 4 sons 2 Daughters md
28 Narayanayen 45	Do —	(28) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter unmd 1 Daughter md
Devakottai 29 Achuta Kristnayen 42	Do —	(29) 1 Daughter unmd
30 Sivarama yen 39	Do —	(30) 1 Wife
Parambagudi 31 Kuppayen 67	Do —	(31) 2 sons 1 Daughter md
Savarakottai 32 Subbayen 38	Do —	(32) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter unmd 2 Do md
33 Guruvayen 35	Do —	(33) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter unmd
34 Ramalingayen 25	Do —	(34) 1 Wife 1 mother
35 Narayanayen 18	Do —	(35) —
36 Nagaiyayen 65	Do —	(36) 1 Wife 1 Daughter unmd
Kachattanellur 37 Subbayen 25	Do —	(37) 1 Wife 1 mother

— Vide preceding side

Pandiyaji
38 Subbiah } do — (38)
mal 40 } — u

Najir
39 Pundarama } do — (39)
yen 40 } — 1 Wife

40 Subbayan } do — (40)
38 } — u

Pandikammaiyi
41 Narayan } do — (41)
42 } — 1 Wife
1 Daughter
and
1 Son under

Pelipattanelias
42 Subbarayan } do — (42)
Ayyan 57 } — 1 Wife
4 sons
4 Daughters m.d
1 Grandson
1 Do Daughter
1 Daughter m.d

Yelandakudi
43 Pichuvayen } do — (43)
alias Pichu 36 } — 1 Wife
Dikxatar — 1 son
1 Daughter
and

44 Subbarama } do — (44)
Ayyan 15 } — 1 Mother

45 Adotha } do — (45)
Narayana 42 } — 2 sons
Dikxatar — 1 Daughter
under

46 Kuppi — } do — (46)
Dikxatar 34 } — 1 Wife

47 Rainara } do — (47)
Da Dikxatar 28 } — 1 Wife
1 Daughter
under

Kachattanelliar
48 Subbadu } do — (48)
vayya alias 60 } — 1 Wife
Subbayan — 3 sons
4 Daughters
and

49 Sundara } do — (49)
Mayen 25 } — 1 Wife
1 Adopted
Mother

50 Samivayen } do — (50)
52 } — 1 Wife

Sivagengei
51 Pitalekar } do — (51)
ini Ammal alias 22 } — 1 Husband
Ammalammal — 1 Daughter
1 Son under

(Vide preceding sides)

VIII ... Q. Is Arunachellavayen's claim 1/4 Vritty from Re Jasun N° 36 & 37 /16 in the ground that his father mortgaged the lands 25 years ago to the ancestors of Re Jasun N° 36 & 37 /16. Re Defendants N° 36 & 37 /16 deny any knowledge of the transaction. Re Plaintiff failed to prove the 1st complaint. Re named two witnesses who deny any knowledge of the transaction. Hence the Claim is rejected

IX ... Re said Arunachellayen in previous para claims 6/16 Vritty from Re Jasun N° 57-57 & 58 /16 in the ground that his father mortgaged the lands ~~to~~ about 35 years ago to one Arunanayen, who mortgaged the lands to the ancestors of Re Jasun N° 57-57 & 58 /16 - when he does not known. Re Claimant failed to prove his claim. Re Subbayanans deny any knowledge of the transaction. Hence the Claim is rejected. Re party is referred to Civil Court. Re Defendants deny any knowledge of the transaction of the mortgage

X ... Re aforesaid Arunachellayen's claim 1/4 Vritty from Re Jasun N° 59 /16 on Re ground that his father mortgaged the lands forty years ago to one Subbaraya Ayyen that Re Jasun N° 59 /16 is enjoying the lands now from some cause or other. Re Subbayanans & Re Defendant ~~any~~ deny any knowledge of the transaction. Hence Re Claim is rejected & Re party is referred to Civil Court. Re lands are in possession of Re Jasun N° 59 /16

