Register of Devadayam Village of Karuvakudi &c in the Taluq of Trichinopoly

1802 / 1360

(1) Karuvakudi; (2) Trivambalam; (3) Nedungalam

	(1) Karuvakudi	(2) Trivambalam	(3) Nedungalam
No 1 to enjoying	25/32		25/32
No 2 Do	25/32		25/32
No 3 Do	25/64		25/64
No 4 and 5 and Do	25/64		25/64
No 6 to 8 Do	25/32		25/32
No 9 to Do	7/8		7/8
No 10 Do			1
No 11 Do			1
No 12 to 14 and Do			1/2
No 15 to 18 Do			1/2
Total	4		7

4 Shares

There are 3 Villages in the Jaumsam of Periyanayaki from all the Revenue of which appears that these Villages were granted in satisfaction & the monthly emoluments of the Worshippers of the Temples in the Village of Tiruparavanam. The Worshippers worship Sri Parvathi & Sri Parameshwara the Swami otherwise called Pushpavaneswara Swamy & adorn all the Images in the Temple in addition to decorating the Jewels &c of the Swami. These Worshippers are also known by the name of Sivachariyar, Bhattamaras, Gurukals. They are the principal servants of the Temple. This office of the Worshipper is a hereditary one as long as the holder keeps a free from blemish in his character. Now the Worshippers who are 7 in No are pointed in their duties. These Gurukals do their work by turns as follows.

No 1 works for 6 days.
No 2 do do 6 do
No 3 do do 3 do
No 4 & 5 do do 3 do
No 6 do do 2 do

No 7 works for 2 days.
No 8 do do 2 days.
No 9 do do do 6 days.

Total 30 days = a month. (Vide next side)

Sheet No. 1557

By Register No. 1360

As per account of Fasli 1211

Punja (Virayadi)	211-5-1	147-96	
Excess — (Do)	48-8-5	34-04	
	260 —	182 —	
Punja Excess (Kurukam)	471 —	263-76	
		445-76	
Deduct Poriumpoo			
Punja (Kurukam)	191 —	106-96	
Remainder		338-80	
Deduct Seasaee Inam			
Punja (Virayadi)	3-1-4	2-19	
Remainder		336-61	
Punja (Virayadi)	140 —	98 —	
Waste — (Do)	68-3-5	47-77	
Excess — Do (Do)	48-8-5	34-04	
	256-11-5	179-81	1080 —
Punja — (Kurukam)	220 —	123-20	123 —
Parity waste (Do)	60 —	33-60	9-3-3
Total	280 —	156-80	132-3-3
Grand Total	336-61		1212-3-3

Sheet No. 1557

For the Fasli as per datum hereof

Now None

Acct of Fasli 1211	For Nirvaham	In Fasli 1214	Sri Subramaniam Sthalam
Maratakudi in Punavasal of Fasli 1224 Boundary-wise Nirvaham as per Acct of Fasli 1244	vagaiyar Sri Subramaniam Nadavaiyar Bhatta Kovil Nirvaham gain-village Karuvakudi	Tiruvasal Nirvaham gain-village Karuvakudi	Punavasal to ancient Nirvaham Varshippers Nirvahagalil Bhatter alias Parthasarathy Bhatter 25
Agrahat acct of Fasli 1263	1 Karuvakudi	1 Karuvakudi	Sellabhatter 40
Board Regr for 1815	2 Tiruvambalam	2 Tiruvambalam	Periya Raja Bhatter 45
	3 Nedungalam-wise Punjaivilumpoo	3 Nedungalam	Karpurabhatter 60
	4 Karpura Bhatter	4 Karpura Bhatter	Sunnakanna Bhatter alias Raja Bhatter 50
	5 Sunnakanna Bhatter	5 Sunnakanna Bhatter	Suppabhatter 25
	6 Suppa Bhatter	6 Suppa Bhatter	Periyanayaki 7 Bhatter 60
	7 Periyanayaki Bhatter	7 Periyanayaki Bhatter	Annabhatter 8
	8 Annabhatter	8 Annabhatter	Raja Bhatter 42
	9 Muttusami Bhatter	9 Muttusami Bhatter	64

To be confirmed under Rule III

Nirvaham one Sarvamanyam Free.
(Sd) [illegible]
Examined Sd — Dewan

Nellakudi village is confirmed in favour of the Temple "Pujaris" & the other servants of the Pagoda.
Sd
15/2/05

Sd Sivasubramania Row
Kumbakudi
30-9-04.

