

Ratio of Government Salago per Acre
 Max Min
 Dry 3-9-9 1-7
 Wet 10-13-3 5-9
 Average Ratio of Government Salago per Acre
 Dry 1-8-8
 Wet 4-8-1

Average Value of gram of Madam on wet land in Kallakottai
 Mahanandi Consisting of Agam Villages in the Taluq of Anur
 Vattalai For a period of 10 years.

From To	Cultivated area in Acre	Export turn	of which zamindars share at 45 percent	Average price of gram of gram	Value of quantity of gram in Rs & P	Ratio per acre
16877-52	11814-48	150701-6-4	70014-4-1	1-7-11	150628-14-2	8-8-3

He again pleads that the remaining 1/4 Village was resumed by the zamindar in A.D. 1818
 in satisfaction of the amir of Pongu then outstanding against the Village
 The Range Vakkal pleads that long since long previous to the Resumption 1/2 Village
 is held by the as Pirkam by the Ogl Grantee & his successors, the 1/4 of the
 Village in addition to the above half was granted to the successors of the Ogl Grantee subsequent to A.D.
 1818 & that he cannot account why half of the Village was transferred to Agam - He Vakkal reports to
 trust half of the Village as Pirkam & the remaining half as Agam - In an account of recent
 alienations forwarded to the Board by the Collector on 11th Feb. 1838,
 the 3/4 of the Village now held by the person of 016 is entered as a subsequent grant. The
 forwarding to the Board this account of recent alienations, was to
 all the other villages of the taluq and in a large number. The Board in their
 in reviewing the collector's report stated that they "entrust you with a
 & registering the lands, which they trust will be done with due consideration
 of the present possessors" X X X. It does not seem that the Village was at
 in A.D. 1818. I doubt much that the request of the person of 016 that
 now be registered in his name by reason that the 1/4 is entered in the Patta, is a fact
 shows that the two Villages of Kungolam & Kallandur were granted to the Ogl Grantee
 the person of 016 claims to only one by reason that the 1/4 was resumed long ago -
 A.D. 1838 forwarded to the Board of Revenue, that the 1/4 of the Village was granted
 Permanent Settlement is not a correct one, because the Range Vakkal himself admits
 is in possession of the Ogl Grantee & his successors since the date of the grant. The Pirkam Village
 zamindary are found only in the alleged account of 1721 & not in the Board's Register of A.D. 1815 & in
 Accounts from 1721 show that half of the Village was Pirkam & the rest was Agam at the time. The Pirkam
 that in addition to that half, 1/4 of the Village was granted subsequently & as the present holder of the Village granted to him
 3/4 of the Village which he is enjoying was held as Pirkam at the time of the permanent settlement. I register here only half of the
 Village as Pirkam & the rest as Agam - The holding of the Village will of course be enjoying 3/4 Village as usual -
 In the account of 1721 Pongu was entered as 40 Ropes for the half Village of the Pirkam portion. The increase of Pongu
 10 1/2 - added to it is now reported by the Range Vakkal to relate to the 1/4 Village granted subsequently to A.D. 1818 - It is true that
 the Patta is dated as far back as 130 years shows that this entire Village was granted as Pirkam to the Ogl Grantee. This document is
 of no use as the person of 016 admits that he has only the enjoyment of the 3/4 Village from long immemorially, as another Village
 there was resumed long prior to the Permanent Settlement & as the zamindar generally resumed by several Villages mentioned in the old Patta
 to the Permanent Settlement - (Vide next page)

Grain office

Register of Inam Maruthavagal hamlet of Nola Saran Village in the Taluk of Arur Pattagae of the Sheringunga Zemindary in the District of Madras

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

As per account of Tash 1211
 Kunjah Peradi 33-6-23-60
 Excess 33-6-23-60
 66-12-46-80

Punjab Paces
 Arur 90-10-1-59-79
 97-88

Deduct Perambles
 Red of Tank Arurham 20-2-11-20
 Pond 2-1-12
 The long ground 1-56
 12-88

Remainder 84-67
 Deduct 10
 1/4 of village Arur
 Punjab Arurham 16-12-29-48
 21-16

Remainder 83-51
 1/4 of the village Nola Saran
 Kunjah Peradi

Notes 20-6-00
 Note since
 brought under
 Cultivation 5-1-3-55
 25-2-28-55

Punjab Arurham
 Cultivation 30-8-22-88

Note 8-2 since
 brought under
 Cultivation 10-2-3-57
 50-11-28-41

Register No. 827
 Sheet No. 971

As per
 per
 account
 46-9-10

Here the large
 the per patta
 185 or A.D. 1783

Red of patta dated A.D. 1783
 Arurham account dated A.D. 1812
 Decision of Pundit Sahib Arurham in A.D. 1820 of 1857

