

Register of Individual Names in the Village of Pattamangalam in the Taluk of Tirupattur in the District of Madura.

Register No 358 Pattamangalam Agri Village - Minor Inams.
Sheet No. 1925

The following are the Individual Names in the Village of Pattamangalam. This is a first rate Village in the perrindary of Tirupattur. It has a large & good tank - Wet lands are cultivated annually twice - the average Wet assessment of the Village calculated for a period of 15 years previous to 1870 comes to 873 8 per acre - The average Dry assessment varies from 172 to 073 8 per acre - The lands of this Village are rented out annually for grain & Dry lands are rented out for ready money Tenwals. The former is known by the term "Vasivayal". Both the Agri & Inam lands now measured in this village were measured in 1870 by one of the servants of the perrindar & except was found fairly satisfactory in them - as usual. It appears that the case numbered one, was not measured because the Inamdar never allowed the perrindar's servants to measure the same - The excepts found in the Inams that were measured are given below - distinctly distinctly in each case - Though the Inams were measured & the excepts was found above the area given in the Estimate Account, about 4 years ago - still, neither partial nor full Tenwals either in kind or money have been collected on the said excepts - During these last 4 years the perrindar & the Inamdar were quarrelling - with each other wyl. perrindar claimed to the full Tenwal of the excepts while the Inamdar opposed it - by reason that the excepts is a portion of their Inam & that it does not consist of any encroached Agri lands. The Inamdar who appeared first in this Office in January last produced a statement inserting therein the area of the Inams as to correspond to the entries in the alleged Estimate Account, as the Range Valuel directed privately the perrindar of the Village not to give excepts to the Inamdar to the measurement Account - & as the Inamdar had no copy of the measurement Account - As I was reported by some of the village Officers in the fact of the Inams in the Village having been measured by the perrindar's servants & the exceptions made now by the Range Valuel not to bring the excepts found in several Inams to the Register, ordered in this Office, I enquired of all the Inamdar about this & who represented their grievances at once - I gave them excepts to the measurement Account & they produced fresh statements inserting therein the area found in the measurement - On the 8 July 64, I wrote to Mr James Fisher, the Range Agent asking him to issue instructions early to the Valuel accordingly to afford me an excepts any explanation on the point in question, as the Valuel said that he is waiting for orders from his employer as to how to argue on the subject - On the 12 July 64, I received a Parast from Mr Fisher in reply to my communication dated 7 July 64 - In which he stated that the Inamdar failed to prove that the excepts found in their Inams is a portion of the Agri Inam, the excepts has been incorporated with the Agri lands & that the Range Valuel has been directed to examine the documents that may be produced by the Inamdar showing that the excepts is a parcel of the Agri Inam & give his opinion on several cases in communication with the Talukdar of Tirupattur - As the Range Valuel kept himself silent for months without affording to me any explanation - Upon this, I summoned the village Officers & enquired them - with the Inamdar - The Response given by them which are placed with this show that the excepts is a portion of the Agri Inam & that none of the Inamdar encroached upon the contiguous Agri lands - Ultimately, this day when I asked the Range Valuel to give a Response stating his objections to registering the excepts, he gave a Response saying that the Range perrindar has not any claim to the excepts being registered here & that the excepts may be confirmed to the Inamdar - From the perrindar's Account, I found that the excepts found gradually in the Agri lands of the Village up to the day of the measurement is at 10 1/2 per acre - on the area of the Agri that inserted in the Estimate Account - while the excepts found in the Inams is at 11 1/4 per acre on the area of the Agri respectively - in the Estimate Account - Upon the above circumstances - the excepts found in the 1870 is confirmed to the Inamdar respectively - In the account of 1871, it is said that these Inams are situated in Pattamangalam & its hamlets of Kinnipally, Palattakurichi & Rosavalampally - The Range Valuel also admits this statement -

As the Range has confirmed the excepts being treated as part of the Inams & the Response made by the Dy. Commr. there to be in the Agri - I see no objection to the same.

(Vide next sheet for Inam Cases) Amma K. S. S. S.
8.10.64

1. *Padia*
Parayil
 2. *Shagga*
gathaw 4-2 1/2
 3. *Kacavan*
Chuv 2-2 1/2
 4. *Vaykil*
Kalil 1-3 1/2
 4-2-2-96
 9-1-45
 4-12-2-3-41
 8-1-1-98
 4-39

1. *Pagoda*
in Veli
yari
Hamlet
of Pattanam
Law
Noweffy
Kp. 100

Vide preliminary remarks
 for the excep- written on
 separate sheet

1. *Kalilita*
gammur
 1. *Pattanam*
galam
and stor
 1. *Wamlets*
 2. *Velupatti*
 3. *Pilattu*
Kurechi
 4. *Koduvattar*
Pattu on
Lump
Kanya
(Velayadi
 4-5-1
 A.C.
 2-90

