Register of Dharmasanam Village of Kurundangulam – [illegible] Taluq of Sivagunga Zemindary in Madura District –

No. 4 Register No 966

Kurundangulam –

குருந்தங்குளம்

Sivaganga
Madura D

I This is one of the Dharmasanam villages in the Zemindary of Sivagunga. It was granted by Muttu Bodoorno Rajah to Perumalayyengar & others of Nana Gotra & Nana Sutra. It is a hereditary grant. No [illegible] There is uninterrupted possession of its holders since the date of the grant – This Village is entered as Dharmasanam in all the Accounts – The [illegible] about the Area or about the boundaries on the part of the Rajah Vakeel – The boundaries now inserted in the vernacular statement correspond to those in the Account of F1246 – and the boundaries [illegible] of the 115 Acres & 83 cents situate therein are registered here. The boundaries of the Village are inserted also in the Account of F1223 – The boundaries given in the Account of F1226 & 1246 are said to be one & the same on the spot though there is some difference in writing. The land ~~[illegible]~~ is divided permanently 40 years ago.

II This Village consists of 12 equal Pattees. They are enjoyed as shown in the margin. Poruppu is paid on the number of Pattees equally & permanently.

III The persons of col. 16 are not any way related to the Original Grantee. They are aliences.

IV The ancestors of the persons No 1 to 7 of col 16 purchased the lands entered opposite their names in A.D 1766 – 1765 – 1804 & 1816 – from one Narayanaiyengar, Anantanarayanaiyengar, Sreeranga Iyengar & Vijaya Deva Iyengar – Four bills are on palmyra leaves – [illegible] to prove the genuineness of the documents as they are said to be of uncertain date – The persons No 8 to 13 of col 16 – [illegible] never offered though summons were issued to them respectively. The persons No 8 to 13 of col 16 say that the ancestors of the persons No 8 to 13 purchased their lands from certain shareholders in the Agraharam long ago & that bill of sale was lost (Vernacular)

	Shares acquired by purchase		
	Supported by document	Unsupported by document	Total
[illegible]	4	"	4
do	2	"	"
do	64	"	64
	192		192
do	64	"	64
	192		192
do	64	"	64
	192		192
	"	"	"
[illegible] 3 to 13 do	"	2	2
Total	10	2	12

Sheet No 1130

[illegible]
Nanja Poraydu 40 6 4 27 33
[illegible] do 5 " " 2 50
45 6 4 31 83
[illegible] Punja Tirvai 160 " " 84 "
115 83

Poramboke
Road of [illegible] 10 " " 5 60
Village site do 3 " " 1 68
[illegible] do 1 " " 56
Burning ground do 2 " " 1 12
[illegible] do 33 " " 18 48
49 " " 27 44
[illegible] Remainder 88 39
Nanja Poraydu 1 12½ 1 31
87 08

Nanja Poraydu Cultivable 38 8½ 27 02
[illegible] do do 3 6½ 2 41
do do Waste 1 7½ 1 09
5 " " 3 50
Total 43 22½ 30 52
[illegible] Punja Tirvai Cultivable 40 " " 22 40
do do Waste 61 " " 34 16
101 " " 56 56
87 08

[illegible] from the [illegible] papers produced by the Inamdars.

Register No 966

212-2-

[illegible] espr Sthanam Sheet 1226 & 1246 show the same	Muttu Bodoorno Rajah date is unknown	Acct of F 1211 Acct of F 1223 Boundary Acct of F 1246 Dharmasanam Register of 1816	Perumal Iyengar & Nana Gotram	Acct of F1211 Dharmasanam Kurundangulam Nanja Poraydu 40 6 4 27 33 In Account of Perumal Iyengar & others
Acct of F1223 Dharmasanam Kurundangulam Nanja Poraydu 40 6 4 28 33				

1 Sreenivasa Iyengar 45 – 2 Ananta Krishnaiyengar 40 – 3 Ananta Charyar 34 – 4 [illegible] 40 – 5 [illegible] 46 – 6 Rangayyan 30 – 7 [illegible] 50 – 8 [illegible] 32 – 9 [illegible] 25

Ab (1) 1½ Pattees – Ab (2) 1 Pattee Brother – Ab (3) 1½ Pattee – Ab 1 Pattee Daughter – Ab – Ab 1½ Pattee – Ab 1 Pattee – Ab (8) 1 Pattee – Ab (9) 1 Pattee

