

no 1 is enjoying	a	6	1	6
no 2 do do	a	a	1	1
no 3 to fare do	a	1	a	1
no 4 do do	a	a	1	1

Tablet - 7 - 2 - 9 -

Sheet No. 1078

Register No 927

1 These are the 3 Damnoosam Villages in the Pannagang of Punguys - They were granted by Pterasill Cawoni Masha balemia Rajah to one Parana as aomi. Luroa Rajah Pany for subsistence - These are hereditary grants. They are in uninterrupted possession of the present holders since the date of the grants. They have no Pottas. They were lost. Both these Villages are entered in lump in all the Pottas by the holders thereof. The lands of these two

Accounts. These Villages are situated country near to each other - They are treated as one Village. The Villages were divided into 9 equal Villages - Pompei is paid in lump. In the Patimara Account also one number is given to both 3 Rivers Villages. No talk was about the Area or about the boundaries on the part of the Rangis Taluk. The boundaries now inserted in the 22d June 1901.

Littles. They are enjoyed as stew in the margin. The leaves are undried or Marsh Kalist.

II. ... New Allegis consist of Geyser ...
 ... This system is ... to that of ...
 ... is usually & permanently ... (This must also)

[illegible]

(Faint handwritten notes at the bottom of the page)

06-20
Ingga
2-5-4

date
unclear
Board Rep

are pp 7
1944

Masawan Karna
Kalam Kolam
Manya Manya

Maina Madurei
Pria Karnasin } No.
R/Mai 20 }

(2) 1 matter

Cash 20% = 60 Rupiah

7-7-"
 reg
 1875
 Kiraydi Kiraydi Kudarappuli
 54- " 54- "
 A Co A Co 30 Kiraydi } 260 - (3)
 27-80 27-80 7-11 Kiraydi } 260 - 2 Matuso
 f

Punga Punga Kasi Livena
 (Kasikam) (Kasikam) II
 129 2/3 139 3/4 4 Pannayav - (4) -
 P. L. S. R. 2
 10/15/67

[Handwritten notes on lined paper:]

A 6 A 6
78-05 78-05 alias Lappayge } 20 - 1 marker
Total Total Livein - 5
A 6 A 6 (5)

[To the right, on another piece of paper:]

Kenneth
19 & 84

115-85 115-85 5 children born } 26 — 1 Wife
In Iowa Lesson 25 } 2 Springer
to each 1 Nage'swa } Brothers
100 100 100 100 100 100 } (6) —
Family Divided

5— 700

[illegible]

(Lanang & Nagalingay } So - 1 wife
Madakot Lwin 32 } 1 son
tae and Anabulan } 1 daughter-in-law

D. B.

Mainan & Reinans Luun } (B)
 holam & Reinans Luun } 1 Wife
 areawon & Reinans Luun } 1 son
 35 } 2 Daughters

The *Allegory*
of the *Allegory*

Rates of Government
 May 3-9-9
 Oct 10-13-3

Rates of Government
 May 1-5-5
 Oct 4-6-1

name
 Madakotai
 and Kara
 Maholam
 Kungarua
 ragan
 for

III The present holders of the Village are not descending, - of Tralal
 They are alien.

IV The person of the person No 1 of 16 says that his client purchased
 3 Vutties in A.D. 1852 for Rupees 2450 from one Jami Nissa Pillai & by whom
 they were purchased previously in public auction in 1851 for Rupees 2450
 when they were sold by the all owners of the village in satisfaction of the debts
 which were due in suits No 369 of 1849 & 238 of 1850 on the plea of the said Jami
 against one Mapula Tenny alias Arumuga Tami, creditor of Tambi's army
 Pillai. The Vuttai again states that his client purchased the remaining 3 Vutties
 from one Appasaraman in A.D. 1857 for Rupees 3200 that the seller purchased
 them previously from Rupees 3300 from one Arumuga Tami in A.D. 1857.

Bill of sales of 1852 & 1857 are on stamped paper leaves -

II The person No 2 of 16 says that his ancestors purchased the 3 Vutties in the Village some time
 centuries ago, but of which one Vutty was sold ^{to another} ~~to another~~ was granted in gift to some of the shareholders
 in the Village retaining ^{the} Vutty in possession of ^{his} family. He produced receipts granted to him by the
 Village & the family of servants from a series of years for the one Vutty which he is now enjoying
 Transaction proved true & correct - Enjoyned proved -

III The person No 3 of 16 are common. Their ancestors purchased the one Vutty
 entered opposite to their names in A.D. 1847/1848 for Rupees 668 - from one Serukameswaram
 alias Tamiyarayan; Tambiarayan alias Tamiyarayan & Rajeswarayan or descendants of the
 Cpl Grantee. Their bills are on plain paper leaves -

IV The person No 8 of 16 just prepared a statement inserting therein that his father purchased the
 - one Vutty entered opposite to his name in public auction - & disappeared after producing it -
 The other shareholders say that the one Vutty ~~which~~ ^{was} rented to the person ~~the~~ No 8 by purchase -
 & that he is enjoying it since long - They are unable to say when, by whom & for how much the was ^{rented}.