As per In Tash
 patta 1211
 Arur = Secotham
 Sattappan Marada
 Vayal
 Hamlet
 Nola Saran
 Kunjah
 Peradi
 A.C.
 40
 In
 Marada
 account of
 Tash 1211
 2-2
 In Tash 1214 &
 1256
 None
 In the
 Zemindari
 account of
 Tash 1212
 Sattappan
 Secotham
 Maruthavagal
 1/2 of the village
 Kunjah Peradi
 33-6-23-60
 1/4 of the village
 Arur
 23-6-23-60
 Total 46-80

Levayunga
 Govindananda
 Pardeci
 also
 Sattappan

To be Confirmed under
 Rule III Clause one
 Free free
 1/4 village
 Zemindars Sedi 16-9-10

Rate of Government Saluk for acre
 Maximum Minimum
 Dry 3-9-9 -1-7
 Wet 10-13-3 -5-9
 Average rates of Govt Saluk for acre
 Dry 1-5-6
 Wet 4-6-1

Confirmed
 19-1-74
 J.D.R. 1936

Average rates of grain of Malabar and other lands in Nola Saran. Major
 name consisting of Arur villages in the Taluk of Arur Pattagae. For a
 period of 15 years

From Tash 1256 to Tash 1270	Col. 1st ed area in acre	Gross out turn	Of which Zemindar Share at 40 %	Average prices of grain	Value of quantity of grain given in Col. 14	Rate per acre
1877-5-2	11814.18	150701-6-4	70014-4-1	1-7-0	100638-14-2	8-8-3

This is a hamlet of Nola Saran village in the Sheringunga Zemindary. From a patta produced by Govindananda Pardeci alias Sattappan the present
 holder of the land it appears that it was granted in A.D. 1783 to Govindananda Pardeci in order that he might live in a situation & devote all his time to the service of the
 Raja (Nola Saran Taluk) and to meet the expenses of the annual Sattappan with the power of disposing of the same either by sale or gift as before the present
 holder of the land. The patta is not a registered one. The Pundit Sahib says that the patta is a genuine one. From the patta it appears in one
 part of the patta was account as 33 Callams & 2 Marada paying a patta of 400 Pans 4 1/2 fanams & in another part half of the village is entered as 33 1/2 Callams paying
 patta. The former extent is reported in the Zemindar account of Tash 1211. In the account of Tash 1212, that is the Zemindar account, the area of the entire village is entered
 as 33 Callams & 2 Marada which are equal to 46 acres & 80 Cents and half of which is said to be the patta of the original patta to the present owner. The accounts are unreliable
 The Inam Patta Collector relies chiefly on the entries in the accounts of Tash 1211 & 1212 & believes that 1/4 of the village of Maruthavagal is held & cultivated at the present
 settlement which is one half of that village. But the person in Col. 16 claims the entire village on the ground that it is in his patta. He admits that he has the patta
 section only 1/4 of the village from time immemorial. The Pundit Sahib (reads that since long previous to the present only half of the village is held as patta to the present
 holder and the remaining half is in the Zemindar that is 1/4 of the village in addition to the 1/4 in the patta. He is unable to prove his statement. The strong point in the Zemindar's favor is long since

1837) in the late Principal Sudder Ameen Court to remove the person in Column II from his office
as pinner and to ~~the~~ $\frac{1}{4}$ of Marathavayal. This suit was decided against the Zemindar and there
was an appeal and special appeal the final result being that the original decision was confirmed.
This litigation may be taken as deciding that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the Village has been held as Inam by the person in Column
II and his predecessors for a length of time and that there is no reliable evidence to show what portion of Mara-
thavayal was Inam and what was held at the permanent settlement. In these circumstances $\frac{3}{4}$ of Maratha-
vayal is regarded as Inam on the ground of long possession.

No disputes about the area or about the boundaries on the part of the Kamidatal Chetambaries
now inserted in the vernacular statement correspond to the long and immemorial enjoyment of the village.
These boundaries correspond to those in the first report made to the Civil Court by the adjoining village on
the 6th March 1839.

Average Annual income of the half village is estimated at Rs. 100 by the Dy. Collector Tula, since then
I have become the valuation as shown in Col. 7 Page 150 for $\frac{3}{4}$ of Marathavayal and this valuation is ad-
mitted by the Zemindar to be correct.

M. W. Dukes
Collector

