Register of Jivitam Village of Marani ~~in the Taluq of~~ Sivaganga Zemindary in Madura District

Marani

Register No. 23

Sketch No. 29

This is a Village granted for the support of the Roman Catholic Church at Sarganai, Dharmasanam Village in the Zemindary of Sivaganga. This Village is entered as Divatanam in the Talumar Account of F 1211 - while it is entered as Divatanam Village or in other words the Village belonging to the Church in question. There is in reality an endowment made for the support of the Church just previous to the Permanent Settlement. The Village is omitted from the Board's Register of A.D 1815 by some mistake or other. The Maratta Account of F 1223 does not mention Village had a Patta on copper plate. The Vakeel of the Gentleman of Olb says that it was once lost - No Tahsildar about the area nor about the boundaries which correspond to those in the account of F 1244, on the part of the Zemindar. Hence the area of 271 Acres & 95 Cents is conferred here. The Church is efficiently supported. The endowment is supported by several Accounts - The excess is within the proper limits of the Village.

Well does depend upon our large Tank - It is fed by "Sarugani Vaippar". The Tank is in repair. It is filled annually - No security of Water is felt - Soil is of a mixed character generally - Some of the Lands are cultivated 2d time - Varibie is raised in 5 or 6 Acres. Average profits of the Village as per statement of the Vakeel of the Trustee is 1031-4 - There is a Gani & reed mounie - In Talumar Account of F 211, Poruppu of Pallis 109-62 is entered for this Village - This is remitted by Government 100 years ago - Now the Zemindar has

Remarks Poruppu -

As per Acct of F 1223							
Nanja Varayidi	90	—	63	—			
Excess do	22-7	—	15	75			
	112-7	—	78	75			
Punja Kuruku	275	21/32	154	42			
Excess do	69	11/32	38	78			
	345	—	193	20			
	271	95					
Deduct Poramboke							
Bed of Tank Kuruku	50	—	28	—			
Tank do	4	—	2	24			
Village site do	15	—	8	40			
Temple site do	4	—	2	24			
	73	—	40	88			
Remainder	231-07						
Nanja Varayidi Cultivated	90	—	63	—			
Excess do do	12-7	—	8	75			
do do Waste	10	—	7	—			
	22-7	—	15	75			
Total	112-7	—	78	75			
Punja Kuruku Cultivated	10	—	6	80			
Waste	262	—	146	72			
Total	272	—	152	32			
Grand Total	231-87						

1131-6-

For the support of the Roman Catholic Church at Sarganai, Dharmasanam Village, now efficiently supported

Per Muttu Vira Vaghu Rindivi vadhi Act of F 1223 Gonari Act of Vellabbo F 1244 Viriya Vivahayo Register Sivor of A.D 1815 Salvadoo vasakan N. Patta 1723 A.D 1801

Sarugo F 211 Su Rindivi vi Kovil Jivitam Act of F 1223 Marani Divatam Nanja Soragini Varayidi Kovil 90-— A 63-— Su Rindivi vi Kovil 300-00 Area do do 275-21/32 Su F 1244 Soragini Kovil Sarvamanyam Marani Area None

Nanja Varayidi 63-— Punja Kuruku 275-21/32 Soragini 154-42 Total 217-42 Kartavia Mho Rosario Register of A.D 1815 None

Marani Sarvesvaran Kovil Trustee & Melavadi 32

To be confirmed under Rule III Clause one Tax Free - Confirmed on present tenure - 9/2/64

Sd/ None

J. Swaminatha Raja Kanakudi 28/10/63

Dair copied

Register of Darmasanam Villages of Silaghapatti, Rundani, Marani, Metaranguli & Tanavayal in Lakki Taluq of Sivagangai Zamin

Register Nos. 908, 909, 910, 911, 912

(1) Silaghapatti (2) Rundani (3) Marani, (4) Metaranguli & (5) Tanavayal

Tanjore District

1 These are the five Darmasanam Villages in the Zemindary of Sivagangai - It appears from the account of F 1223 that most of these Villages were granted in AD 1756 to one "Bandari" & the rest was granted in AD 1792 to Vijaya Rao - for subsistence - These are hereditary grants - These are in uninterrupted possession of the holders since the date of the grant - These Villages have no Pottas - They are lost - In the English account of AD 1815, it is said that there is a Potta for these Villages & that it is a registered one - In the account of F 1211 these Villages are entered on lump with their area - In the account of F 1223 the area of these 5 Villages are entered on lump - No Villagewise Area is found in any account - Again, the lands in these 5 Villages have been divided into 63 equal Kuttis - Hence these 5 Villages are brought on one & the same Register - The Mahazanams treat these Villages as one Village

The Mahazanams requested me to bring also the 6th Village Pikkalakkad on this Register by reason that these Villages are contiguous to each other & that they are treating all these 6 Villages as one - I was unable to comply with their request as the boundaries of these 5 Villages alone are recorded in the account of F 1211 & those of the 6th Village Pikkalakkad were not recorded in any Account. Poruppu of Rupees 75-15-6 is paid on lump for these 6 Villages - I allotted of this sum, 58-6-6 to the 5 Villages under settlement F 1179 - to the Village of Pikkalakkad - with reference to the entries in the English account of AD 1815 - No Talk can about the area or about the boundaries on the part of the Ranis Vakeel - The boundaries now inserted in the Mahazar correspond to those in the account of F 1211 - A memorandum statement

