

Large Little
Share Share

Latlu Inarakolam

கா. டி. 6. 10. 19. திரு. 10.

18

LD

Sheet No. 820

As per list of Fr 1211:
Kama - (Vijayadig) - 46-6-31


 Panga Box & p (Panga) 250 — 140 —
110
 Deduct Transport —
 Deduct Tax (Panga) 20 — 11 — 20
 Village site (Box) — 2 — 1 — 12
 Washing ground (Box) — 4 — 2 — 24
 Pond — (Box) — 2 — 1 — 12
 Burial ground (Box) — 1 — — 56

Deduct from the Statement 40 papers
 produced by the Government.

Remaridei	154-86
the Village of Remaridei - (trans- migration) - 15-85	15-85
Pungu - (Kus-kaw) - cultivation	110 1/2 61-88
Waste (Do) - - - - -	110 1/2 61-88
	61-88

1/2 of the village of Pharmsavanam perlen-
 rangai (Kinnagdi) —
 cultivation 22 2 " 15 55
 Pungia — (Kinnagdi) —
 cultivation 110 1/2 61 58
 Kote (Loo) — a —
 110 1/2 55
 Total 148

1 This is one of the Villages in the Zemindari of Ponganga - The entire Village is now held as Darnasaram by the persons of 16 -
From the account of 1721 it appears that half of the Village was granted for the support of Narikudi Chuttnam in Ponganga Zemindari
& the remaining half was granted for the subsistence of one Pongajijem 1013 - In the English account of A.D. 1815 copy of which is forwarded
to the Board of Revenue it is said that this is a Darnasaram Village - ^{But} the Pongas of Darnasaram portion alone. ^{It is half Pongas & it is entered in it -} For the
account of 1723, ^{the entire Village} ~~half of the Village~~ is entered as Darnasaram ^{of Pongas} ~~of Pongas~~ - In the Zemindari Chuttnam & Darnasaram
Debajada Accounts ¹⁷²¹ half of the Village is entered as Darnasaram & half as Chuttnam - But a remark ^{is written in the Zemindari} ~~is written in the~~ ^{is written in the} ~~is written in the~~
Debajada Accounts ¹⁷²³ that the Chuttnam portion of half Village was ^{converted into} ~~was~~ Darnasaram in 1723 - The off Darnasaram
portion of half Village consists of 8 ~~equal~~ shares & the Chuttnam portion of half Village consists of 10 equal Vettes or Pongas. They are enjoyed as
shown in the margin - (The next side) The whole Village is confirmed

[illegible]

To be confirmed under Rule originally held the
 1823 signed under Rule 024 Chatham having
 been alienated
 for alienation -
 German 200 for
 the village 24-13-3 in the understanding
 that the confirmation
 a larger extent both in
 acres - a new little of
 the original boundary
 are at any future
 time proved to have
 been overstepped.
 13/2/65 W.M.
 T-4
 26-5-84
 1624
 Fair copied

Imu

1-7.
5-9.

Day 1-5-6.
 April 4-6-7.

From <u>Fr. 1850</u> to <u>Fr. 1876</u>	Cultivated area in <u>acres</u>	Grass out turn	Of which <u>Hay</u> Dair shares at 45 percent	Average prices of grains	Value of quantity of grain given in Col. 4.	Ratio per Acre
63 m 0	4 — 0	76 m 0	76 m 0	Rs 1 6	Rs 1 6	Rs 1 6
10135 — 5	7094 — 54	74286 — 82	28090 — 60	1 — 8 — 3	41715 — 13 — 4	5 — 16 — 9

(Handwritten notes from page 60)

1/2 of the Kuffays 9 A Kilanda } Leo - (97)
Village 2 Kristia mayus 28 } 1 wife
Remainder 40
1/2 of the Su Ft 10 Langaraka } Leo - (10)
Village 1244 } 1 wife
Dachasam 2 sons
Wangas Dharma Maru Pilloi } 2 Grand
56. } 2 Grand