Re Claimant Arunachellayen has no enjoyment of the ~~any~~ lands in this Village. He said that he had from his own allegations entered in paras VIII - IX & X. It is evident that he has not enjoyed any of Re lands now & during Re last 30 or 40 years. In the state of things, he said Grant Chetty 6/16 Vritty on the 7 April /64 for Rupees 105 to Re persons N° 24 /16 Re persons N° 24 /16 ago that he does not know to whom the 6/16 Vritty belongs, that he was enjoying from time immemorial 3/4 Vritties in the Village, that some of the Subbayanans pretended that Re said 6/16 Vritty is the property of Re said Arunachellayen & proposed him to buy it for 105 Rupees & also Re said Subbayanans transferred now at the time of purchasing Re said 6/16 Vritty in addition to the 6/16 Vritty to Arunachellayen & invited Re said Arunachellayen to give it as gift to one Mutturayen, Re person N° 24 /16 Re said Arunachellayen is on a stamped paper

Re person N° 24 /16 gave a writing & agreed to & accepted that one of Re instalments Subbayanans pretended him & made to buy 6/16 Vritty for 105 Rupees to give 1/8 Vritty to Re Claimant Arunachellayen & to allow 1/8 Vritty to Re said Arunachellayen & that 1/4 & 16 - 4 that 1/4 Vritty is his property. Arunachellayen sold

(Vide material)

Sheet (no 3) - Dharmasanam Kaelpattanellir in the Taluq of Yemmiseuveram & Zemindari estate in Madura District

to prove that the Vritty is his own & that it was mortgaged by the ancestors of the Pltff's Pltff's grandfather & Pltff's father the Mahazanams entered some enemy & the said Arumadaiyan Grandfather & Pltff gave Arumachalam ayen 1/8 Vritty as gift & then favourable ijo 4 of 16 - He requested to register the Vritty also in his name - His 1/4 Vritty being proved to be the property of the person No 24 of 16 & as the lands are now in his possession, the said 1/4 Vritty is registered in his name -

Register No 515 Sheet No 687

XI --- One Subbarayer alias Appu Vayer claims 1/8 Vritty from the person No 36 - 1/16 Vritty from the person No 50 - 1/32 part of a Vritty from the person No 21-22 & 23 of 16 on the ground that his father mortgaged 1/16 Vritty to the ancestors of the persons No 36 & 50 of 16 - 60 years ago & that the person No 21-22 & 23 of 16 purchased the 1/32 part of a Vritty from one Subbayen 60 years ago - The Mahazanams & Defendants deny every knowledge of the transaction - The Pltff failed to prove his claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court -

XII Ramaswamy Sastry claims 1/16 Vritty from the person No 59 of 16 on the ground that his father mortgaged the lands 45 years ago to one Ramen Subbayen, whose family is not in existence & that the person No 59 of 16 purchased the lands from some one - This proved to be quite false - The Claimant says that he cannot prove his claim - The Mahazanams deny every knowledge of the transaction - Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court -

XIII --- One Veerarayayyen claims one Vritty & 1/4 Vritty from the persons No 28-50 & 64 - viz 1/4 Vritty from the person No 28 - 1/2 Vritty from the person No 50 & 1/4 Vritty from the person No 64 - on the ground that his grand father mortgaged the lands of the ancestors of the Defendants about 60 years ago - The Claimant failed to prove the same - The Mahazanams & Defendants deny every knowledge of the transaction - Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court - The Candidate not in possession of the land 50 or 60 years -

XIV One Parvatavarnum claims 1/8 & 1/16 & 1/16 Vritty from the person No 42 of 16 on the ground that the person No 42 of 16 acquired the lands 20 years ago - & Defendants say that the Pltff's claim is false - His Village was resurveyed 28 years ago - (Vide next sheet)

