Register of Dharmasanam Village of Kallangudi in [illegible] of Sivaganga Zamindary

Kallangudi [illegible] 1819

Register No. 500

Sheet No 659

No 1 is enjoying		7/16
No 2 is enjoying		3/4
No 3	do	1/16
No 4	do	1/16
No 5 to 8	do	5/8
No 9	do	1/16
No 10 to 14	do	28 11/16
No 15 to 26	do	28 11/16
[illegible]	do	3/4
[illegible]		
[illegible]	do	1/2
[illegible]	do	1/16
[illegible]	do	3/16
[illegible]	do	1
No 31	do	1 7/16
No 32	do	1/16
No 33	do	1/16
No 34 to 37	do	5/8
No 38	do	1/2
No 39	do	1/8
No 40	do	1/2
No 41 to 43	do	2

68 Vultte

1 This is one of the Darmasanams in the [illegible] of Sivaganga. This was granted by the former [illegible] to the persons [illegible]
There is a hereditary grant. There is no written [illegible] of the [illegible] since the date of the grant. There is a Patta only [illegible]
which is produced now by one of the Mahajanams [illegible] the persons No 2 of 16. The Village is not entered in the accounts [illegible]
of A.D. 1815 by some mistake or other from the [illegible] is entered in any of the Accounts. The Mahajanams say that they
do not know whether the Patta is genuine or not [illegible] that they [illegible] the enduring [illegible]. Hence I consider [illegible] my opinion [illegible]
the Patta [illegible] part of the Country, [illegible] the Pattas are [illegible] to a vast extent. The Village is entered in all the existing accounts
The Village has 6 Hamlets shown below.

1 Koneri yendal
2 Nanjarvoyal
3 Sevavoyal
Malagandan [illegible]
[illegible]

The Village consists of 68 equal Vettus. They are occupied and enjoyed by the [illegible]
The lands are exchanged once in 12 years. Five years ago lands have been divided permanently by abolishing the practice of exchanging the lands periodically under a written agreement. Now the persons No 26, 9, 33 & 2 of 16 argue that the lands should be [illegible] former practice of exchanging [illegible] made five years ago & that the exchange [illegible] Mahajanams say that it is not proper [illegible] to violate the conditions entered in the agreement [illegible] to nullify the agreement [illegible]

[illegible]

Dharmasanam

Jodi As per Jolum rar Act 411-3 6
Kammi 8-9-6
Remainder as per the Mahajanams Statement 402-10 —

Hiranya Garbha yoji Raghunatha Setupaty [illegible] Salivo [illegible] 1617 A D 1695

[illegible] Hindu Act F 12[illegible] [illegible] Act F 12[illegible]

Dharmasanam Kallangudi
Nanja Varapdi 44 [illegible] Ar 312-20
Punja Karuku 21 —
Total 326-76
In Hindu Act of F 1228 Area [illegible]
In F 1228 Dharmasanam Kallangudi Area None

Dharmasanam Kallangudi Hamlets
1 Koneri yendal
2 Nanji voyal
3 Sevavoyal
4 [illegible]
5 Morichi Natti
6 Kodup[illegible]
Nanja Varapdi 500 — Ar 350
Agahar Devasthanam Area 12 —
Remain 488 — Ar 351 —
Punja Karuku 42 — Ar 23

Rameswaram [illegible]
Kallangudi
2 Virabhadra Ayyan
3 Chinna Iyam [illegible] Sankaran
45
[illegible] Seshayyan
6 [illegible] Iyan
7 [illegible]
8 Narayana [illegible]

Share holder: 1 Wife, 1 [illegible], Daughter, 1 Adopted son
Share holder: 1 Wife
Son of the [illegible]: 2 Sons, 1 Daughter, 1 Married Daughter

Total —
As per Act of F 1228

Nanja Varapdi	500 —	350 —
Excess	52 —	36 40
	552 —	386 40
Punja Karuku	42 —	23 52
Excess do	428 —	239 68
	470 —	263 20
		~~5[illegible]~~ 649 60
Deduct Poramboke		
Temple site Varap	2 —	1 40
Village site do	3 —	2 10
Incrable land do	42 —	29 40
Paths do	3 10 3	2 62
	50 10 3	35 52
Bed of Tank Karuku	150 —	84 —
Incrable land do	20 —	11 20
		130 72
Deduct Servamaniam		
Nanja Varapdi	1 3 3 —	88
Remainder		518 00
Nanja Varapdi Cultivable	500 —	350 —
Punja Karuku Cultivable	42 —	23 52
Excess	[illegible] 250 —	144 48
Total	300 —	168 —
Grand Total		518 —