	Poruppu	Shares acquired by purchase		Total
		by the Sirkar	by the Ryots themselves	
No. 1 is enjoying	3-½	-	-	3-½
No. 2 — do —	3-½	-	-	3-½
No. 3 to 6 — do —	-	37½	-	37-½
No. 7 — do —	-	2-½	2-½	5-
No. 8 to 10 — do —	-	-	9-½	9-½
No. 11 — do —	-	-	4-	4-
Total	7-	40-	16-	63-

Sheet No. 1051

A Statement of F 1223 -

Nanjo Varayadi	76-3-5	53-39	
Excess	178-24-¾	124-74	
	254-27-¾	178-13	
Puny's Pasu Kan	134-⅞	75-53	
Excess	1440-	806-40	
	1574-⅞	881-93	
		1060-06	

Deduct Poramboke

Bed of Tank Kerakkal	5-	36-40
Tanks — do —	10-	5-60
Village site — do —	15-	8-40
Grazing ground — do —	10-	5-60
Threshing ground — do —	5-	2-80
Temple site — do —	5-	2-80
Burial Ground — do —	3-	1-68
Jungle — do —	40-	22-40
	153-	85-68
Remainder		974-38

Deduct Seraies Inam

Nanjo Varayadi	4-2½	22
Punjo Pasurakan	2-	1-12
		1-34
Remainder		973-04

Nanjo Varayadi Cultivated	75-13-¾	53-17
Excess do — do —	113-	79-10
Waste	65-24-¾	45-64
Total	254-2½	177-91
Punjo Pasurakan Cultivated	132-⅞	74-41
Excess do — do —	880-	548-80
do — Waste	300-	168-
Vanbiru do —	7-	3-92
Total	1419-⅞	795-13
	1573-⅞	878-04

Deducted from the statement of Area found in the Mahazanam

Account of F 1211 — Ivanayakan Ponnu Darmasanam Bandara Vagaiyara Pandiyan Sarogha Ammani Nachiyar Darmasanam

Account of F 1223 — Darmasanam Sarogha Ammani Nachiyar Darmasanam

Boundary Account of AD 1815 — Register of AD 1815

Nanjo Varayadi as per Settlement for Pikkalakkad 6 Villages 62-4-8 Jodi 13-10-10 Total 75-15-6 as shown in the 5 Villages under Settlement

Remainder belonging to Pikkalakkad 17-9-

A Mobo of F 1366 to Vaddinadhaiyan registering for ¾ shares engaged Duos Received 10/7/66

Nanjo Varayadi — Vedaji row 49 — Kanmai — Vellayan Setti alias Virappan Setti 43 — Chinnan Setti 38 — Sina Vellayandi Setti 30 — A. Varappan Setti 22 — Visiri Kad — Venkatachalam Servaikaran 38 — Kanmai — Ramasami Servaikaran 32 — do

Nanjo Varayadi — Vedaji row 2 — Hindu Pariah — Servaikaran — Kanmai — Ramasami Servaikaran 32 — do

Punjo Pasurakan — Vedaji row 2 — Hindu Pariah — Servaikaran — Kanmai — Ramasami Servaikaran 32 — do

Son of Rajangam Brother of the Jodi No. 2 of 13 — 1 Wife, 3 Sons, 1 Daughter, 2 Married Daughters (2); 1 Wife, 1 Son, 1 Unmarried Daughter (3); 1 Wife, 2 Sons, 1 Daughter, 1 Married Daughter, 1 Son (4); 1 Wife, 1 Son, 2 Married Daughters (5); 1 Wife, 2 Unmarried Daughters (6); 1 Wife, 1 Brother (7); 1 Wife, 1 Son, 1 Married Daughter

Members of Family & Cows are divided - One Potta is recommended

(Vide next sheet)

To be continued under Pikkalakkad Register No. 913 / Jodi No. 9/13 / Jodi in all of which this is joined in a lump. It is not necessary to sub-divide the Jodi. The 2 Rupees

To be confirmed under Pikkalakkad Register No. 913 / Jodi No. 9/13 / Jodi in all of which this is joined in a lump. It is not necessary to sub-divide the Jodi. The 2 Rupees

In Clause III Agreed as under

Rule III for abuses -

Darmasanam 58-6-6

Good 2⅛ = 2 37/64 — Two Rupees Forty Three Annas

Pikkalakkad 7-7-64

Confirmed in one 7D in the 5 Villages named in the head of the Register & Pikkalakkad Register No. 913 / Jodi No. 9/13 / Jodi in all of which this is joined in a lump. It is not necessary to sub-divide the Jodi. The 2 Rupees

Two Rupees Forty Three Annas

Rs. 282 -

10/2/65

1894

vernment Salagi per otherwise

Max Rain

Dry 3-9-9 a-1-7

Wet 10-13-3 a-5-9

Average rate of Government Salagi per otherwise

Dry 1-5-6

Wet 4-6-1

Average Value of grain of Kelawaram wet land in Jayangondam Mogaram consisting of Ayen Villages in Sabhá Salagi for the period of 15 years-