Vinayadi Saranam
22-3-11 Kattu
A C. Maraku
15-55 lam 11 Adimila } Leo - (11)
Ondurate Wangas Tinn 32 } 1 wife
cut off Vinayadi
44-6-11 } 1 Grand
Ft 12-11 } 1 Grand
Leo-Lo-A C.
31-10 12 Latchuma } Leo - (12)
Su Begu nu Suro 20 } 1 wife
pe 18-15

Sharmasa
nam 13 Kilamega } Leo - (13)
Kattu Tinn 20 } 1 wife
Emarakabud 1 son

Krist 14-1-11 } Leo - (14)
mayus & Tinn

Vide preceding side

As it appears from the ^{Memo} ~~furnish~~ Disputada Account of 1813 that the Chutrum portion ^{of the Village} half was transferred by Darnasaram about 60 years ago - the entire Village is treated now as a personal grant or Darnasaram - It is to be said that the entry of the entire Village as Darnasaram in the English Account of 1815 is a correct one & that the entries in the Accounts of 1811 ^{and} ~~1811~~ half of the Village as Darnasaram & half as Chutrum portion are nominal ones. The Rango Vakeel says, as it appears that the Chutrum portion of half Village was converted into a personal grant in 1813, his client has nothing to say about classing the entire Village as such now in this settlement. The Chutrum is apparently left up - It has several other lands. Hence the entire Village is treated in this settlement as a personal grant. The furnish account of 1813 is bound in a book with that of 1811 viz. the Village consists of 18 ^{as already said} ~~Villages~~ ^{Chutrum} portions of half Village consists of 8 Tulkies & the Darnasaram portion of half Village consisting of 10 equal Tulkies. The lands are divided permanently. Purge of Paper 26-133 is paid equally on 10 Tulkies & 8 Pals respectively. The boundaries of the Village are recorded in the account of 1814. The boundaries now inserted in the vernacular copies correspond to those in the account of 1814. The Rango Vakeel objects to registering here 171 Ams & 10 pints situated within the said boundary recorded in the account of 1814 by reason that there is a "Musham" order dated 1810 (Pranidhar). issued by the Zamindar Gannan Mullu Thiriah Ragunatha Gowry Vallabha. Pringa Todaya Tevar to the Darnasaram, Monneyar Marayavarigen to be affected that the Village was measured in the said year at the request of the Mahajumams of the Village, & found 36 Kallam & 8 Maras of Chel corresponding with 25 Ams & 10 pints) & 52- $\frac{11}{16}$ of Musham of Dry equal to 28 Ams & 90 pints. Blue within the proper limits of the Village that the oxen now added to the said area, of 6 Ams & 111 pints & 10 pints of Dry entered in their vernacular Register are situated within the proper limits of the Village, that they know nothing of what & how much of Dry entered in their vernacular Register are situated within the proper limits of the Village, that they know nothing regarding the measurement said to have been taken place in 1810, & that they have no objection to the following documents of a village.

- showing the proper bounds & size of the entire Village & that the boundaries entered in these two documents corresponds those in the Account of July 1244. - though there ~~is~~ some difference in the wordings between the boundaries given in these documents & those of the Account of 1244 -

A - 1 "Arisama Pattanam" or deed of Piri-money executed by Marudai Parvakkaren to Muttukappan, his son-in-law for his (Marudai Parvakkaren's) Daughter - Dated 1795. This is on a plain paper leaf ³²⁸ This document relates to the Puthuram portion of the Village & in the words it shows that the Puthuram portion of half Village was granted by Marudai Parvakkaren to his Daughter as Piri-money. The said Marudai Parvakkaren was Minister of the predecessor of the Patimmar Jaminadar.

B. ... Deed of gift executed by Muttukappan, son-in-law of Marudai Parvakkaren, to Kristingen, Jathin younger brother of the person N° 3 of 1861 ³²⁸ granting the Puthuram portion of half Village to him in gift. This document is dated 1796. This is on a plain paper leaf.