Maduresi 52 Pattatchi Ramayen 40	Mal	—	(52) 1 Wife 1 son	
53 Sitaramayen 35	Leo	—	(53) 1 Wife 2 sons 1 Daughter 2nd	
54 Rainadum daraiayen 28	do	—	(34) 1 Wife	
55 Subbayen 20	Leo	—	(55) 1 Wife	
Pasumbagadi 56 Sellamayen alias Subbiha mani Ayyen 20	Leo	—	(56) 1 Wife + Mother	
Kachattanullur 57 Rainavadiyer 50	Leo	—	(57) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter 2nd	— Vide preceding side
58 Senkaravadhiyer 47	Leo	—	(58) 1 Wife 1 son	
Tevakottai 59 Sunderama yen 38	Leo	—	(59) 1 Wife	
Madurei 60 Ramasamiyen 61	Leo	—	(60) 1 Wife	
61 Ramayen 45	Leo	—	(61) 1 Wife 2 sons 2 Daughters 2nd	
Vilachery 62 Narayanadhiyer alias Naraniyen 70	do	—	(62) 1 Son 1 Daughter 2nd 1 Grand son 1 do Daughter	
Paramakudi 63 Ramalakshmi 48	do	—	(63) 1 son & Daughter 1 Daughter 2nd 1 Son in law	
64 Ayyanperumal 28	Leo	—	(64) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Mother	
65 Rangayen 60	do	—	(65) 1 son 1 Daughter 1 Grand son	

66 Ruppayen 62 - Ac & Sons & Daughter in law

The witnesses named by the Pff deny every knowledge of the Claims action - Defendant every knowledge of the transaction - The Defendant is enjoying 5 Vritty 8/16 Vritty acquiring it lawfully - Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court -

XII One Ganeshy Ayyen Claims 7/16 Vritty from the Widow № 63 of 16 by reason that his Mother Father Father mortgaged the lands to one Venkataramayya & Ammamma about 60 years ago, that the Father in law of the Widow received in the lands in mortgage from the Ogl mortgagee 30 years ago - & requests under the circumstances to regain the lands in his name - The Defendant deny every knowledge of the transaction - The Magistrate denies every knowledge of the transaction - Hence a false complaint - Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court -

In the letter of things the Claimant says that the said 7/16 Vritty to one Subbaya on the 25 March 64 - for Rupees 57 executing a Bill of sale on a stamped paper the Father, the Claimant says, has no enjoyment of the lands - The Claimant & the alleged purchaser combined together & created the bill of sale while the lands belong to the Widow № 63 of 16 & while she is enjoying from time immemorial - Hence the bill of sale became a dead letter - the purchaser says that he has no enjoyment of the lands - He is required to Civil Court -

XIII One Venkata Narayen Claims 3/16 share from the person № 197 of 16 on the ground that the deed of mortgage property passed between his & his divisions of Mr. Mother Father Father & Father of the person № 197 of 16 about 60 years ago where that Rs 3/16 Vritty belongs to his Mother Father Father - He admits that he has no enjoyment of the lands since long - It is proved that Rs 3/16 Vritty is always enjoyed by the members of the family of the person № 69 of 966 - Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court -

XIII One Ruppayen Claims 3/16 Vritty from the person № 31 of 16 on the ground that while he is enjoying the said 3/16 Vritty from time immemorial the person № 31 had the lands entered in his name in the revenue station improperly - The person № 31 of 16 says that if the Claimant takes oath that it belongs to him he will relinquish the lands to him at once - The Claimant took oath as to which the person № 31 of 16 - Hence the person № 31 transferred the lands to the Claimant in the open Cutchery - Hence disputed ended - The Claimant is numbered as 68 of 966 -