Deduced from the statement of papers produced by the Mahajanams

2200

of Government Taluq per [illegible]

Mean Chain

Dry 3-9-9 1-7

Wet 11-13-3 6-9

Average rates of Government Taluq per [illegible]

Dry 1-8-6

Wet 6-1

Average grain of the [illegible] in wet land in Tinnevelly

[illegible] of the Taluq [illegible] for a period of 15 years

A

From Fasli 1256 to Fasli 1270	Cultivated area of land	Gross outturn	Of which remainder there at 45 per cent	Average prices of grain	Value of the quantity of grain [illegible]	Rates per [illegible]
K. A. C.	A. C.	[illegible]	[illegible]	Rs. As. Ps.	Rs. As. Ps.	Rs.
7181-11-5	5-7-2	60472-2-2	2945-1-4	1-7-6	44471-12-8	9-

II Tirvai is fixed on the number of Chattees equally & permanently. The present Tirvai fixed between [illegible] given in the Talmars account. It was reduced [illegible] on behalf of [illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible] of the Tirvai

[illegible] is related or [illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible]

of the Original [illegible]

[illegible] tradition

The persons No 5-6 & 8 of [illegible] purchase [illegible]

[illegible] 1820-1821-1822 & 1825 [illegible] 8 & 17

[illegible] 1847 1848

[illegible] 65-9

The [illegible] 1853-1857 1860 & 1863

1850 1851 [illegible] 1854-1855 [illegible]

[illegible] Enjoyment [illegible]

			[illegible] 1 Son 1 Unmarried Daughter 1 Brother
12 Latchumanan ditto 16	A C	(11)	1 Wife 1 Son
13 Ramanathan ditto 15	A C	(12)	1 Wife 1 Brother
14 Latchmanan ditto 12	A C	(13)	1 Elder brother 1 Mother
15 Muttukaruppan ditto 22	A C	(14)	1 Wife 1 Unmarried Daughter
16 Arunachalam ditto 12	C	(15)	1 Wife 1 Mother
17 [illegible] Chalam ditto 7	C	(16)	1 Mother 2 Elder brothers
18 Ramanathan ditto 13	C	(17)	1 Mother
19 Latchmanan ditto 7	A C	(18)	1 Mother 1 Elder brother
Muttukaruppan ditto 10	C	(19)	1 Mother
21 Vellayan ditto 50	A C	(20)	1 W[illegible] 3 Sons 2 Daughters 1 Unmarried Daughter
22 Arunachalam ditto 26	A C	(21)	1 Wife 4 Sons 3 Daughters-in-law 2 Grandsons 2 Unmarried Daughters
23 Muttukaruppan ditto 18	A C	(22)	1 Wife 1 Mother
24 Narayanan ditto 3		(23)	1 Mother 1 Elder [illegible]

Vise [illegible]

[illegible]

Sheet No 2 Dharmasanam Kallangudi in Amaravaty Taluq of Sivaganga

Sheet No. 660

IV One Venkata Krishnan Claims 6/16 of a Vetty from the person No 27 of 16 on the ground that the lands were mortgaged by his late father, who died 31 years ago, to the late father of the person No 27 of 16 forty years ago. For how much & for how many years it is not known. He failed to prove his claim. The Mahazarnam say that they never heard of this transaction nor saw any of the members of the family of the claimant. Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court.

IV One Tirumalaiengar Claims to one Vetty in the Village from the person No 5 of 16 on the ground that his father's Elder Brother mortgaged the lands about 45 years ago to the late father of the person No 5 of 16. He failed to prove the same. He produced only the document of 10 years old. They show that he had some lands in this Village. Mahazarnams say that they know nothing about this nor saw any of the members of the claimant's family. Defendant repeats the same words. Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court.

