Register of Darmasanam Village of Puduckadi in Portipanur Taluq of Sivaganga Zemindary in Madura District.

Sheet No 1
Register No 949

Register No. 949

Puduckadi புதுக்குடி

Sheet No. 1106

1 This is one of the Darmasanams in the Zemindary of Sevaganga. This was granted by one of the former Zemindars of Sevaganga to the Bramins of various families or of Nana Gotra & Nana Sutra for their subsistence. This is a hereditary grant. This is in uninterrupted possession of its holders since the date of the grant. The Mahazanams produced a Copper plate Potta purporting that it was granted by the original Grantor. In the English Account of A.D. 1815 copy of which is forwarded to the Board of Revenue, it is said that this Village has no Potta. No mention of the Potta is made in any other Account. The Ranys Vakeel says that the Potta is a genuine one. This Village is entered as Darmasanam in all the Accounts. The boundaries of this Village are recorded both in the Potta & in the Account of F1244. The Mahazanams wrote a remark in the vernacular statement that the boundaries inserted in the Account of F1244 are not ~~of~~ correct, & that the boundaries inserted in the Potta should be confirmed being correct ones. The Ranys Vakeel supports the remark of the Mahazanams & states that the boundaries in the Potta may be confirmed here. In the Potta it is said that this Village is bounded by Vengalur (Sevaganga Ayen) Viraludy (Sivaganga Jivitam) Sergamongalam (Ramnad Darmasanam) Muniyanendal (Ramnad Ayen) Maingudi (Sivaganga Darmasanam) Yemeneswaram (Darmasanam in Ramnad) Arungolam (Sevaganga Ayen) & Gundugolam (Sevaganga Ayen). In the Account of F1244 it is said that the Village is bounded by Nandugachy (Sivaganga Darmasanam) Vengalur, Virakudi, Muniyanendal, Maingudy & Arangolam. On the whole as it is proved that there are several defects in the boundaries of F1244 & that the boundaries given in the Potta are correct ones, the latter is confirmed here. The boundaries in the Potta correspond to the recognized limits of the Village. (Vide next side)

As per Account of F1211
Nanja Varayidi 450-7-„ 315-35
Excess do 34-3-„ 23-95
Total 484-10-„ 339-30
Excess Punja Staruka 1250-„-„ 700-„
Grand Total 1039-30
Deduct Poramboke
Bed of Tank Staruka 410-„-„ 229-60
Tank do 20-„-„ 11-20
Temple site do 5-„-„ 2-80
Village site do 35-½-„ 19-88
Channels do 10-„-„ 5-60
Total 480-½-„ 269-08
Remainder 770-22
Deduct Service Inam
Nanja Varayidi 12-13-4½ 9-09
Remainder 761-13
Nanja Varayidi Cultivated 400-„-„ 280-„
do Waste 37-7-1½ 26-26
437-7-1½ 306-26
Excess do do 34-3-„ 23-95
Total 471-10-1½ 330-21
Excess Punja Staruka Cultivated 250-„-„ 196-„
Waste 419-8-„ 234-92
Total 769-8-„ 430-92
Grand Total 761-13

Drawn from the statement as per produced by the Mahazanams

2502-80

Darmasanam now

Jodi as per Istimrar Acct 390-14-3
Ijafa „-„-9
Total 390-15-„

Her
Tirumalai Setupati to Hindu Deities
Dates unknown
As per Potta produced by the Mahazanams
Tirumala Kiran Jogarlayaji Raghunadha Setupaty
Dated Salivahana 1592
A.D. 1670

Acct of F1211
Acct of F1223
Boundary
Acct of F1244
Board's Regr of A.D. 1815
1 Patta on copper plate

Senkara Sastri
As per Potta
Nana Gotram

In F1211
Darmasanam Puduckadi
Nanja Varayidi
450-7-„
A 315-35
In Hindivi Acct of do
Area do

In F1223
Darmasanam Puduckadi
Nanja Varayidi
450-7-„
A 315-35
Venkata Subbayan & Nanagotram

In F1244
Darmasanam Puduckadi
Area none
In F1263 none
In Regr of A.D. 1815
Puduckadi Venkata Subbayan & others

Puduckadi
1 Sellamayan alias Subbayan 70 } Share holder
2 Subbayan 42 } Do
3 Venkateswarayan 35 } do
4 Subbayan alias Narayanayan 38 } do
5 Muttusen Narayan 33 } Great grandson of elder brother of Grandfather of the No 15
6 Minakshi Iyen 34 } Ab
7 Venguru Iyen 49 } Ab
8 Subbayan 43 } Ab
9 Venkatramayan 38 } Ab

(1) 1 Wife 2 Sons 2 Married Daughters 2 Daughters in law 1 Grandson
(2) Wife 2 Sons 1 Daughter in law 1 Married Daughter 1 Unmarried Daughter
(3) 1 Wife 2 Sons 1 Married Daughter 1 Unmarried Daughter
(4) Wife 1 Unmarried Daughter
(5) Wife 1 Son Unmarried Daughter
(6) 1 Wife
(7) Wife 1 Son 4 Married Daughters
(8) Wife 4 Sons
(9) 1 Wife

All in one Family & lands are Divided. One Potta is recorded

To be confirmed under Rule 6th 3 Agreed.