XIV One Ruppayen Claims 1 Vritty 11/64 ga Vritty from the person № 42 of 16 on the ground that his father in law & the son of Father's Elder Brother of the person № 42 of 16 mortgaged 2 Villages & 22/64 ga Vritty about 60 years ago to certain persons - Vritty since undivided & that half of these Claims right 1 Vritty 11 Vritty should fall to the share of her Mother in law, who transferred all her property to him in AD 1860 - under a Settlement on a stamped paper - the admits the lands are not in his possession - It is proved that the Mother in law of the said Ruppayen had two Brothers & 1 1/2 Vritty in the Village, that she died in 1849 two Brothers & the person № 60 of 16 for Rupees 12 executed a bill of sale on a stamped paper for one of 1 1/2 Vritty the ground in sight 7/16 Vritty & the Claimant about 10 years ago 1/32 Vritty Vritty to one other person & that the Claimant sold her 1/16 Vritty - In the Bill of sale of 1849, the Mother in law admitted therein that she had in the Village only two Brothers & that he sold them - It is not proven that the lands Claimed by the Claimant were mortgaged formerly by his Ancestors by the Father in law of the Claimant & by the Father of the person № 42 of 16 - One of the mortgagees whom the Claimant produced states that the lands were mortgaged formerly by his Ancestors by the Father of the person № 42 of 16 - & not jointly by Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court - The Mother in Law of the Claimant & the Father of the person № 42 of 16 were cousins - Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court - respectively - The Father in law of the Claimant & the Father of the person № 42 of 16 were cousins - Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court -

(Government agent)

XVIII - - - - - One Nadarajan claims 3/4 Vritty from the person N° 25-26-27-28 of 16 on the ground that his father's Mother's father mortgaged the lands about 50 years ago to the father of the father of the person N° 25 of 16 - The claimant failed to prove his claim - Abeygunawardene & Defendants deny knowledge of the transaction - The claimant says that his father died 20 years ago & that his father's mother father died 40 years ago

XIX - - - - One Ramanathan el claims 7/16 Vritty from the person N° 48 of 16 by reason that her father in law mortgaged the lands about 90 years ago to the father of the person N° 48 of 16 - Defendant denies every knowledge of the transaction. Abeygunawardene also deny every knowledge of the transaction Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court - Such false complaints are very common in this part of the Country

Registered No. 575

XX - - - of the person N° 50 of 16 claims 3/16 Vritty or thereabouts that from the person N° 65 of 16 on the ground that his Elder Brother, who died 20 years ago mortgaged the lands to the father or grand father of the person N° 65 of 16 - Defendant denies every knowledge of the transaction & pleads that their ancestors purchased the lands from the father Elder Brother of the Claimant - vide D 1809 for 36 Rds - Title good is on a plain Cadjan lease - Abeygunawardene offers the claim of the person N° 65 of 16 - His story is satisfactorily proved - Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court -

XXI - The person N° 29 of 16 claims 1/8 Vritty from one Ramalingam dk on the person N° 2 of 16 on the ground that the 1/8 Vritty is in the possession of Ramalingam dk pleaded that he has no right of the lands upon which day the Abeygunawardene entered it in the names of the Defendants fraudulently & that 15 of 16 pleaded that although they were mortgaged by forefathers ago by his ancestors those of the person N° 29 of 16. Hence the 1/8 Vritty is entered in his name - The person N° 29 of 16 pleaded that the 1/8 Vritty was given to him as gift by the person N° 29 of 16 & that he has no original deed - same it was given to him 2 years ago. Produced 3 gifts. The person N° 29 of 16 says that he never received the 1/8 Vritty to the person N° 4 of 16 - The person N° 4 of 16 & Ramalingam dk failed to prove their claims - Hence the parties are referred to Civil Court - Ramalingam has no share in the Village - Abeygunawardene denys every thing are entered in the names of the person N° 29 of 16 & the parties are referred to Civil Court - Ramalingam has no share in the Village - Abeygunawardene denys every thing - knowledge of the transaction & the Mortgage -

XXII - Independent of the above, several of the Abeygunawardenes complained that some of the principal shareholders in the Village entered wrongfully into some of the shares of the former in the names of the latter - The principal shareholders also fraudulently confessed their guilt at once as it was impossible for them to conceal it any longer & prepared a fresh "Panguwala Jabitah" or list of shares newly at the commencement of all the shareholders in the Village - This list was produced to me with the signatures of all the shareholders in the Village - This list is adopted in the settlement to the satisfaction of all -