V The person No 2 of 16 Claims 6/16 of a Vetty from the persons No 15 to 25 of 16 on the ground that when his father sold the lands to the said persons No 15 to 25 in AD 1851, the father's younger brother of the person No 15 of 16 executed an agreement to him binding himself to restore the lands to him if the money is paid to him within a period of one year from the date of the sale. It is proved that the agreement is genuine one & the Bill of sale also is a genuine one. The lands are in possession of the purchasers since the date of the purchase. The bill of sale shows that the transaction is an outright one. The father of the claimant who ~~[illegible]~~ died two years after the transaction took place never paid the money to the Sellers nor received the lands from him. The claimant also is silent since long. I see therefore no ground to annul the sale. The claimant admits that the Bill of sale is genuine & that the purchasers did pay money or value of the lands to his father. Hence the Claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court.

IV The persons No 10 to 25 of 16 gave 10/16 of a Vetty & 2 acres & 15 cents of Wet which they had in this Village in addition to the lands now entered opposite to their names, to the Mahazarnams of Achangudi, who also hold shares in the Dharmasanam under Settlement, & received in exchange 28 Vetties in ~~the~~ Achangudy ~~in exchange~~ AD about 5 years ago under a written agreement. The persons No 10 to 25 are enjoying ever since their lands (28 Vetties) in Achangudi. The Relatives of Rangys the persons No 38 & 84 of 16 who are enemies of the persons No 10 to 25, & who possess trivial share in the Dharmasanam as well as in Achangudi, appeared before me very late & pleaded that the Sellers or the persons No 10 to 25 of 16 purchased 28 10/16 of Vetties in Kallangudi or in the Village now under settlement from one Ramaswamy Iyengar which belong to the Zemindar as Kottukagyam or purchased [illegible] to the said Ramaswamy Iyengar as Jivitam, that property & which was given to the said Ramaswamy [illegible] out of which the persons No 10 to 25 gave 10/16 of a Vetty & 2 acres & 15 cents of Wet to the said [illegible] Achangudi & received in exchange 28 Vetties in the said [illegible]

Appomo Setti 35	do	(24) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter unmarried 1 Married Daughter
26 Kallappa Nayan alias Venkatarama Nayan 18	Share holder	(25) 1 Wife 1 Mother
27 Sundara Nayan 40	do	(27) 1 Wife 2 Sons 2 Married Daughters
28 Subramani Iyen 55	do	(28) 1 Wife 3 Sons
29 Kuppa Chengan 40	do	(29) 1 Wife 1 Married Daughter
30 M. Venkatrama Nayan 30	do	(30) 1 Wife 1 Son
31 Kuppammal 37	do.	(31) 1 Married Daughter 1 do Unmarried
32 Minakshi Ammal 50	do	(32) None
33 Kristnayan 30	do	(33) 1 Wife 1 Son
34 Vappatchi Somanayan 35	do	(34) 1 Wife 1 Mother
35 Venkata Rangaiyan 25	do	(35) 1 Mother
36 Virozayan 25	do	(36) 1 Brother 1 Wife
37 Subbayan 10	do	(37) 3 Elder brothers
38 Sangam Achayan 1[illegible]	do	(38) 1 Wife

Vide precis ante

(8)

proved [illegible] in the Village of Kallengudy under Settlement

– [illegible] them that ~~the~~ his Vuttees should be registered ~~in theirs~~ in his name in the Register –

– & that therefore the exchange should be annulled & the 28 Vuttees which the persons No 10 to 25

– is ~~now~~ N.L in Kalangudi N.L enjoying in exchange of their lands in Kallengudy [illegible] should be restored to them

– Mahazanama –

1 The Zemindar's Vakeel who is present in the office & who is hearing the arguments of the persons No 33 & 34 of 16 – says that the said arguments of the persons No 33 & 34 of 16 ~~[illegible]~~ are unfounded ones & that the Zemindar has no claim to the lands in question – or to 28 10/16 of Vuttees in Kallengudy under Settlement –