V The family of the Cpl Grantee is extinct -

IX One Mohammed Abdul Raza ^{of Marattayam} claims to 3 Vutties from the person No 1 of 16 by reason that
 he purchased them in A.D. 1846 for Rupees 2100 from one Arumuga Tami & that bill of sale is on a stamped paper leaf
 The Vuttai of the person No 1 of 16 says that his client purchased the 3 Vutties in A.D. 1857 for Rupees 3200 from one Appasaraman
 & by whom they were ~~previously~~ ^{previously} purchased in the same year from Arumuga Tami for Rupees 3300 as shown in the
 IV of his Register - Bill of sale is on a stamped paper leaf - that the 3 Vutties are in possession of client & that the claim
 of Mohammed Abdul Raza is a fictitious one - The Vuttai produced another ^{copy} of the Decree ^{of the Court} (see next page)

Average Value of grain of Meluaram in wet land in Malakka hamam
 Consisting of 1000 Villages in the Taluk of Kattaraman Kattar
 for a period of 15 years

From A.D. to A.D.	Cultivated area in Acres	Grain tunes	Of which minerals at 45 per cent	Average prices of grain	Value of grain per tune in Rs	Rates per Acre
1795-1800	1757-1800	51699-4	22986-5	1-7-4	25301	2-7-6-9

Sheet
No. 1079

in suit N° 680 of 1857 of the Moosaffi Court of Serangaya - The results of my enquiry ^{into the sharehold} into the sharehold of the Village go to prove that these 3
were originally the property of one Arumuga Tamen, but the Tamen mortgaged them to the claimant Mohommad Abdul Rader Markayer, but the Markayer
mortgaged them to Arumugabellam Vetti; but the Vetti ~~and~~ sued Markayer for the recovery of the mortgage sum as the Markayer failed to redeem the mortgage
within a stipulated period. that the Pongors were sold in ~~the~~ satisfaction of the decree in the suit N° 100 of 1858 of the Judge of the late Moosaffi Pudukottai
that in this auction the ^{the mortgagee's} right of the 3 Pongors were purchased by one Sani Nodha Pillai; that in the meantime the original owner, that is Arumuga Tamen
~~and~~ sold them to one Appadharanayagam, who sold them to the person N° 1 of 1857 that the person N° 1 of 1857 is enjoying the 3 Pongors ever since -
The Decree in N° 680 of 1857 shows that this suit was brought by the ~~person~~ ^{on which} person N° 1 of 1857 against the said Arumuga Tamen & Appadharanayagam -
for the recovery of $\frac{1}{4}$ out of $\frac{3}{4}$ that is purchased by him ~~as~~ by reason that the Defendants, preventing him from enjoying the same, that the Arumuga Tamen
admitted before the Court of his having sold the 3 Pongors to Appadharanayagam, but Appadharanayagam admitted of his having sold 3 Pongors to the person N° 1 of 1857 -
& that the Court ^{it} ~~admitted~~ ^{admitted} that the $\frac{1}{4}$ Pongor which was in dispute to the person N° 1 of 1857 - From this it is evident that the claim preferred by the Mohommad
Abdul Rader Markayer is a fictitious one. The alleged seller ~~Arumuga Tamen~~ Arumuga Tamen is responsible for the sum for which the claimant says
he has purchased the 3 Pongors of the transaction were bona fide - The claimant has no enjoyment of the lands. Hence the claim is rejected; the 3
Pongors are registered in the name of the person N° 1 of 1857 & the claimant is referred to the civil Court -

X----- Again, one Vellamswamy Tamen of learning to 3 Pongors ^{of the} ~~of the~~ ^{from the person N° 1 of 1857} from the person N° 1 of 1857 by reason that, his eldest son purchased the 3
Pongors in 1828 from the person N° 1 of 1857 Raykannadha Gowry Vallabha Periya Vozaya Tamen; but out of this one Pongor was sold, three
Pongors are in possession of his step Mother & the remaining 3 are in his possession up to this day - The Vellam of the person N° 1 of 1857 pleads that the claim is
quite fictitious one & that he neither the claimant nor his step Mother has any share in the Village; that his eldest purchased the 3 Pongors from
the Tamen Nodha Pillai in A.D. 1852 for Rs. 2450 & enjoying them ever since & that the said Tamen Nodha Pillai purchased them previously
in A.D. 1857 in public auction of the Moosaffi Court of Serangaya - The claimant Vellamswamy Tamen failed to prove his claim. The
of the person N° 1 of 1857 is proved satisfactorily & the 3 Pongors are in his possession - Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to the civil Court.
These 3 Pongors are registered in the name of the person N° 1 of 1857 -

Valuation

XI Wet lands in this Village depend upon two Tanks of moderate size. They are in repair - They are fed by a single stream of water - They are fed by the
Waste Water of the adjoining Villages. The Tanks are filled annually. Scarcity of Water is not felt generally. The holders of the Village of about 55 Acres of land &
78 Acres of dry as waste fallow lands and 21 Acres of Wet as waste. They say that the Waste lands of 21 Acres are of long ancient lands fit to be cultivated early
or within 4 or 5 years. Some of the Wet lands are cultivated annually 2 times - One an average $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{5}$ of the Wet area is used to be cultivated three or four double crops -
Nanjath & Pungath lands are of a superior quality - The soil is of red clay. This soil is considered to be well adapted for ^{as the best of the business party} agricultural pursuits -
The Village is in flourishing state - Two or three Acres are cultivated with garden crops - The average income of the Village ^{as the best of the business party} is about 3000 Rupees per annum. There are no other Villages contiguous to this - The Agri-
cultures of Parangudi & Tirangudi are at a distance of about 3 or 4 miles from this Village. The average Wet assessment of these Agri-
cultures for a period of 15 years previous to 1827 comes to 7-5-0 or 8-5-11 per acre - The average Dry assessment of the Village is about 1-1-0 per acre - The highest rate of Dry assessment is charged for full
cultivation is situated varies from 5-0-0 to 13-0-0 per acre. The highest rate of Dry assessment is charged for full
(1/2 per acre)

S. S. Prabhakara Rao Esq.