Grain Fasle to Fasle 1270	Cultivated area in Acres	Grain cultivated	Yearly Government share at 45 per cent	Average prices of Grains	Value of the quantity of grains given in Kist	Rates per Acre
Rs a p	A C	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p
7191-8-2	5034-02	44709-9-4	21293-9-0	1-7-9	31607-2-6	6-4-5

A Ci Kuraku Vi Kid (8)
33-28 134-7/8 8 Samii Vad } Al
Tinjo Kuraku A 75-53 yor 48
169 6/16 Lakshmii 9 Viswanú } Al (9)
A 94-85 Narasim Mayan 70
Total 128-13 mayan Dr 10 Kuppa } Al 10
yan 60
In Pindivi Adabj 5 Gudals inclusive of Dormoda man Sciencheap patty Avadiyan Kóvil in Sanjore
1 Sciencheap Vattis 1 Pitalo Kid 11 Atmano Mahswami Trustee
2 Kuruva doni 6 Villages Nanjo Varaiydi Venuvalangan Tamberian 40
3 Maroni.
4 Kidaran gudi
5 Tanavo yal A 6-30
6 Pitalo Kid Nanjo Varaiydi Swabhú marow- In Six 44 Dormoda man 1 Sciencheap patti 2 Tanavo yal 3 Pandoni 4 Maroni 5 Kallati
53-7-4
A 37-48
Tajabich Ledual Inám
A 4-20
Remainder Dasmo sanam Varaiydi
47-7-4
A 33-28
Tinjo Kuraku
169 6/16
A 94-85
Total 128-13

Vide preceding side

I Hence the boundaries are confirmed here & the 10 66 16 Kuls situated therein are registered here-
The creeks is a marked one. but it is situated within the proper limits of the Village-

III ..... Of the 5 Villages brought on the Register, Sciencheapatty is considered the Mother Village & the remaining four the Hamlets of the same-

IV ..... In the Accounts of F 1211 & 1223, certain Lands are deducted as Inám- Rogers Manyem - Per person No 1 & 016 is the son of the said Pookanie Rá - Per Inám Land was granted in A D 1792 - Per Person was married with the Dasmasanam Lands- about 60 or 70 years ago. The persons No 1 & 2 & 016 also are brothers Sold rights & Vatties- in these Villages-

V These Villages consist of 63 equal Vatties. They are enjoyed as shewn in re- margin of the preceding side - The Lands are divided - of the Pongu of Rupees 75756 - levied originally on the 6 Villages mentioned above in the first para, 73756 are paid on 56 Vatties & 2 Rupees are paid for 7 Vatties held by the persons No 1 & 2 & 016- It appears that Originally favourable Pongu — or Legal Pongu was fixed on the 7 Villages as the Landed Tenure, who were the ancestors of the persons No 1 & 2 & 016 & were holding them to Office of Kattakar - The persons No 1 & 2 & 016 may but they are paying Pongu Rupees 2 only for Dry Lands belonging to them & that Wet Lands are free from all tax - (Government rent)

2d sheet of Perugalpatty, Ramanee Maravi, Mahasangudi & Panavayal - Sivaganga Zemindary Taluk -

From Rio 908
to Rio 912

II ..... According to the Settlement account as there are no Dry lands in the 6th Village of Pikkalakad which is brought into a separate Register, it is to be read that the persons N°1 & 2 of 16 are paying 2 Rupees only of the Pongu of Rupees 58-6-6. levied on the 5 Villages under settlement; in the English Register of A.D 1815 & treat the matter as such - In other Words - 58-6-6 is the Pongu on 58 Vuttees in these 5 Villages & 2 Rupees are the Pongu on Pikkalakad - In the 6th Village of Pikkalakad 9 shall mark 8 of Vuttees as free from the 6 of Pongu - The sum of Rupees 58-6-6 is paid equally on the 5 of Vuttees in the 5 Villages under settlement -

III The family of Bandary who is said in the Account of N°223 as having acquired originally most part of these Villages in gift in A.D 1750 from Rajaja - Sempa Rayah is extinct - Of the persons ~~N°1 & 2~~ in N°16, N°1 & 2 of 16 are descendants of the person N°2 of 16 who acquired a portion of these Villages in A.D 1792 & others are alienees who acquired lands as follows -

I The persons N°1 & 2 of 16 ~~acquired the property~~ are descendants of the 6th Grantee N°2 of 13 -

II The person N°4 of 16 is an undivided younger brother of the person N°3 of 16 - The person N°5 is the son of Father's younger brother of the person N°3 of 16 - The person N°6 is the grand son of Father's younger brother of the person N°3 of 16 - The persons N°3-4-5 & 6 of 16 live together, but ~~N°3 is~~ undivided separately & the family is one & undivided one - The lands in this Village entered opposite these names were purchased by them jointly for the support of a Choultry established by them in Ramanee in Amaravaty Taluq in Sivaganga Zemindary -

Registers Nos 908, 909 910, 911, 912

Sheet No. 1052

AI ---- In A.D 1855, the person N°3 of 16 purchased 7 Vuttees from the joint stock for Rupees 1225 from one Bapuryen - Two bills are on stamped Cadjan leaves - The ancestors of Bapuryen purchased 5 Vuttees out of the said 7 in A.D 1786-1793-1797-1808 & 1818 - from one Narayana Nambiyar, Venpatha Pandiar, Bajana Poudiar, Subbayen, & Narayanyen - for Rupees 105 - Four bills are on plain Cadjan leaves - The other two Pongus, are said to be the Patrimony of the said Bapuryen -