1 The results of my enquiry go to prove that the Zemindar of Sivagunga had formerly 28 10/16 Vuttees in the Darmasanam under Settlement which it is said to have been purchased formerly by the Zemindar; that the father of the present Zemindar gave the lands in A.D 1827 to the Mother of one Ramaswamy Seven, N.L who was his concubine N.L ~~his Illegitimate son~~, to be enjoyed as hereditary under a Written agreement or "Nerubem", & that the illegitimate son Ramaswamy Seven sold the lands to the persons No 10 to 25 of 16 in A.D 1843 & 1851 for Rupees 11266–110– under two written Bills of sales on Stamp Cadjan leaves – & that the Bill of sale of 1851 has been registered in the Sub Court of Madura on the 25 July /61 by the then presiding Judge Mr Dykes – & that the persons No 10 to 25 etc are enjoying the lands uninterruptedly since the date of the purchase – The N.L purchasers produced the Nerubem said to have been given by the Zemindar to the ~~Letter Ramaswamy Seven [illegible] given a copy of the Nerubem granted~~ N.L to the Mother of Ramaswamy Seven N.L ~~[illegible]~~ in A.D 1827 alienating the lands. N.L Sheet N.L This shows that the lands were granted to the Mother of Ramaswamy Seven to be enjoyed hereditarily –

– The person No 33 produced ~~a~~ copy of a "Nerubem" or order said to have been issued by the – Zemindar to the Mother of Ramaswamy Seven above alluded to – This ~~also~~ document bears – a date, 3 days previous to that given in the copy of "Nerubem" produced by the persons No 10 to 25 as – having ~~been granted~~ N.L given it to them N.L by Ramaswamy Seven – The Nerubem produced by the person No 33 shows that the lands were granted to ~~the Mother~~ Ramaswamy Seven ~~or~~ himself by the father of the present Zemindar as Jivitam – The persons No 33 & 34 construed the term Jivitam into maintenance allowance N.L a life grant N.L The person No 33 says that he – acquired copy of the Nerubem from the person No 26 of 16, who is a adopted boy – The boy says that the person No 33 asked him to see the Tin Case in which documents are preserved for the Nerubem & that he found it on searching ~~it~~ accordingly – The person No 1 of 16 who is the father of the Mother of the person No 26 says that the Tin case is in his possession since the last 20 – years & that he never found any time ~~on~~ the copy of the alleged Nerubem – Hence it is evident that the persons No 33 34 & 26 of 16 forged the Nerubem to shew that Ramaswamy Seven had no right to sell the lands to the persons No 10 to 25 & to get the transaction of the sale cancelled –

On the whole as there is no dispute on the part of the Zemindar regarding the N.L ~~authority~~ right of Ramaswamy Seven in selling the lands to the persons No 10 to 25 – the matter ended ~~quietly~~ quietly – Even if the Zemindar had raised objection ~~and~~ against the transaction of the sale at the instigation of the persons No 33 & 34 – I do not think it will stand good – because his father gave the lands to ~~the~~ his ~~[illegible]~~ Concubine [illegible] years ago & the lands were sold by Ramaswamy Seven 20 & 12 years ago respectively to the persons No 10 to 25 & the latter are enjoying the lands ever since uninterruptedly – The silence of the Zemindar, so long, is tantamount to relinquish his claims in the lands – It will not be just on his part to plead that he is ignorant of the said Ramaswamy Seven having sold the lands to the persons No 10 to 25 – Under the above circumstances, the claims of the persons No 33 & 34 are rejected, & the sale ~~in~~ & the exchange of lands are confirmed & the – [illegible] referred to Civil Court –

39 Atreni vasachariyar 60	Share holder	(39) 1 Married Daughter
Kaliyappa Villa Madattam		
40 Rangammal 30	Do	(40) 1 Married Daughter
Rameswaram		
41 Veeragammal 30	Do	(41) 1 Husband 1 Married Daughter
Kallangudi		
42 Yatchammal 30	Do	(42) None
43 Subbammal 25	Do	(43) 1 Husband 2 Married Daughter 1 Do Niece

Vide preceding side

Pettah Kollangudy

Valuation

This is one of the most important Darmasanam Villages in the Zemindary of Sivagangai - The Mahajanams are very quarrelsome - The Mahajanams and the persons N 33 & 34 and others who in fewer number produced Registers as follows - in the first instance

Nunjah — 350 Acres

Punjah — 191½ Acres

Total — 541½ Acres

Of which deduct Poramboke Tank bed &c — 156½

Remainder 385

Particulars

Arable Nunjah — 329

Arable Punjah — 56

At the time of the settlement the persons N 33 & 34 of 16 argued that the above account is not true & that they will not sign it unless the measurement Account of Tirdary in AD 1859 of the Village is adopted - The Mahajanams immediately requested me at once to substitute the measurement account for the settlement they produced before me on the ground that it is not an accurate one. The Village was measured correctly by the Mahajanams in AD 1859 when the lands were divided permanently - abolishing the practice of periodical exchange - As all the Mahajanams produced fresh Account at once with their signature, as follows - it is adopted in the settlement.