[illegible] family [illegible]

To be confirmed under Rule III – permanent Quit rent 35 – 9 – 6 –

Confirmed as recommended on a Q.R. of Rs 64 – 10/11/74

Quit rent 64 – 8 –

[illegible]
1210

[illegible] Resumed 1320 [illegible]

Rates of Government Salogs per Acre

Max Min

Dry 3-9-9 " 1-7

Wet 10-13-3 " 5-9

Average rates of Government Salogs per Acre

Dry 1-5-6

Wet 4-6-1

Average Value of grain of the worm on wet land in Koranjedi Magánam consisting of Ayen Villages in the Talug of Palani for the period of 15 years —

A

Fuslies 1256 to 1270	Cultivated area in acre	Gross outturn	Of which Zemindar's Share at 45 per cent	Average prices of grain	Value of the quantity of grain given in col 4	Rates per Acre
G Ms A	A C	G Ms A S	G Ms A S	R A P	R A P	R A P
3566-3-3	2496 — 37	25227-11-3	11085-11-"	1-7-9	16487-5-"	5-9-9

10 Subramaniyamsetti 20 } Al (10) 1 Wife

11 Nágamsetti 15 } Al (11) none

12 Venkata Chalamsetti 46 } Al (12) 1 Wife 2 sons

13 Ranjam Setti 35 } Al (13) 1 Wife 2 sons

Vide preceding side —

IV The holders of the Village say that the family of the orig Grantee is extinct — They produced receipts ~ said to have been granted by the zemindari servants for the payment of the Poruppu in A D 1801 – 1802 – 1803 – 1844 – 1845 & 1861 – These receipts are of not of much use as they contain no names of Mahazanams but it is said therein that they were granted to the Mahazanams – Again I think that the persons of No. 16 – having possession of ~~[illegible]~~ these receipts which are said to be genuine by the Rangi Vakeel, ~~[illegible]~~ viewed as a proof of their having right in the Village – None of the zemindari accounts show ~~[illegible]~~ who are the proper owners of the Village – If the Village were in possession of the persons of No. 16, some of their names would be have been inserted in ~~the~~ any of the accounts of all – This is not the case – Hence I doubt the genuineness of the bills of sales – On the whole ~~[illegible]~~ to disprove there are no materials ~~[illegible]~~ to prove or disprove the title of the present holders of the Village – It is proved that they are in possession of the Village but there is nothing to shew ~~[illegible]~~ confidentially how & when they acquired it – Under these ~~[illegible]~~ dubious circumstances, I recommend to confer the village on 1/4 of assessment on the persons of No. 16 —

Valuation —

V — Wet lands in the Village depend upon one Tank of moderate size – It is in repair – It is fed by a Single Stream – The Tank is filled ~~[illegible]~~ annually – Scarcity of Water is not felt generally – The Mahazanams classed 29 1/2 Acres of Wet & 22 1/2 Acres of Dry as cultivated lands and the rest as waste viz 1 Acre of Wet & 36 Acres of Dry – They say that the Dry waste lands are of about 10 years uncultivated lands & that they are fit to be cultivated with Dry crops within the next 10 years – This is not true altogether – Some of the Wet lands are cultivated annually 2d time – Nanjah & Punjah lands are not of a very superior quality – Soil is of red clay description – No garden crops are raised in the Village – The Village is in pretty good state – The average income of the Village is 104 Rupees per annum as per statement of the Mahazanams – This is not true – The contiguous Ayen Village is Sevalattur – The average wet assessment of the Village calculated for a period of 15 years previous to F 1270 comes to 6 – 7 – 2 per acre – The Dry assessment is at 1 ~~[illegible]~~ per Acre over all the lands indiscriminately – The Mahazanams say that the ~~[illegible]~~ soil of the Village is somewhat

(+) inferior to that of the contiguous Ayen Village – In consideration of the fertility of soil &c I frame the valuation of the village as follows —

	R A P
Wet 29 Acres cultivated at 6 Rupees per —	174 — —
Wet 1 Acre & 52 cents Waste at 1 Rupee —	1 – 8 – 0
	175 – 8 – 0
Dry 30 Acres cultivated at 1-0 per —	30 —
Dry 26 Acres & 56 cents waste at 4 As per acre —	6 10 – 0
	36 10 0
Total	212 – 2 – 0

Kunnakudy 13/10/66 }

[illegible] Rao

Nivagam

(8)