To be confirmed under Rule III
(Sd) [illegible]
Examined
Sd Dewan

28 Jan 1906

Gc 2.9.8 16-8-0

Sd Sivasamy
Collector
23/2/06

Register of [illegible] village of Karuvekudi in the Zamindari of Tengenga Zamindari Estate in Madura District

Karuvekudi

Sheet No. 175

Register No. 9 / 5

Jasper sheet of Sq. 1228

Karuvekudi

This is one of the Villages in the zemindary of [illegible] - This is entered as Agraharam in the Account of Fl 1214 as Dharmasanam in other Accounts - The holders of the Village pleaded that this is an ancient Dharmasanam & that the benefits of the Inam Rules may be extended to them. The Revenue Board argued that the being one of the Agrahara Villages the benefits of the Inam Rules may not be extended to the same. Hence the task of deciding whether the Village was or was not deducted from the assets of the Permanent Settlement upon which devolves upon the Commissioner - The Village pays no Patta - It is entered as Dharmasanam in the Manilla Account of Fl 1223 & the English Account of AD 1815 & 17 of which is forwarded to the Board of Revenue - In neither of them the date on which this Village was granted is given - The name of the Grantor is given in form as one Muttu Vadaya Nadha Pariya Vadaya Tavar who seems to have lived long before the Permanent Settlement - In an Account of alleged recent alienations forwarded to the Board in AD 1838 by the then Mr. J. Blackburne, the Village is entered as the one granted in Fl 1214 by Gavury Vellabadi Raya Vadaya Tavar, Dubashee of Zemindar - This Account was prepared from the materials furnished by the Zemindar - However is not accurate - In the Register of AD 1815, which was prepared under the superintendance of Mr. Peter - It is said that the Village was granted by Muttu Vadaya of Nata Tavar who lived long before the Permanent Settlement - I consider that the entries in the English Register of AD 1815 is more trustworthy than in any one - Hence I Register as a Village deducted from the assets for which the Permanent Settlement was made and treat it as such - (Viceroy ade)

To be confirmed under Rule V Clause III Agreement (Rule VII for alienees -)

Peishcush Rs. 63107

Gowd 217/8 = 56 Rupees

Pais Inam both to be declared / Mutt settlement as there is no objection - Arab mirasdars title having been granted before the Decennial Settlement -

1/11/8 [illegible]

Alienation Family - Divided - Lands are undivided - Pay Patta in second

R. Sivarakhana Rao 2

Nunnalade 2-8-64

Dharmasanam Karuvekudi Nadu Kudi area wanting Rayat 110 — A 6 77 — Rayavaram Adi 43-09

Mutta Vadaya alias Periya Vadaya Tavar died in unknown

Sanad of Fl 1211 Rayavaram Adi

Manita sanad of Fl 1223. Boundary sanad of Fl 1240 Board Regr of AD 1815 No Patta

Mr. 8-9, 1870 Class 7 D Rejected

In Fl 1211 Ayen Dharmasanam Karuvekudi area wanting Rayat 110 — A 6 77 — Ayen Dharmasanam Karuvekudi Rayat 110 — A 6 77 — Do Regr of AD 1815 Dharmasanam Karuvekudi Venkata

In Fl 1223 Karuvakudi

1 Nacayanayen alias Dharasa ami Ayen 42 — (1) Wife — Father

2 Sipparaya Ayyen 18 — Do — (2) Father

3 Venkataramayen 10 — Do — (3) Elder brother

4 Venkata Rainayen 50 — Do — (4) Wife & sons

5 Sinnayengar 30 — Grandson of person in Col 15 — (5) Wife

6 Sinnayengar 45 — Son of person in Col 15 — (6) Wife

7 Nacayappa Pillai 35 — (7) Wife, Daughter

Rayat Rayavaram Adi 43-09

Dharmasanam Karuvekudi Nadu Kudi area wanting Rayat 110 — A 6 77 — Rayavaram Adi 43-09

Dharmasanam Karuvekudi Nadu Kudi area wanting Rayat 110 — A 6 77 — Rayavaram Adi 43-09

Dharmasanam Karuvekudi Nadu Kudi area wanting Rayat 110 — A 6 77 — Rayavaram Adi 43-09

Dharmasanam Karuvekudi Nadu Kudi area wanting Rayat 110 — A 6 77 — Rayavaram Adi 43-09

Dharmasanam Karuvekudi Nadu Kudi area wanting Rayat 110 — A 6 77 — Rayavaram Adi 43-09

Lay 3-9-9 — 1-7
Wet 10-13-3 — 5-9

Average Rates of Government Tolls per Acre
Dry 1-5-6
Wet 4-6-1

Average Value of grain of Melwaram or wet land in Kunialaiki Mahimam Consisting of Ayen Villages in the Taluq of Mainad for a period of 15 years

From A.D. 1856 to A.D. 1870	Cultivated area in Acres	Gross out turn	Of which ga-mindar's share at 45 per cent	Average price of grain	Value of quantity of grain given in Col 4	Rate per Acre
H — M — P	A — C	K — M — P	K — M — P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P
474 — — 5	1731 — 84	15227 — 1 — 3	6809 — 2 — 4	1 — 8 — 4	10383 — 11 — 10	5 — 15 — 8

Extract of Ramanathapuram Document in Sivaganga Zemindary.