1. *Kalilita*
gammur
 1. *Worshippin*
 1. *Adanmal*
gi Kilan
 40
 2. *Adi Velan*
 22

To be kept in view
 flame on Tan Tree
 remains Look 3-9-3

1385

Phonshumara
 87064

1. *Lekam*
mi vapp
kal 7-1
 2. *Vairuma*
nachuv 7-1
 1-13-4-1-39

For the Jodi
 support 12-0
 1. *Pagoda*
of Pan
Wan
in Veli
yari
Hamlet
of Patta
mangalam
 3-3-3

Vide preliminary remarks
 for the excep- written
 on separate sheet

1. *Pannam*
in Veli
 1. *Pannam*
rudir
 1. *Aganor*
in Patta
mangala
and stor
 1. *Wamlets*
 2. *Velupatti*
 3. *Pilattu*
Kurechi
 4. *Koduvattar*
Pattu on
Lump
Kanya
(Velayadi
 1-8-4
 A.C.
 1-14

1. *Velipari*
 1. *Pannam*
Aganor
 1. *Worshippin*
 1. *Adanmal*
gi Kilan
 40
 2. *Adi Velan*
 22

To be kept in view
 flame on Tan Tree
 remains Look 5-12-6

1386

Phonshumara
 87064

1. *Shagga*
gathaw 4-2 1/2
 1-13-4-1-39

For the Jodi
 support 2-9-2
 1. *Pagoda*
of Patta
Kachipar
Amman
in Veli
yari
Hamlet
of Patta
mangalam
 3-3-3

1. *Pattattu*
Kachi
 1. *Pattattu*
Kachi
 1. *Pannam*
in Patta
mangalam
 2. *Velipari*
 3. *Pilattu*
Kurechi
 4. *Koduvattar*
Pattu on
Lump
Kanya
(Velayadi
 1-8-4
 A.C.
 1-14

1. *Velipari*
 1. *Pattattu*
Kachi
gammur
Truttee
 1. *Kattamara*
Chiyar
Panni
in Patta
mangalam
 40

To be kept in view
 flame on Tan Tree
 remains Look 2-9-2

1387

Phonshumara
 87064

Total 1-5-5 = 97.

Sheet No. 1928

vide preliminary remarks
for the exco^p. written
on separate sheet

The Grand Father of the person of 116 purchased
the house in A.D. 1796 for Rupees 1375
from an Itanaraj - Bill of sale is on
a plain paper leaf - The front title -
genuine by the Ponnur receipts produced -
by the Itanaraj & by the evidence of the
villagers & enjoyment of long time of peace

Good 20/8 - 1 Rspice

Len
1368

J. J. Thompson
87084

Compd
20 Feb 85. U.S.

vide preliminary remarks
for the excepⁿ - written
on separate sheet -

Pattanamangalam
1 Paranthu } Bl. (1)
mayen 40 }

2 Savindara } Leo - (2)
mayen 45 } 1 wife
1 son
2
E. P.

Family -
 and Love
 are ever
 Yours
 P. M.

To be kept in file 221
Zimmerman Box 6 of 7

Cont 22/8 + 80 -

£000.
1369

Benzel

The person of 1816 purchased the Town
15 years ago from one Garmenty Dyers & descended 1570-16
of the Cpl Grantie. No bill of sale. It was lost. The family of the
Cpl Grantie is extinct - Transcription proved to be correct.
Eng. proved by general W. Brown.

Wm. L. Garrison
 57584
 July 9th

vide preliminary remarks
for the excep. — written
on separate sheet.

Who is enjoying	—	3	—	66
Who is —	—	2	—	66
		6	—	32

Kandramani
= kam
1 Gornidagen } M
44

Pattamangalam
2 Venkatasub
= kayen 47 }

(1)
1 Wife
1 son
2 Daughters
 Fun. End

(2)
1 Wife
1 Daughter
 End

FF and

of the
Family.
Divided.
and are

To be kept under Rule II p. 3
Agreed - being an ancient
prescription -

Genova 20-11-58

134

Conced

Gold Page 4-00

3-8-

The grand father of the present N. Y. & C. -
 purchased the land situated opposite to -
 No 1 in N. Y. & C. 1769 & 1771 for 1000 -
 \$7 11. from one Van Hook & Livingston -
 a descendant of the Ogl. Purchase -
 Two bills of sale are on plain paper -
 bearing the genuineness of which is
 proved by the signatures & by the receipts from the present
 owners.

The grand father of the person
died 1816 purchased the land
entire opposite to the person
for \$2500 from the descend
of the ex^l Grant in c. d. 1796
Bill & who is our agent

J. G. W. W. W.