XXIII - - - - One Ignatoraj Ayan claims 3/4 Vritty from the persons N° 15 & 16 of 16 on the ground that his father's grand brother mortgaged it to the Great Grand father of the Defendants half century ago - Defendants & Abeygunawardenes deny every knowledge of the transaction of the Mortgage hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court

(Vide next and)

Valaiyur

XXIV

Wet lands depend upon 3 Tanks - Of these one is larger & two are small - They are in repair They are fed by one of the branch channels of Vaigayar - are important ones in this Village The Mahajanams say that one branch channel of Vaigayar feeds the Tanks & another irrigates their Wet lands directly - Thus the Village has very good & substantial sources of irrigation - The Tanks are filled annually - as the rivers flows every year - Scarcity of water is not felt yearly - For the lands are not cultivated annually - The Village is an important one - & at the same time a Gentlemans - The Mahajanams say that 235 Acres 20 Cs cultivated as Punjah lands are not got ab all to be cultivated better as Wet, Garden or Dry - nor were they cultivated any time previous to this - I know that some of the lands in the Tanks are cultivated as water begins to subside or Tanks become Dry - with some Dry grain or other - In some places cucumbers &c are cultivated in the bed of the Tanks - The Tank beds are possessed of very fertile soil - and generally contains alluvium - I need not say much how troublesome people are Here Mahajanams & how far their account may be depended upon - The details in previous pages will prove all this -

The Mahajanams planted 217 Acres of Wet as cultivated lands & 66½ Acres of Wet as waste - I am certain that there is no reason at all to term so much lands as waste - particularly when the Mahajanams have substantial sources of irrigation & fertile lands in addition to every one favourable seasons & high prices Some Wet lands of the Mahajanams say that these 66 Acres are partly cultivated with Dry crops & partly as Mettukal with Wet occasionally - Even the attested ones of the Mahajanams Wet lands of the Caste are cultivated with Wet crops & that there is little or no waste in Wet lands - I doubt that the Mahajanams planted as some of the cultivated lands - partly as Punjah and partly as Dry lands - I warned them that they will be subjects to serious loss if they were not honest in preparing the account - Dry will not mind these warnings They will not repent for their dishonesty unless they are in the middle of greater - Some of the Wet lands are cultivated annually & two crops Raagi & Cholam annually with double crop - No green leaves in the Village - Even an average of ½ of the Wet lands are irrigated, cultivated annually with double crop - No green leaves in the Village - Raagi & Cholam are the staple crops - Pillus are cultivated in one or two Acres of Dry lands - Of the Mahajanams Dry lands Cholam, Raagi & Varagu & alluvium - with Betel gardens - All lands are of a superior quality generally - Soil is mixed with Negu, white clay called Manal, & Vandal - People enjoy rude health - This Village is situated on the banks of Vaigayar - I saw myself this Village on the part of the Tabayon my way from Madura to Rameswaram - People enjoy rude health - This Village is one of the most important of seven Villages of Periamiguty in Ramnad Zemindary is situated - Revenue income of this Village as per statement of the Mahajanams is 800 Rupees per annum This is not true - The contiguous seven Villages are Manavasi, [illegible], all near Nattu, Kodumbury - The average Wet assessment of these Villages calculated for a few years previous to 1870 comes to 7 Rs 1 & 1.1 Rs 5-64 pence - respectively - The average of these 3 Villages comes to at 70 Rupees per acre - The average Dry assessment of the seven Villages comes to 2-4-0 to 0 13 6 per acre - The highest Dry rate is charged for Elloor which the Mahajanams say is not good ground in this Village - The Mahajanams say that the soil of this Village may be classed as Wet 220 Acres cultivated annually in good & partly 2 times at 7 Rupees per acre 1540 — Wet 66½ Acres income in seven years gently 64 Rupees per acre 264 — 1796-0-0 Dry 120 Acres cultivated at 1½ per acre 180 — Dry 48 Acres Waste at ½ Rupees per acre 24 — 204-0-0 Note Betel garden is included in the irrigated lands -

Rameswaram 29-9-84

Tillai

[illegible]