AII The person N°3 of 16 purchased 5 Vuttees in A.D 1855 for Rupees 87-5 from joint stock from Kasi Meera Raviten & Vellaya Raviten alias Meera Raviten for Two bills are on stamped Cadjan leaves - Of these 5 Vuttees, 3½ Vuttees were purchased previously in ~~A.D~~ 1854 & 1854 - for Rupees 395 from one Rama Chendryen, Amarta Ranyen, Doraswamy Ayen & Rembaby Ammal - under 8 bills of sales which are on plain Cadjan leaves - It is said that the sellers purchased the other 1½ Vuttees from certain shareholders in this Village - as there are no bills of sales, the details of purchase are not known -

B ..... The person N°3 of 16 purchased one Vutty in A.D 1856 for Rupees 175 from joint stock of 7 from one Sundaramayen One bill of sale is on a stamped Cadjan leaf - The said Sundaramayen purchased the Vutty previously in A.D 1840 for Rupees 64 from one Venkata Subbayen under one bill of sale on a plain Cadjan leaf -

C ..... The person N°3 of 16 purchased in A.D 1856 four Vuttees for Rupees 800 from the joint stock from Subbramanayen & Brubmayal by Ammal - Two bills are on stamped Cadjan leaves - The late father of the ~~person~~ said Subbramanayen, who was the father in-law of Bruta Nayaky Ammal purchased the four Vuttees previously in A.D 1796-1804-1805 for Rupees 67 - from one Lania Vadyan & Subbayen - Three bills are on plain Cadjan leaves -

D ..... The person N°3 of 16 purchased from the joint stock in A.D 1857 for Rupees 1225 - Seven Vuttees from one Ranga Nayy - One bill of sale is on a stamped Cadjan leaf - The sellers father purchased the 7 Vuttees previously in A.D 1839-1840-1841-1843 for Rupees 648 from one Seshayen, Subbayen & Ramayen & Gopala Sawmy Ayen One bill of sale is on a stamped Cadjan leaf & 4 bills are on plain Cadjan leaves.

(Vide next sheet)

E The person N° 3 of 16 purchased 3½ Vrittes in A.D 1857 for Rupees 612 from the joint stock from one Gaddara Achary - One bill of sale is on a stamped Fadjan leaf - The seller purchased the 3½ Vrittes previously in A.D 1853 for Rupees 480 from one Bapuvyen alias Ranie Lingayen One bill of sale is on a plain Fadjan leaf.

F The person N° 3 purchased 8 Vrittes in A.D 1838 for Rupees 1400 from the joint stock from one Kylasamyen - One bill of sale is on a stamped Fadjan leaf - The ancestors of the said Kylasamyen purchased the lands in A.D 1772, & 1823-1831-1837-1848-1849 - for Rupees 330 from one Walla Perumaliyen, Lakshmy Narasamyen, Perumaliyen, Muthiyen, Sellapa Nambiyan - Rama Swamy Ayen, Sadasiva Batten & Rámachendra Ramalen &c Eight bills are on plain Fadjan leaves.

G The person N° 3 of 16 purchased one Vritty in A.D 1859 for Rupees 175 from one Subbaya Ayen from the joint stock &c One bill of sale is on a plain Fadjan leaf - The said Subbayen says that he acquired the Vritty previously from his Mother's Father - This is not true Vide para XII.

H The person N° 3 of 16 purchased one Vritty in A.D 1864 for Rupees 175 from one Ponnayen. One bill of sale is on a stamped paper - The ancestors of Ponnayen acquired the said Vritty partly by purchase & partly by gift in A.D 1761 - One document is on a plain Fadjan leaf

I The ancestors of the person N° 7 of 16 purchased 3½ Vrittes in A.D 1774-1775-1783-1805-1848 - for Rupees 91 from one Seshadry Dikshatar - Subbiah Achary, Subbayen, Venkata Varadayengar & Ruppayen - Four bills are on plain Fadjan leaves - He says that his ancestors purchased also. - The other 1½ Vrittes & that bill of sale is lost -

J The lands entered opposite the persons N° 8 & 10 of 16 are said to have been acquired partly for by purchase & partly by gift by their ancestors - No documents are produced before me -

H - The four Vrittes entered opposite the Temple N° 11 of 16 were granted by certain shareholders of the Village &c made an endowment to the Institution long ago. The Vakeel of the Trustee of the Temple produced two documents, one dated 1816 & another dated 1847 - These were executed by Lakshmy Narasamyengar & Kylasamyen & proved to be genuine - The deed of 1816 shews that ½ of the Village was granted to the Temple - The Vakeel of the Trustee says that only four Vrittes are now possessed by the Temple & that he cannot say what became of the Rayroos, nor has he any document - There are serious disputes & arrears & disputes in this Village regarding Vrittes, which will be noted below - Desiring yet more plain Fadjan leaves &c