	A Cents	
Nunjah	386-40	
Punjah	263-20	649-60
Deduct Poramboke		131-60
Remainder		518-00
Particulars		
Wet		350
Dry		168

Sheet No 661

There are 5 Tanks in the Village - Of these one is large & 4 are small in size - They are sound in strength - Independent of these there are two small Tanks - which are in disuse since the last 40 years. The bed of which are cultivated with Dry crops - The 5 Tanks that are in repair are adequate to irrigate the Wet lands in the Village - The large Tank in this Village is fed by the river "Virasalagar" an important hill stream in the District & the minor Tanks are fed by the one large Tank - The Tanks are filled annually - Scarcity of Water is not felt generally - Of the Wet lands 270 Acres are cultivated annually - In full of the remaining 80 Acres, half is cultivated with Dry grain as Manavari & the rest annually with ~~the~~ Dry grain. From the disuse of the two Tanks in question - The Mahajanams ~~[illegible]~~ state that the 80 Acres now cultivated with Dry grain are [illegible] cultivated & [illegible] will be cultivated [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] named Tanks [illegible]

- from 70 to 160 acres are cultivated 2d time — I may safely class 120 [illegible] as wet lands cultivated annually 2d time — There are no long waste lands in Wet-
In Dry lands, most of the lands are cultivated annually [illegible] of the area as Mattukkad — Dry lands are cultivated only once — ~~&~~ Varagu & horse gram
are grown in Dry lands — The people of this part of the country live entirely upon "Varagu grain" No Tobacco is raised in other localities than in backyards —
- No Dry lands are cultivated with wet crops — Soil is of a superior quality generally — The soil contains several ingredients such as "Nasil", Pottel, Serel &c
- Serel is well suited for Dry cultivation in this part of the country. Thus the Village is in flourishing state — The Darmagaram [illegible] settlement is
- surrounded ~~with~~ by several important Ayan Villages — I have no materials to ascertain the average assessment of the adjacent Ayan lands — The statement
- Agramon the 2d side of the first sheet shows the average single crop assessment of the "Ettiyapuram" a Division ~~of~~ in which the Darmagaram
- is situated — The rate is certainly arbitrarily high to some extent though not to its full extent — In the adjacent Ayan Villages of Nagaly & Serumadu
the Dry lands ~~are~~ bear an assessment at 11 As per acre for Varagu crop while the lands grow — Average profits of the Village as per statement of the
- Mahajanam are 1113 Rupees per annum — This is not true this is false — In consideration of all the above circumstances, I form the valuation of
- the Village as follows with the aid of the Mahajanam —

Wet 120 acres cultivated annually twice at 9 Rupees per acre — 1080 — 0
Wet 150 acres cultivated annually once at 6 Rupees per acre — 900 — 0
Wet 80 acres cultivated with Dry crops annually & as Mattukkad at 1½ Rupees per acre — 120 — 0
2100-0-0

- 100 acres of Dry cultivated annually — at 11 As per acre — 68-12
68 acres of Dry cultivated as Mattukkad &c at 8 As per acre — 34 —
102-12-0

I have made the above classification with the aid of the Mahajanam — after consulting with each other — In the first [illegible] of the Register — Total 2202-12-0
- all the [illegible] lands are classed as ~~[illegible]~~ cultivated without entering into the details —