Zemindar's Jodi 390-15

Govt 2/8 = 264

Confirmed as recommended in rule 7 D on a Q.R. of Rs 264. The Rani's claim has been properly referred to a Civil Court.
18/2/65 W.M.S.

A. Sudarshana Rau.

Remarked 3-9-64.

2-4 W.S.

T.D. No 1570

II However the Mahajanams wrote a remark ~~[illegible]~~ N.B. that ~~if~~ they will guide by the boundary Account of F1244 if it is proved to be correct one on a personal examination – The 1039 Acres & 30 Cents brought on the Register being within the limits of the Village they are confirmed here. The excess is a marked one as usual.

III This Village consists of 80 equal Vrittees. They are enjoyed as shown in the margin of the 3d sheet. The lands are divided – Porupu is paid on the number of Vrittees equally & permanently – A statement is produced which is signed by the majority of the Mahajanams or by all those who appeared for the settlement – Another statement was produced by one Meenatchy(1) Sundaramyen – Ananta(2) Narrama Iyer; Appa(3) Torai Iyer; Narasimha(4) Avadhany & Kalahasty(5) Iyer ~~inserting~~ stating therein that this Village consists of 70 Pongoos. The Mahajanams say that these 5 individuals have no ~~[illegible]~~ shares at ~~[illegible]~~ all in the Village. nor ~~they are~~ are they enjoying any portion of the lands in the Village. It appears that this Village was consisting 70 Vrittees & that they were raised to 80 ~~[illegible]~~ in August 1863 – on the consent of all the shareholders in this Village under a written agreement⊗ on a stamped paper – From this agreement it appears that the Mahajanams ~~[illegible]~~ had added the raising the number of Vrittees from 70 to 80 some of the ~~lands~~ "Samudayam" lands in 80 Vrittees & made a rule to ~~[illegible]~~ exchange the ~~[illegible]~~ holdings in the Village once in 7 years – This agreement was signed by 21 persons holding 77 Vrittees out of 80 in this Village – Again the agreement shows that ~~[illegible]~~ the Mahajanams are under ~~[illegible]~~ contemplation to make various improvements in this Village by converting Dry lands into Wet & by improving the Tanks from the joint stock – The Mahajanams who are holding 76 15/16 Vrittees gave a Razinamah before me which is placed with this, stating that, the lands in this Village were already divided into 80 Vrittees – ~~&~~ that they paid Porupu this year on 80 Vrittees & that they are willing to abide by the conditions in the agreement – One Meenatchy Ammal & Parameswaryen who are enjoying 3 & odd Vrittees say that they are unwilling to abide by the agreement above alluded to & that the lands in the Village should be continued as 70 Vrittees as heretofore. Parameswaryen above alluded to signed the agreement, & the said Meenatchy Ammal never signed it – As the lands in the Village were already divided into 80 Vrittees on the consent of all the shareholders in the Village & as now the holders of 76 15/16 Vrittees agree to ~~[illegible]~~ guide by the stipulations contained in the agreement. I register the lands of the Village as 80 Vrittees – 17[illegible] [illegible]

⊗ This is called "Samvati" "Pattram"

10 Kattusami Iyan 32	Do	(10) Wife 1 Son
11 Vengammal 35	Do	(11) 4 Married Daughters 1 Son of Daughter
12 Dharma Iyan 45	Son of the Iyen of 15	(12) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter in law 1 Married Daughter 1 Unmarried Daughter
13 Kristna Iyan 40	Do	(13) 1 Wife 1 Son 2 Married Daughters
14 Sanjivi Iyan 35	Do	(14) 2 Elder brothers
15 Subbayan 30	Do	(15) 1 Wife
16 Kandayan 25	Do	(16) 1 Wife
17 Sankara Narayanayan 32	Son of younger brother of the Iyen of 15	(17) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Unmarried Daughter
18 Vengava Iyan 25	Do	(18) 1 Wife
19 Subbayan 16	Do	(19) 2 Elder brothers
20 Sankayan 63	Son of younger brother of Father of the Iyen of 15	(20) Wife 2 Sons 2 Daughters in law 3 Married Daughters
21 Vengammal 40	Share holder	(21) 1 Married Daughter 2 Sons of Daughter
22 Narasayan 42	Do	(22) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Unmarried Daughter
23 Dorasami alias Rama Kristnayan 35	Do	(23) 1 Wife 1 Sons
24 Kuppayan 62	Do	(24) 2 Sons 2 Daughters in law 1 Grandson
25 Subramanya Sastri	Do	(25) 1 Wife 2 Sons 1 Daughter in law 1 Married Daughter