VIII

IX One Ramchandrayen of Talengembady in Tanjore District claims to one Vritty out of the lands entered opposite to the persons N° 3-4-5 & 6 of 16 - by reason that his late father who died about 30 years ago mortgaged it to one Meerá Kany Ramalen about 40 years ago & that the one Vritty was sold by one Arumtangy Rangachary to the person N° 3 of 16 - & that as Rangachary had no right to sell it, the lands, they should be registered in his name now - The Vakeel of the Complainant produced before me a deed of Mortgage said to have been executed by Meera Lavai Ramalen to his father Ganapaty Ayen - in A.D 1815 - Nor is on a plain slip of Fadjan - The document shews that some Lands were mortgaged by the complainant's father & the persons N° 3 who appeared on behalf of the person 4-5 & 6 of 16. - please that the complaint is not well founded & that he purchased seven Vrittes from the said Rangachary under the bill of sale marked D. which is on a stamped Fadjan leaf. It is proved satisfactorily from the documents & that Rangachary had 7 Vrittes who sold them to the person N° 3 of 16 in A.D 1857 & that the seller is enjoying the lands ever since undisturbedly. The fact of the father of the Complainant having mortgaged one Vritty & Allemalcany Ramalen is not proved - nor the genuineness of the alleged mortgage bond is proved - being a document dated as far back as half a century - The Complainant pleads that his father mortgaged the lands 40 years ago while the mortgage bond produced by his Vakeel shews that it was mortgaged 50 years ago - The Complainant is the Record Keeper of Negapatam Civil Court. He is rich man in addition to his natural abilities - If the Vritty were really in mortgage, he would not have kept himself silent. Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to the Civil Court. It is proved by the very document produced by the Vakeel of the Complainant & the Complainant has no enjoyment of the Vritty as the last half century - Rangachary who sold 7 Vrittes to the person N° 3 of 16 is also he says to have sold his own lands (Vide next sheet)

The Vakeel of the Complainant has produced a plan of the village is completed as alleged - A Pongoo tree mentioned in the boundaries in this village as they stood in Fasana or A.D 1824 - This paper does not bear any date in the engraving - This paper marked M is filed with the papers for the inspection of the Revenue Authorities - Not sent as no encroachments are reported -

3rd sheet of Complaints

Sheet No. 1053

X ..... One Muttu Nawby of Arasady or Tovil claims to one Vritty out of the lands entered opposite to the person N 356 of 16 - by reason that, his late father mortgaged it 50 years ago to one Meera Kany Ravuter, who re-mortgaged it about 15 years ago to one Visva Nagyen, N° 9 of 16, & that the person N 3 of 16 did not till about a fortnight ago that the Vritty is on mortgage with him, & that he has neither seen nor heard of any document to prove the case - [illegible] - dated 1831, which is to have passed between him & his Elder Brother. The Counsel of the Complainant produced an agreement of the division of property dated 1831, which they said they divided it equally among themselves. - The person N 3 of 16 pleads that he purchased the Vritty in A D 1866 - January, from one Ponnayan, son of Father's Elder Brother of the Complainant - & produced the bill of sale marked I I - The seller admits that he sold his lands - to the person N 3 of 16. The Complainant says that he must have asked Ponyan & not Ponnayan sold his own - Pers. Ponyan is in possession of the person N 3 of 16 as it is on mortgage with him since the year A D 1857 - The said Visvanadayen says that the Ponyan is with the person N 3 of 16 - The Visvanad yen, he is a bitterest enemy of the person N 3 of 16 as to the latter refused to give to the former Father's Kandasami in marriage - [illegible] - Tube - It is usual to insert in the [illegible] agreement of the division of property, the property disposed of by Brothers - If the Vritty [illegible] were mortgaged [illegible] really [illegible] ago, it to the fact would have been mentioned in the [illegible] agreement of the division property of 1831 - [illegible] omit that the document - [illegible] - But it contains the property which was not in the possession of the parties having concern in them - on the whole as it is not proved.

Register Nos. 908, 909, 910, 911, 912

that the Claimant father had one Vritty in dispute with the above - but it was mortgaged to Meera Kany Ravuter, & that that Vritty is with the person N 3 of 16, the claim is rejected & the party is referred to the Civil Court. The Complainant is of 54 years old - If the Vritty were really in mortgage he would not have kept so long silent - The Complainant says that he asked the son of the younger brother of the alleged mortgagee about this, & that he denies any every knowledge of the transaction -