1080
900
1980
120
2100

[illegible] Naidu
[illegible]
2-11-63

P. S. — After completing the settlement of this Village on the 4th October/63, as stated above, the Ex-zemindar, when he was in possession of the zemindary & previous to the decision of the
Privy Council, awarding the zemindary to Muttama Nachiyar, claimed the 28 10/16 Vritties which Ramaswamy Iyer sold to the persons No 10 to 25 of [illegible] — on the ground
that Ramaswamy Iyer had no authority to sell the lands & that these lands were granted to his mother as life grant or to be enjoyed as long as she is alive —
& failed to prove the same — I sent for Ramaswamy Iyer & examined him, he admitted of his having sold the lands to the persons No 10 to 25 & pleaded with
- much cunningness so as to support the claim of the zemindar to the effect that he does not know on what tenure the lands were granted to his mother by the ~~[illegible]~~ Zemindar
zemindar; that he does not know whether he had or had not authority to sell the lands in question; that he sold the lands ~~[illegible]~~ from pressure of private liabilities
& that he ~~did~~ does not know when his mother died & so on — On enquiring the said Ramaswamy Iyer I found that the [illegible] zemindar gave 29 Villages to the family
of Ramaswamy Iyer in AD 1822 to be enjoyed hereditarily, forming ~~[illegible]~~ these 29 Villages as Sub Division & giving the name of the Sub Division

(See next sheet)

~~[illegible]~~

- 4th Sheet of the Darmasanam of Nillangudy -

Istimrar zemindar's Arzee to the Coll. dated 3d October/19
1 From Coll. to Bd 3d March/21
1 From Bd to Coll. 12 do 1821
1 From Coll. to Bd 23d Augt/21
1 From suppt of Coll. 10 Septr/21
1 From Coll. to Bd 20 Octr/21
1 From Bd to Coll. 29 Do/21
1 From Coll. to Board 21 Novr/21
1 From Bd to Coll. 29 Novr/21
1 From Coll. to Bd 23d April/22
1 From Bd to Coll. 27 May/22

From the voluminous correspondence it appears that 29 Villages were given as Sub Division & it was registered in the name of Mattu Ramasing Tever the Elder Brother of the said Ramaswamy Tever – In asking for the Sub Division, the zemindar pleaded that the Elder Brother of Ramaswamy Tever & his brothers ~~are~~ were his ~~[illegible]~~ legitimate sons.

– In his letter dated 3d March 1821, para 2, the Collector states thus – "The person for whom the zemindar is desirous of providing" "is said by him to be ~~an~~ his son, born in marriage, & by others to be his natural son & he bestows the Villages in conformity to section" "~~[illegible]~~ Regulation XXV of A.D. 1802 –. This passage shews how the members of the family of Ramaswamy Tever was treated by the ~~[illegible]~~ Istimrar zemindar – The Elder Brother of Ramaswamy Tever & Ramaswamy Tever himself sold some of the Sub Division Villages to others – In this state of things how is it possible to say that the 28 10/16 Vutties in Nallungudy, the Village in settlement, were given to the mother of the said Ramaswamy Tever without the authority of disposing of the same – The persons No 10 & 25 of 16 produced a Nirubam [illegible] given to them by Ramaswamy Tever as having been granted to the latter by the zemindar. This shews that Ramaswamy Tever had authority to sell the lands.

Register No 500

Sheet No 662

After the arrival of Nattama Nachiyar, I asked her Vakeel, whether she has any claim to the lands – He wrote a remark on the statement of the Village that the Ranee has no Takrar or claim about these Pongoos & that he received orders from his ~~[illegible]~~ employers to mention this to the Deputy Collector – If. Even if the Ex-zemindar remained in possession of the zemindary, his claim will not stand good as it is clear that the lands were granted to the mother of Ramaswamy Tever to be enjoyed hereditarily – Now as the Ranee says that she has no claim to the lands, the matter ends itself – & the lands are registered in the name of the persons No 10 & 25 in proportion of their shares in them –