The above documents contain the boundaries of the Village. The Rang's Vakeel says that as these documents being of an old date, he cannot say whether they are genuine or not. The person N° 3 of 1861 produced copy of the Nirebham order of A.D. 1810 stating that that document is written for him since the last 30 or 35 years or since he attained his majority. Hence the genuineness of the "Nirebham" ~~order~~ or order produced by the Rang's Vakeel is proved.

I see no ground to suspect the genuineness of the documents marked A & B. They are old. The name of the Kristingen to whom the deed of gift of 1796 is entered in the Board's Register of A.D. 1815. The Rang's Vakeel failed to produce ³²⁸ the measurement Account of A.D. 1810 & prove that the Malabarans of the Village encroached upon any of the contiguous Ayer lands. He argues ~~that~~ to take the wordings ³²⁸ in the Nirebham as ~~proof~~ a proof of the Malabarans having encroached upon Ayer lands - to the extent of 6 Annas of 111 Annas & 10 Annas of 111 Annas. I doubt much the accuracy of the measurement of A.D. 1810, even if the Village ³²⁸ would have been measured in the year. I found several discrepancies in the survey measurement conducted under the ³²⁸ able superintendence of Mr. T. Allum in the Ceded Districts. If the measurement ~~was~~ ³²⁸ correct one the Jaminadar would not have permitted the Malabarans to overstep the boundaries of the Village. On the whole as the boundaries of the Village are well defined both in the ~~above~~ documents A & B & in the Account of 1244, & all the lands brought on the Register are in long enjoyment of the Malabarans. Hence I am registered in 171 Annas & 10 Annas entered in the vernacular Register of the Malabarans. All I plead is that the measurement of A.D. 1810 is not an accurate one. The measurers generally don't take pains of measuring accurately the Jungle & Waste lands. They leave this work to chain men whose measurement is either includes ³²⁸ or excludes ³²⁸ the measurement account. There is only one Ayer Village Terjanam contiguous to the Village under settlement.

True & Correct.

II. The persons N° 1 & 2 of 1861 are descendants of the original Granthee & the person N° 3 of 1861 is a descendant of Kristingen who received the half Village said to be in the Puthuram portion, in gift in A.D. 1796. There are others of a recent date. The persons N° 4-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-12-13-14 of 1861 purchased lands in A.D. 1811-1844-1859 for Rs. 290 from one Venkata Somayajee Iyer, a shareholder in the Village. One bill of sale is on a stamped paper leaf, two bills are on plain paper leaf. The person N° 10 of 1861 purchased his lands in A.D. 1863 when they were in public Auction by the Principal Judge & Magistrate Court of Madurai in satisfaction of a decree of A.D. 1861. The ³²⁸ person N° 11 of 1861 was one Purna Tamby Sann who purchased lands ³²⁸ from the person N° 1 of 1861.

III. ... Wet lands depend upon one large Tank. It is in repair. It is fed by a Jungle Stream & by the Waste Water of the contiguous Village. The Tank is filled annually. Scarcity of Water is not felt generally. Navigable & Puriat lands are full water annually in full. Some of the Wet lands are full water annually 2 times. 1/3 of the Wet lands is said to be full water generally 2 times. Wet & Dry soil is of a medium character generally. No garden crops are raised in this Village. The Village is in flourishing state. Harvest is good. The average income of this Village is 124 Rupees per annum as per statement of the Muzdaran. This is not true. The contiguous Upper Village is Jyamin. The average Wet assessment of this Village calculated for a period of 15 years previous to 18270 comes to 7 Rupees per acre. The average Dry assessment varies from 1-2- to 0-7-58 per acre. In consideration of the fertility of soil we I frame the valuation of this Village as follows. The highest rate of Dry assessment is charged for Pulao, which is not grown in this Village.

Wet 31 Acre full water at 7 Rupees per acre — 217 —
 Dry 100 Acre full water at 1 Rupee — 100 —
 Dry 24 Acre Waste land at 1/4 Rupee per acre — 6 —

Total — 323 0-0 —

Received
 25-5-84

Received and Paid

Hand Copied