XI ..... One Arunasalam Tumbiah claims to 1 3/4 Vritties from the person N° 3 of 16 by reason that her late Husband who died 15 years ago mortgaged the Lands 20 years ago from one Veera d[illegible] Vayan; but in his estate of Vengi, the person N 3 of 16 is enjoying the lands since the last 10 years from some unknown Cause; that the mortgagee died 7 or 8 years ago, leaving a son & that he does not know him - She named a few witnesses in support of her claim - The Witnesses who are present deny every knowledge of the transaction - She produced an agreement of property said to have been passed between her late Husband & his father's Elder Brothers sons & Gopala - in A D 1833 - shewing that his family had 3 1/2 Vritties & that these are divided equally by them - Pers document is on a plain Tadjan leaves - She proved the genuineness of this document by two Witnesses - who attested them - The person N 3 of 16 pleads that he purchased 7 Vritties from one Ranga Tevy in A D 1857 under the bill of sale marked D for 1225 Rupees & that he sold & purchased them previously from Seshayen, Subbayen, Ramayen, & Gopala Sawmy Ayen - Referring to a bill of sale executed by Gopala Sawmy Ayen & the Rama Tevy father of the said Ranga Tevy it appears that he (Gopala Sawmy Ayen) had 3 1/2 Vritties in the Village & that he sold them in A D 1843 for Rupees 224-9 to Rama Tevy - whose son Ranga Tevy sold them in 1857 - The said Gopala Sawmy Ayen is the son of Father's younger brother of the Husband of the Claimant Arubay Ammal - Ranga Tevy's son Narasimha Tevy admits of his father having sold 7 Vritties to the person N 3 purchasing them previously from one Seshayen, Subbayen, Ramayen & Gopala Sawmy Ayen - The person N 3 of 16 produced an agreement of the division of property dated 1831 which is said to have been passed between the late Husband of the Claimant & his father's younger brother who was the father of the said Gopala Sawmy Ayen - this division [illegible] two stamped Tadjan leaves - The shews the Gopala Sawmy Ayen father is to enjoy all the property in this District & that the late Husband of the Complainant is to enjoy the property in Tenjore District - The Complainant [illegible] admits that the document is a genuine - The lands in question are in possession of the person N 3 of 16 - since the date of the purchase - The complainant pleads about that I awarded her some lands in the Dannesanam Village of Vellanad - the Taluq of Tenkasi in Tevagunga Zemindary - out of the lands mentioned in the agreement of the division of property of 1833 - Now I find that this division agreement of 18[illegible] - It is true I awarded 1/8 Vritty in Mallangadi out of the lands entered in the document of 18[illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [

Complainant & Gopala Sawmy Ayyen & as Gopala Sawmy Ayyen admitted the genuineness of the document. Now that admission seems to be a fraudulent one. In other words that admission was made to acquire the 1 3/4 Vrittes in the Village - On the whole as it is proved that the said Gopala Sawmy Ayyen had 3 1/2 Vrittes - (inclusive of 1 3/4 Vrittes to which the complainant claims) & that he said them in A.D 1843, which passed as far back as 21 years, to Ramasawmy & that Rangasawmy the son of Ramasawmy sold 7 Vrittes inclusive of the 3 1/4 Vrittes to the person No 3 of 16 in A.D 1857 - the claim is rejected & the party is referred to his Court

XII. One Latchmy Ammal claims to own Vritty from the person No 3 of 16 by reason that her late Husband had mortgaged it about 25 years ago to one Meenakshy Ravuten; that Village Ravuten, the son of the Elder Brother of the said Meenakshy Ravuten sold it to the person No 3 of 16 about 5 or 6 years ago improperly; that her late Husband died about 18 years ago; & that he will prove this by one Veeravandayen (person 9/16) Ruppayen (No 10 of 16) & Sawmyen. The latter state that the no documents to prove this. Ruppayen denies every knowledge of the transaction - The person No 3 of 16 says that the complainant Latchmy Ammal had one Vritty in this Village; that he gave the Vritty to his father in law as "Sokana Dravayen" or mamiyar &c; that the late Elder Brother of the claimant, whose name was Narayanen, when came to mortgage this Vritty to the said Meenakshy Ravuten &c, the said Meenakshy Ravuten objected to receive it in mortgage by reason that it was the property of the late Husband of the claimant & not that it was not the property of the Elder Brother of the claimant; that upon this the late Husband of the complainant told to the Ravuten that it is the property of Narayanayen & that he gave it to him & after the mortgage bond was executed the person No 3 of 16 says that the complainant Latchmy Ammal had one Vritty in this Village - The person No 3 of 16 further states that Subbarayen the younger brother of the complainant said the Vritty to him in A.D 1859 for Rupees 176 & executed the bill of sale marked I & that he is enjoying the land ever since - The said Subbarayen, younger brother of the claimant, admits the genuineness of the document & pleads that this Rayyen may be pleased to direct the Village Moorthy to grant him a Patta for the land - The Mokhasamans who appeared for settlement say that they are not aware of the getting up of the said document by Subbarayen, the younger brother of the complainant, & one Meenakshy Ravuten of this Village - The person No 3 of 16 produced an enclosure called mortgage bond executed by Narayanayen, the elder Brother of the complainant & of Subbarayen, younger of Narayanayen & the complainant says that he cannot say whether or not the mortgage bond bears the signature of his late Elder Brother & that he cannot recognize his writing - The said Subbarayen also says that in A.D 1835 mortgaging the Vritty - This document is on a plain Cadjan leaf - Subbarayen, younger of Narayanayen & the complainant says that he cannot say whether or not the mortgage bond bears the signature of his late Elder Brother & that he cannot recognize his writing - The said Subbarayen also says that in the name of Peter Rayer, the late Husband of the complainant, is marked down thereon & that he cannot say whether it is the signature of Peter Rayer or not - The complainant lost her late Husband before she attained her age - It is proved that the Village Ouravaten received from the complainant & the person No 3 of 16 paid to the said Village Moorthy & that Subbarayen, the son of the Father in law sold the land - It is not proved that the late Husband of the complainant transferred his Vritty to his father in law - & that Subbarayen, the son of the Father in law sold the land - The person No 3 of 16 - Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to the civil Court -

XIII The above complaints are collusive - The persons No 8 & 9 of 16 gave rise to these complaints as the person No 3 & 6 of 16 failed to pay them what they agreed - The person No 9 of 16 desired the person No 3 of 16 then the expenses of the marriage of his son - The person No 3 of 16 says that he left them in possession of the 60 years ago -

