

Melamarungur 6000 10 m 10 in

Sheet no 1073

In proof of this he produced the following settlement Accounts of the First and Villages

1 Pettkul account 9 AD 1813—
1 D D D AD 1816—
1 D D D AD 1817—
1 D D D from AD 17256 to 17270.

All these settlement accounts
are in a large roll of Cajon Lamm
Bauer & Co. no ground to suspect the
(vide next case) general

Paillard from the Habitant de-piers
produced by the Gaulandore.

Jintan gadi Mr The Act of As per L^t 211 In 1823, Linganga
 paper name L^t 1211 Zennisor Jintan now He Hemo
 October of the Act of He Hemo
 about is original Bendaui 1860 - masan In 1824 Katchingon
 54-11-2 Grantor Act of 1860 2nd Cayan Buraqhal
 New the of late Act of 1860 2nd Cayan Buraqhal
 same is unknown L^t 229 Karampon 1860 2nd Cayan Buraqhal
 J. Boundary 45-n masan's Katchingon
 Act of 31-50 now 40
 L^t 1244 In Bendaui In 1863
 Odaykat Act now
 Act of 1863
 1863

(1)
1 Son
2 Daughters
1 Grand
Daughter

To George Washington D.C.

Heavenly Love - 57 71 2. 1750

Gold 2 2/4 = 31 Rufen

Handwritten:
 J. L. Lusk and Co
 New York
 27 Feb 64

Confirmed on
1/2 a specimen
The same appears
have been original
Given to a Dean
D. H. B. 62

23/6/65

190

Rates of Government Taluqs per Acre

Prose Min
 July 3-9-9 - 1-7
 Oct 10-13-3 - 5-9

Average Rates of Government Taluqs per Acre

July 1-5-6
 Oct 4-6-1

Average value of ground of Revenue on wet land in Pallela
 Magan consisting of 8 Agave Villages in Vuravati Taluq
 for the period of 15 years

From 1200 to 1270	Cultivated area in acres	Grains in autumn	Of which Revenue Share at 45 per cent	Average prices of grains	Value of the quantity of grains given in full	Rates per Acre
1200-10-3	5786-02	57824-2	23391-1-1	1-8-3	35515-9-5	6-2-2

III. No. Taken about the area or about the boundaries on
 the parts of the Rangitakul. The boundaries now marked in the
 revenue records correspond to those in the Account of 1246.
 Since the boundaries are confirmed here & there by 1274 -
 facts situated persons are registered here. At the Village is in
 possession of the zemindar, Rangitakul is not paid, still.
 I think that the Power given in the Talukdar Account
 should be adopted with the settlement & treat the matter as such -
 If the Village falls in possession of the zemindar, the revenue should be
 paid. The Rangitakul says that there is no crop in the wet lands in the Village -

III In the settlement Account of 1207, it is said that the Village
 to one "Kattakuttu Rangitakul" was resumed & incorporated with the zemindar Rangitakul
 in that year, but 1238 Kallans which averaged to 96 Ann 450 Paise, were granted in lieu of this in
 the Rangitakul Village of Rangitakul; but the produce of these 96 1/2 Ann also ~~was~~ has been placed
 under attachment & that of the Pundarikota parts to Rangitakul paid by the zemindar, the said 96 1/2 Ann
 will be incorporated with the zemindar's Agave lands or with "Talapet" as per order of the zemindar already
 issued.

IV In the account of 1280-5 Kallans or 3 1/2 Ann are entered in the name of one Palayam
 V In the account of 1281-5 Kallans or 3 1/2 Ann are entered in the name of one Palayam
 under settlement in the name of Mangayya Rangitakul.

VI From the Rangitakul Accounts entered above in para 2 it appears that the Village is
 in possession of the zemindar since 1280 & that the zemindar used to grant a portion of it to the persons
 whom they liked at times - The Village of Rangitakul above alluded to in para 3, seems to have been
 resumed as soon as it was granted - In the whole it is not proved whether the Village under settlement
 fell in possession of the zemindar legally or by a Ragemanah of the owner or by
 coercive measures of the zemindar. The latter is presumed to be the case - At the same time the
 Village is under settlement in possession of the zemindar since the last 57 years - The Village seems to fall
 within the scope of Section III Rule XXV. I am afraid at the same time whether it will be paid
 upon the zemindar who has possession of the Village since the last 57 years - In any case as the
 is a service grant of ~~the~~ ^{the} nature & as the service is not done since long, I recommend to
 compare the Village upon the Rangitakul with Rangitakul who has possession of the Village with the rest
 of the zemindar under a recent decision of the Privy Council, on 1/4 of assessment - This recommendation
 falls within the scope of Rule XX & of the instructions issued for the settlement of the Pundarikota in the Districts -

Valuation
 - correct - But he wrote a remark on the revenue records that there are crops that may be found by measurement would be liable to full assessment of Govt
 Thus I had to keep quiet - The Rangitakul says that all the wet lands are cultivated annually & that on an average 28 Ann fall upon the head of the lands
 cultivated annually & the remaining 3/2 Ann as waste - The zemindar's cultivation Accounts are not trustworthy as the practice of preparing them are
 very lax - There are no dry lands in this Village but the fallow lands - Some of the wet lands in this Village are fallow & some are under cultivation - The soil is of a superior quality
 generally - The average income from this Village as per statement of the Rangitakul is 122 Rupees per annum - The contiguous Agave Villages are Pundarikota
 & Nilamangudi - The average wet assessment of these Villages comes to 5-2-8-3 per acre - The average wet assessment of this Village under settlement is 6-2-2
 per acre - This average is calculated for a period of 15 years previous to 1270. In considering the fertility of soil & the
 I frame the valuation of the Village as follows -

Wet 28 Ann full water at 6 Ann per acre 168
 Wet 3 1/2 Ann "do" "do" "do" 10-8-0
 Total 178-8-0

A. P. Rangitakul