This document is sent with the Sale for inspection

Register No. 925

Sheet No. 1076

In the body of the Mortgage bond it is read & written plainly that 5 Veys & 8½ Acres of Land were mortgaged to the Grand Father of the person N° 7 of 16 for 5 years. Below the signature of Mokhtyarnama &c, it is written newly at the foot of the document in one corner that the 3/4 Thirty of Gopalayen, a Father in law of the complainant, has been mortgaged in lieu of the Tomb property of the Village. This is not consistent with the subject in the body of the document, & it is written newly. Hence the foot remarks are newly added ones. The plaintiff produced a deed of division of property dated 1826 - Exhibiting shewing that his Father in law & his brothers divided the lands in the Village among themselves. This document being of a date previous to the bill of sale executed by his Father in law to Sawmy Nadha Pillai who sold the 3/4 Thirty to the Grand Father of the person N° 7 of 16, it is of no use. It appears that one Mutter sued the person N° 7 of 16 in the Moonsiffs Court of Sivaganga for 3/16 Thirty by reason that he mortgaged the 3/16 Thirty to the person N° 7 of 16 sometime ago, that he purchased 1/2 Thirty from the Father in law of the Claimant & released 1/8 Thirty & the Thirty in mortgage from the said Father in law of the Claimant. The person N° 7 of 16 produced a suit that the Plaintiff (Mutter) was enjoying 6/16 Thirty viz 1/4 Thirty by purchase & 1/8 Thirty in Mortgage, that he sold them 1/4 Thirty & the remaining 1/8 Thirty is in mortgage with him & that he would transfer the 1/8 Thirty to the Ramnad Subbedar to whom it belongs. Accordingly the 1/8 Thirty is registered here in the name of the sons of the Ramnad Subbedar (N° 2 & 3 of 16). In the bill of sale executed by Mutter to the person N° 7 of 16 viz d 1847 he admitted that he sold to the latter the 1/4 Thirty when he argued in the Village by justice. The said Mutter never appeared for the settlement. The servant word that the Claimant Subbedar will represent his Case. He never even gave a Vakalatnama to Subbedar. On the whole as Mutter's Claim proved to be fictitious one, it is rejected. He has no enjoyment of the land. The bill of sale executed by Mutter is on a plain Cadjan Leaf. It appeared to be genuine one. by some of the Villagers who attested it. The Claimant Subbedar & Mutter having connived with each other brought this fictitious complaint. The Claim of Subbedar also is rejected, for 3/4 Thirty being fictitious one.

Valuation

Wet lands in the Village depend upon one Tank & moderate supply. It is in repair. It is fed by Temple Streams & by the Waste Water of the adjoining Villages. The Tank is filled annually. No scarcity of Water is felt for the lands cultivated annually. The Villagers say that 80 Acres of Wet are cultivated annually - ones. Some of these lands are cultivated also 2 times. The Vakeel of the person N° 7 of 16 who prepared the statement of the Village first, produced first a false account concealing much land. Ultimately the other shanbogues brought every thing into account. The Vakeel himself avoided his account. Soil is of a superior quality generally. The Villages are flourishing. It is noted for fertility of soil &c. The Mokhtyarnama at the suggestion of the Vakeel of the person N° 7 of 16 states that the average income of the Village is 80 Rupees per annum. This is quite false. This is not any small portion of the real income. The Range Vakeel who inspected the Village often gave very good report. The contiguous 4 Villages are Kalyanaveda Tamarakudi, Kandanikudi, Kandanikudi, the average Wet assessment of these Villages comes to 8 & 5 per acre respectively. The average of these Villages in aggregate comes to 6½ Rupees per acre. The average Dry assessment varies from 1-14 - 0-1-2 per acre. In consideration of the fertility of soil, I frame the valuation of the Village as follows.

Note: The Villagers assert that even when unfavourable seasons the gaining of the cultivation &c.	Wet 80 Acres Cultivated at 6 0 per pa	480	
	Wet 43½ Acres Waste at 10	4 12	484 12
	Dry 3 Acres at 1-8 per acre		4 8
	Dry 10½ Acres Waste at 4 As per acre		2 10
			681-4-0

A. Lawrence Asst