XIV - One Settuvayen claims 6 Gowe Vrittes from the Shanbogue as inherited ancestral in this Village on the ground that his Grand Father just left them in possession of one Settuvayen, who died 50 years ago, to manage the affairs of the same; that the Mokhasamans accepted these Powers & that he does not know who accepted them - He produced first & produced ultimately an agreement said to have been executed to his Grand Father by the said Settuvayen, shewing that he is entitled to 4 Vrittes - are with Settuvayen - The genuineness of the document is not proved - nor the complaint or claim proved to be true - Hence the claims rejected & the party is referred to the civil Court -

(Vide next sheet)

XV Another two Sharpes also are mischievous fellows who gave rise to the settlement of the delay in this Village for long, by representing that Rayyen No 3 of 16 gave no fee or "Kattakanikai" to the Shanbogue &c - Rayyen disappeared as soon as I gave orders to settle the Vrittes of the Village -

Registered Nos 908, 909, 910, 911, 912

Sheet No 1054

XV ..... There is much trouble about the Vrittes entered opposite to the persons N° 8-9 & 10 of 016- The person N° 9 & 10 are R. Kenny & [illegible] N° 8 of 016- the person N° 9 of 016 claims the 11 Vrittes - & pleads that he acquired [illegible] by gift & purchase & gave up his Vrittes to [illegible] rest in his possession; that he has two Bills of sales only for 2 Vrittes purchased in the name of his Elder Brother in A.D 1840; that the documents relating both gifts & with the person N° 8 of 016; that he cannot procure & produce them [illegible] as he & the person N° 8 are not in good terms & that his statement is the only proof & lies & his Daughter being holding 11 Vrittes now in the Village- He prayed to name Witnesses to prove the enjoyment of 11 Vrittes - He again says that the person N° 8 of 016 is enjoying 5½ Vrittes & that he wanted rent from the person N° 3 of 016: He further states that the person N° 10 of 016 is enjoying 6 Vrittes - Thus the total of the Vrittes in possession of the persons N° 8 9 & 10 of 016 comes to 22¼ Vrittes - The person N° 10 of 016 pleads that he is enjoying 6 Vrittes under a decree of the Moorsiff's Court of Sevagangai in suit N° 1203 of 1854 - The person N° 8 of 016 never appeared before me though I sent [illegible] summons & notices during the last 8 months or since I came to Sivaganga & began with the settlement of Sevagangai Zemindary - This is attributable to the mischievous advice given to the person N° 8 9 & 10 of 016 - I secured the attendance of the person N° 9 of 016 with much difficulty - He gave a Rejoyel & disappeared through he knew well that I would settle up the case - The persons N° 3 4 5 & 6 of 016 are Nattukottai Chettiers, as they requested to give "Nattukottai Kai" to the persons N° 8 9 & 10 of 016 who gave rise to the several disputes - The main point for settlement here is - What number of Vrittes do the persons N° 8 - 9 & 10 of 016 hold -

- N° 1 is holding ——— 3½ Vrittes -
- N° 2 do ——— 3½ Vrittes -
- N° 3 & 6 are holding - 37½ Vrittes -
- N° 7 is holding ——— 5 Vrittes -
- N° 11 is holding ——— 4 Vrittes -

Total 53½ -

- After deducting the above, there are only 9½ Vrittes left for the persons N° 8 9 & 10 of 016. The Vrittes held by the persons N° 1 & 2 of 016 & the persons N° 3 & 6 of 016 gave a Rejoyel stating that the persons N° 8 9 & 10 of 016 are enjoying only 9½ Vrittes in the Village jointly & that the Daughter of the person N° 9 of 016 has not any enjoyment of any lands - The persons N° 3 & 6 of 016 produced an agreement said to have been executed by the person N° 5 of 016. by person N° 8 of 16 renting him out in A.D 1858 - 3/8 of the 9½ Vrittes belonging to the persons N° 8-9 & 10 of 016 - for 4 years - The lessor signed - This agreement is on a plain foolscap. The person N° 10 of 016 denies every knowledge of the transaction - One Subbaroyen one of the Vakeels who attested the agreement admits the genuineness of the same - The person N° 9 of 016 says - in his Rejoyel that the person N° 8 of 016 did rent out 5¼ Vrittes & the person N° 5 of 016 - Only 3 odd Vrittes were rented out & not 5¼. The agreement proved the genuine one. In the agreement the person N° 8 of 016 says that he rented out 3/8 of the 9½ Vrittes which he & the persons N° 9 & 10 of 016 who are then in the Village hold - Petition proves that the persons N° 8-9 & 10 of 016 do hold 9½ Vrittes only in the Village - It also appears that in A.D 1847 the persons N° 8-9 & 10 of 016 who are then in the Village had produced a list of their property written in their own hand wherein they owned [illegible] Vrittes as their own property which they had produced in the Court of Sevagangai in suit N° 1203 of 1854 - The persons N° 8 & 10 produced a list wherein 9½ Vrittes in the Village as their own property - The persons N° 8 & 10 produced a list wherein 9½ Vrittes in the Village as their own property which they had produced in the Court of Sevagangai in suit N° 1203 of 1854 - The person N° 9 of 016 produced a list before the said Arbitrators wherein [illegible] Vrittes in the Village as his own property - The person N° 10 of 016 instituted an Auction in the Moorsiff's Court of Sevagangai in suit N° 1203 of 1854 - as the persons N° 8-9 & 10 of 016 granted & dissolved the arbitration [illegible] & the person N° 10 of 016 applied to the Moorsiff's Court of Sevagangai in suit N° 1203 of 1854 - On this Plaint the person N° 10 mentioned that the - agreed to the list drawn up by the Arbitrators & signed all the Mukhtarnamahs - [illegible] - from the preceding it would appear that the persons N° 8-9 & 10 of 016 signed all the Mukhtarnamahs & gave up their Vrittes in the Village - [illegible] - Thus the settlement of Vrittes [illegible] - Debtors [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] -

