

Wt 4-6-1

A

6 Anna suoni yen 18 } 20 —	(8) 1 wife 6 Brothers
9. Subharana yen 58 } 20 —	(9) 1 wife 4 sons 4 Daughters
10. Appattu rayen alias ma halinga mayen 55 }	(10) 1 wife 3 sons 2 Daughters 1 Grandson
11. Andappan setti 30 }	(11) 1 wife 1 son 1 Daughter
12. Narayana setti 28 }	(12) 1 wife 1 son

Three preceding see



Plentiful paper - Transactions proved to be bona fide - enjoyment proved -

[illegible]

(Will not sell)

(Fair copy)

Registered
No. 253

Sheet
No. 313

The persons A 4-5-6 & 7 of 1816 plead that the agreement was not executed by Muttigen (alleged mortgager) & that if the document is genuine, the plaintiff
N 1 & 2 of 1816 must to have remained as long as lent nor have received some loans to them, & they went to the date of the said agreement.
The plaintiff then produced the Karamal account & listing the shares in with the names of the shareholders with the names of the fields composing each Pongor
of A D 1831 & 1843, which are on 6 plain paper leaves with the field & also Grammatkosen of A D 1843 showing the names of the shareholders in the Village & the number
Further held by them, with the details of each transfer that took place by sales & gifts to the persons A 4-5-6 & 7 of 1816 again plead that the said Karamal account
of 1831 & 1843 contain the date in the plain writing of the person N 1 of 1816 - The person N 1 of 1816 says that the writing said to be his is not his really his own
Against the person A 4-5-6 & 7 of 1816 they & their forefathers purchased 7 Villages in A D 1815-1819-1820-1823-1825-1829-1831 & 1838-
from the father of the person A 4-5-6 & 7 of 1816 & from one Nayalanga Tawae of Muttikamachy, who purchased land previously
from the descendants of the Ogl Grantee & produced 11 ^{old} bills of sales, 9 of which are on plain paper leaves & 2 on stamped paper leaves -
They again pleaded that of the 7 Villages, the Villages were sold to the person N 3 of 1816 & 9/16 to the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 - & that the remaining 1/16 of the person
in their possession since the date of the purchase - The person A 4-5-6 & 7 of 1816 further pleaded that they are ^{old} paying the Pongor of the Village of 37-8 to the person
N 1 & 2 of 1816 after the forefathers used to pay to the same forefathers of the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 for the other lands then in the possession of the person N 1 & 2 of 1816
that the person is paid to the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 under the orders of the person since the last half century & that the person directed to pay the
Pongor to the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 as they perform certain ceremonies during Dasara festival. ^{old} The person A 4-5-6 & 7 of 1816 produced hand leg
writing containing 53 receipts granted for the payment of Pongor by the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 to the person N 1 & 2 of 1816, in A D 1831-1832-1833-1834-1835-1836-1837-
1838-1839-1840-1841-1842-1843-1845-1846-1847-1848-1849-1850-1851-1852-1854-1855-1856-1857-1858-1859-1860 & 1861 - Further the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 received it is said
that the Village for which the Pongor is paid is the property of the person A 4-5-6 & 7 of 1816 or in French it is said "Tengel Pongor" The person N 1 & 2 of 1816 further admit the genuineness of the
receipts & plead that all the bills of sales are forged ones - They said that the bills of sales of A D 1823 & 1825 are actually Pottabaramina falling of the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 & by
Nayalanga Tawae given, the person who purchased previously from the descendant of the Ogl Grantee, executing bills of sales on two stamped paper leaves selling 1/16 Village
are also forged ones - Though there are no witnesses to prove the genuineness of the said documents, ^{old} it is proved by the receipts granted by the person N 1 & 2 of 1816 & by
forefathers, that the transaction in question are bona fide & that the documents are genuine ones - With regard to the agreement alleged to have been executed by the
father of the person A 4-5-6 & 7 of 1816, I cannot but mention here that the I suspect the genuineness of the said agreement, because several papers are introduced by further
in several cases, ^{old} the officials of the person into remembrance, the system of preserving them being very ^{old} - Again if it were true, it is at the option of the
Defendants to refuse or to act upon it - because it was executed in A D 1827 or 36 years ago - & because some of the father were sold to the defendants by the forefathers of
the plaintiffs - Hence the agreement is of no use & deprive the Defendants from their legal proper shares in the Village - Hence the claim is rejected - & the party is re-
fused. The receipts are sent with this for the inspection of the Receiving Officer - Bills of sales are also sent with this -
The plaintiffs are paid in ready money by the person at the proper months for their services during the Dasara festival - The salary was fixed on the ground -
that the plaintiffs have no land & no other means - With regard to Pongor, I must say that the person has right in it - He may allow the plaintiffs to enjoy it as
as he likes & appropriate it for his own use when he thinks proper to do so - because the person transferred his collection of Pongor to the plaintiffs in favour
Hence I claim the Pongor of 37-8 - as the person's Pongor -

(Vice-mutual)

(Fair copy)

D. The person N^o 1 of 1866 claims again the lands entered opposite to the Woman N^o 3 of 1866 who is her younger sister. It is proved
 that she got only from the foregoing five acres more, that she purchased $\frac{14}{16}$ of the land from the Mahajans about 20 years ago. From her father's
 property & that she is enjoying it ever since. Again it is proved that she acquired the remaining lands from her father about 15 years ago -
 as she lost her husband in her youth. The Mahajans & the brother of the person N^o 1 admit the transaction. Hence the claim is rejected & the
 party is referred to find fault. The person N^o 1 of 1866 produced a document to show that an agreement of the division of property between himself & the
 person N^o 2 of 1866. It is true that the $\frac{14}{16}$ of the land were divided. The person N^o 2 of 1866 says that his brother N^o 1 of 1866 received it improperly & that
 he is now in possession of the land. The person N^o 1 of 1866 says that he is now in possession of the land. The person N^o 2 of 1866 says that he is now in possession of the land.
 The person N^o 1 of 1866 says that he is now in possession of the land. The person N^o 2 of 1866 says that he is now in possession of the land. The person N^o 3 of 1866 says that he is now in possession of the land.

Tabernacle

Vapour

III. --- The lands depend upon a Tank of moderate size. They are in repair. They are fed by Lumpy Stream. They are fed also by the Waste Water of the Agri Village of Karakulam. The latter is fed by one of the branches of the stream of Kallan. The Tanks are fed annually. Security of Water is not much felt. The Chittagunams say that the Wet lands (classed as waste) are partly, Matted and partly waste & that all these may be cultivated at once if the Tanks are improved. There is no waste of a large extent in the Village. The I find from the individual statement of the Chittagunams. Dry Waste is of long uncultivated lands. Some of the Wet lands are furthered annually 2^d times. No Tambore is raised. Wet soil is of a mixed character generally. The average income of the Village as per statement of the Chittagunams is 150 Ropes per annum. This is not true. The contiguous Agri Village is Karakulam. The average wet income of the Village is about 200 Ropes per annum. The Chittagunams say that the lands of the Dammassunams were cultivated may be classed as far better than the contiguous Agri Village in fertility. The Village is in good state in consideration of the fertility of soil. In I find from the statement of the Village as follows.

Oct 40 been full time at 6 of paper Ave 24
 Oct 7 been back at 1 of paper Ave 7 247
 Day 4 of been back at 1 of paper Ave 1-2
 Total 248

Lat 2687-

Reverend
307 1/2

Richardson & Co.

(Fair copy)