1 One Venkata Subbyen claims 1/8 Vutties from the person No 1 of 16 on the ground that this is the property of Ranganayakee Ammal, the Daughter of his father's Elder Brother; that she died 18 months ago without leaving any other heirs & that the person No 1 of 16 usurped the lands & sold a portion of them to the Chetties of 16. The person No 1 of 16 says that the father of the deceased had 1 1/2 Vutties in the Village, that of this he gave 3/4 Vutty to the deceased 39 years ago, that he gave 1/2 Vutty to him being his son-in-law, that he gave 1/4 Vutty to his another son-in-law Ramachary about 28 or 29 years ago, & that he & Ramachary sold their lands after enjoying them long time – In proof of this he produced a bill of sale executed to the father of the person No 15 of 16 by the deceased selling her 3/4 Vutty in A.D. 1858 for Pagodas 900 in a written bill of sale on a [illegible] leaf – In this document it is said that she sold her 3/4 Vutty which she had in this Village – The claimant named 3 Witnesses. They stated that the lands were in possession of the deceased up to the date of her death – It is proved by the Mahazarnama that it is true that the father of the deceased gave 1/2 Vutty to the person No 1 of 16 & 1/4 Vutty to Ramachary in gift some 30 years ago & that they enjoyed the 3/4 Vutty & sold it to others – Again the Bill of sale executed by the deceased admitting that she had in the Village 3/4 Vutty only is an additional proof that the Vutties which Venkata Subbyen claims were not in possession of the deceased Ranganayakee Ammal – Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to

18

Register of Devadayam Village of Kallangudi in Amaravaty Taluq of Sivagungo Zemindary in Madura District

Kallangudi

கல்லாங்குடி

Register No. 841

I This is one of the Villages in the Zemindary of Sivagungai. This was granted by Tribbuvana Chakraverty for the support of Shree Tirupa Agateswara Swamy in Kallanguddy. This is a permanent grant. No Potta. The Temple is efficiently kept up. Fire feast & are performed annually.
The Village is entered in all the Accounts in the name of the Temple. No Talk arose about the Area or about the boundaries on the part of the Ranny's Vakeel.
The boundaries now inserted in the vernacular statement correspond to those in the Account of F1269. Nor in the Jamabundy Account of the Zemindar.
The Temple & the Villages appertaining thereto are in possession of the Ranny. The 758 Acres & 85 Cents situated within the said boundaries are registered here.

II The average income of the Village is 396 Rupees per annum as per statement of the Vakeel of the Trustee. This is not true.
The real average income is 700 Rupees per annum as per my Calculation made with reference to the fertility of soil &c

Sheet No. 991

As per Stat of F1211
Nunja Varayedi 67-1-46-95
Excess 57-"-39-90
124-1-86-85
Excess Punja Aurake 1200-"-672-"
758-85
Deduct Poramboke
Varayedi } 22-7-15-75
Aurake 767-"-429-52
445-27
Remainder 313-58
Nunja Varayedi Cultivated } 65-7-45-85
Waste 1-8-"-1-10
Excess do do 34-7-24-15
Total 101-8-"-71-10
Excess Punja Aurake Cultivated } 33-3/4 18-90
Waste 399-1/4 223-58
Total 433-"-242-48
Grand Total 313-58

700
Net

For the support of Temple of Tirupa Agasteswaraswami in Kallangudi
No [illegible] kept

As per Petitioner of Tirupa Pooja on the Villages & Poramboke is 29-3-10
Now Pooja collected on all the Villages belonging to this Temple on lump is 101-3-8
This ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] by Rupees 3-11-9 of the Pooja for all the Villages given in the Petitioner account

Tribbuvana Chakraverti
date is unknown

Acct of F1211
Hindwi Acct of F1223
Boundary Acct of Fields
Aykut Acct of F1263
Board's Regtr of AD 1815

Tirupa Agasteswora Swami

In F1211 Kallangudi Tirupa Agasteswaran Kovil Kallangudi Nunja 67-1-" At 46-95
In Hindwi Acct of do Area do

In F1223 Kallangudi Eswaran Kovil Kallangudi Nunja Varayedi 67-"-" At 46-90
In F1244 none
In F1263 Devaday Kallangudi Nunja Varayedi 82-9-" At 57-85
In Regtr of AD 1815 Kallangudi Eswaran Pagodi in Kallangudi

Kallangudi Tirupa Agasteswaraswami
Trustee Kattama Nachiyar Avergal Ranny of Sivagungo Zemindary
46

To be confirmed under Rule III Clause one Tax Free.

Jummee Jodi for all the Villages belonging to this Temple } 101-3-8
Nos 1361, 1362 & 1363

Swaminatha Row
Recorded
13-6-64

Confirmed on present tenure. One T.D. will be given for this village & Regr Nos 842, 843, 844 held by this Pagoda the Jodi on all of which is fixed in a lump. The particulars of each village will be given on the back of the T.D.
26/7/64

T.D.
994

present remarks
41.