Rajo
at 30 July 1855

On the Recd of the pursis N° 1 & 2 & the person N° 3 & 5 & 6 of 16 produced a Petition presented by [illegible] on the 5th July 1855 stating that the civil is a collusive one & that the persons N° 8 9 & 10 of 16 have neither 18 Vrittes on the Village nor the Village consists of 64 Vrittes as insisted in the Plaint & reply & by them. The Court fixed a diary on the 31st July 1855 that the Rajegamanship does not affect the interests of the Plaintiff & Petitioner & that the Rajegamanship is applicable only to such property as is in possession of the Offr & Defendants.

~~On the said diary~~ the Petitioner Rajagoorny had 7 Vrittes on the Village. By mistake the person N° 8 of 16 ~~[illegible]~~ in A.D 1855 & omitted his name in the bill of sales of D. The persons N° 3 & 6 of 16 are cultivating them.

On the whole as it is satisfactorily proved that the persons N° 8 9 & 10 of 16 held only 9½ Vrittes in the Village, I registered them in their names & refused them to the said Court. The person N° 1 of 16 produced bills of sales for 6½ Vrittes dated 1840 - 1841 & 1843 & they are on palm leaves. He ordered the Mahajanams to prove the genuineness of the documents. They are civil ~~[illegible]~~ ground. The documents relate only 6½ Vrittes & 9½ Vrittes are registered in his name & not in his Comr. ~~[illegible]~~ The genuineness of these bills of sales ~~[illegible]~~ much doubted.

XVI — It seems that bills of sales are of no use. The claim preferred by the person N° 1 of 16 — not 83 — The Mahajanams proved that the Village consists of 63 Vrittes. All the bills of sales ~~[illegible]~~ & that the Village consists of 63 equal Vrittes. Hence the claim is rejected.

XVII — One Ramaswamy Sastry claims to ~~[illegible]~~ Vrittes from the person N° 9 of 16 on the ground that his Grand Father mortgaged it to the Executor of the person N° 9 of 16 fifty years ago. He says that he cannot prove this. The Mahajanams deny every knowledge of the transaction. Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to the Civil Court. The alleged mortgage deed being lost &c.

Valuation

XVIII — Wet lands in these Villages depend upon Ten Tanks — of these 7 are large & 3 are small. They are in repair. They are fed by Temple Streams. The Tanks are filled annually. Security of Water is not [illegible] generally. The Mahajanams [illegible] & 683 Acres of Dry [illegible] cultivated lands. & 46 Acres of Wet & 168 Acres of Dry as waste. & say that the Waste lands are of 5 or 6 years old [illegible] They agree say that the Waste & Dry Waste lands may be brought under plough within the next 3 or 4 years. There is some exaggeration [illegible] Some of the Wet lands are cultivated annually 2d time to a small extent. The Mahajanams say that 28 or 30 Acres [illegible] improving the Tanks &c. This convention ~~[illegible]~~ is expected to be made within the next 10 years. Four Acres are cultivated with [illegible] 30 or 40 of Mangoe trees & 1000 Palmira trees. This is a Neeravarambu Village & not Adiaram lands. Punjah & Punjah Do. as are generally [illegible] The soil is of red clay. The Village is in flourishing state. A harvest is good. The average collection of these Villages as per statement of the Mahajanams ~~[illegible]~~ is 650 Rupees per annum. This is not true. The Contingencies of Ayen Villages is Settlegary. The average Wet assessment of this Village is calculated for a period of 15 years previous to 1270. Comes to 8 12 — per acre. The average Dry assessment of the Ayen Village varies from 2 2 — to 0 14 — per acre. The Mahajanams say that the Dry lands of this Village may be classed on par with those of the Ayen Village & that Wet soil is of an inferior quality to some extent. This seems to be true. The highest rate of Dry assessment is charged for Cotton. This, the Mahajanams say, is not grown in this Village. I consider that the Wet rate of assessment of the Contiguous Ayen Village is somewhat high.

In consideration of the fertility of soil &c I frame the valuation of the Village as follows.

Wet 132 Acres cultivated partly once in full & partly 2d time at 7½ Pagodas per acre	990 —	
Wet 46 Acres Waste, Mettukadu &c all get the cultivated only at 3 Pagodas acre	138 —	1128 0 0
Dry 622 Acres cultivated at 1 2 — per acre	699 12 —	
The rate is charged on the Ayen Village for Acres per the Gingly ord cent	85 —	784 12 0
Dry 170 — Waste, Mettukadu &c at ½ Pagoda per acre		
	Lit. 1912 12 10	

Ramasamy Row &c.

1924-10