

D 4836/6
D-2

I This is one of the Villages in the jurisdiction of Turgonga - Of this it was granted for the support of the Chattram of Ludigwan.
by "Mansapa Parvayan", the Minister & predecessor of the Patimran former son of the Village was granted by
Mahab-chivara Rajah who reigned over this part of the country centuries ago - to Rameshadra Parayya
for subsistence - The former is a permanent grant, while the latter is a hereditary grant - Neither of these grants has been
II No talk now about the area or about the boundaries on the part of the Rang's Palace - The boundaries were
inserted in the memorial statement correspond to those in the Account of 1724. Hence the boundaries are confirmed here

of the 20th June 12 parts extracted thereon are registered above

III The Village is omitted by mistake from the English Register of 1785-
was in the Navy's Hall.

requesting A.D. 1875 -
and the Navy's Hall and says that 1/8 of the Slaves sold by the
Christians the 1/8 by the Mahogany men from time immemorial
whatever may be the outcome in some of the Accounts of 1872 -
(See next page) Continued as

(This used side) Confirmed as
recommended
to the Lutheran
Chaplain in
present tenure
in the existing
Jodi of No 34411
18/2/65 RWS

1077
H. L. ...
F. D. No.
1728
Kunachun?
22-10-26.

To be confirmed as Confirmed as
 Place III of grade recommended
 Rule III - for alienation - in one TD on a
 (7/8 Page) 22/22/29.
 10/2/65 10/10
 as ferrous 202-42-10
 1727 10/10
 1727 10/10
 1727 10/10

[illegible]

(Faint handwritten notes and sketches on aged paper)

Separate Polte in re-

^{open}
 Total - 41-68-
 Dry - 160-44-
 Total - 202-12-

of which deduct
 Preamble & Man - } 98-43-

Remains - 104-59-

Particulars -

Wet full water - 34-23-

Dry Waste - 7-41-

41-24-

Pungla full water - 63-35-

- 104-59-

This account is kept in the settlement. The Muzars assure me that they neither cultivated any lands nor placed Wet or Dry

XIII The Mahajanams placed 7 Ann of Wet as waste. They say that from Sade Lands some ridges that they will be full water within one or two years. If that be the case, these are not waste lands. No Sade in dry lands. but the Muzars placed 7 Ann of Wet as Preamble - This is a considerable area. The account for the entire village was prepared by the holders of the Darmasamam portion. The Range Valuel, who is a Valuel of the Preamble of the Preamble has referred carefully all the names of the holders of the Darmasamam - All of them say that 9 Ann of Wet as Preamble are unfit for full water. Some of the Waste lands are full water annually 2nd time - Mangala & Pungla lands are of a superior quality generally. The soil is of red clay. Wet lands are defended upon one large Tank - It is in repair - It is fed by a Pungla Stream & by the waste water of the adjoining Village. The Village is in good state - The average income of the Village of the Preamble portion is 25 Rupees per annum as per statement of the Mahajanams. Nothing is true - & the average of the Village of the Darmasamam portion is 160 Rupees as per statement of the Mahajanams. Nothing is true - The Range Valuel is not uninterested within the holders of the Darmasamam portion - The contiguous Agre Village is Pullatty - The average Wet income of the Agre Village calculated for a period of 15 years from intervening the 1256 & 1270 comes to 8759 per acre. The average Dry assessment is at 0751 per acre. The holders of the Village say that the soil of this Village is not fit to be placed on par with that of the Agre Village - In consideration of the fertility of soil & I frame the valuation of the Village as follows -

Wet 36 1/2 Ann full water at 7 Rupees per acre - 25372--

Wet 5 Ann Sade & Mat 2 Rupees - 10 - 263-12-0

Dry 3 1/2 Ann full water at 13 Rupees per acre - 5196

Total 315-5