Vide preceeding

Sheet No 2 Dermasanam Villag of Vadackadi in Partipanur Talug of Sevaganga –

Register No 949

Register No 949

Sheet No 1107

I see no ground to disturb the arrangement & reduce the Vritties again to 70 – on the ground that the holders of 3 & odd Vritties out of 80 never agreed to abide by the conditions contained in the agreement –

III ..... The persons of c16 against whom the word shareholder is marked down are said to be descendants of the orgl Grantees who were of Nava Gotra & Nava Putra & others are aliens –

II. The persons No 7 - 8 - 9 10 - 28 - 31 - 32 - 33 - 34 - 41 - 46 - 51 - 52 53 & 54 of c16 purchased their entire lands in AD 1797 - 1800 - 1832 - 1835 - 1836 - 1839 - 1840 - 1842 - 1847 - 1848 - 1849 - 1850 - 1852 - 1858 - 1859 - 1862 & 1863 - 1864 for Rupees 4600 11 – from Sinayen & shareholders in the Village – Four Bills are on stamped Cadjan leaves – 22 bills are on plain Cadjan leaves – Ten Bills are on stamped papers – The persons No 6 - 29 - 30 - 40 - 42 - 43 - 44 - 45 - 47 - 48 - 49 - 50 - 55 & 60 of c16 purchased all their lands – But some have bills of sales & others have no Bill of sales – The bills of sales in existence shew that these individuals purchased some of their lands in AD 1766 - 1767 - 1771 - 1772 - 1786 - 1818 - 1824 - 1835 - 1848 & 1863 – for Rupees 2720 - 1 11 from Ramyen & shareholders in the Village – 11 Bills are on plain Cadjan leaves – One Bill of sale is on a stamped Cadjan leaf – & 11 Bills are on stamped papers – The persons No 47 & 50 of c16 acquired some lands under a Razeenamah filed in suit No 1213 of 1856 on the file of the Moonsiff's Court of Sevagunga – The persons No 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 12 - 13 - 14 - 15 - 16 17 18 - 19 20 - 21 - 24 - 25 - 26 - 27 - 35 - 36 - 37 - 38 - 39 - 61 - 62 - 63 - 64 & 65 of c16 acquired some of their lands partly in gift & partly by purchase in AD 1694 - 1717 - 1739 - 1749 - 1750 - 1752 - 1757 - 1759 - 1765 - 1766 - 1772 - 1785 - 1786 - 1789 - 1807 - 1808 - 1811 - 1812 - 1816 - 1823 - 1824 - 1826 - 1832 - 1839 - 1841 - 1843 - 1844 - 1847 - 1848 - 1851 - 1855 - 1856 - 1859 - 1861 - 1863 & 1864 – for Rupees 7358 – No Twenty bills are on stamped Cadjan leaves – Sixty bills are on plain Cadjan leaves & 19 Bills of sales are on stamped papers – The Mahajanams say that the persons who are enjoying in this Village certain Poorjoos without documents as will be seen from the statement given in the margin of the 3rd sheet acquired the lands partly by purchase & partly by gift long ago & that they are rightful owners of the lands entered opposite to their names respectively –

(V[illegible])

26 Krishna yen 44	Share holder	3 Sons 2 Daughters in law
27 Muttu vayan alias Narayanen	do	(27) 1 Wife
28 Narayana Sastri alias (Pitchy –) Stappa Sastri 56	Al	(28) 1 Wife 2 Sons 2 Daughters in law
Malaghanur		
29 Sundararaja mayen 31	Al	(29) 1 Wife 1 Mother 1 Father
Vadackadi 30 Vaidyi Iyen 32	Al	(30) none
31 Siskavad yar alias Muttu Vadyar 32	Al	(31) 1 Wife 2 Sons 1 Married Daughter
32 Naguvadyar 25	Al	(32) 1 Wife
33 Iyo Vadyar alias Narana Vadyar 20	Al	(33) 1 Wife
34 Venkata chalamayen 60	Al	(34) 1 Son 1 Daughter-in law 1 married daughter
35 Subbara yar 57	Share holder	(35) 1 Son
36 K. Sub bayen 58	do	(36) 1 Wife
37 Nagayar 56	do	(37) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter in law 2 married daughters 1 unmarried Daughter
38 Nagammal 27	do	(38) 2 married daughters 1 do unmarried
Cheval Patti 39 Vira Raghavayen 40	do	(39) 1 Wife 4 Sons 1 Daughter in law
Palakulam 40 Armoga Sivan 46	Al	(40) 1 Wife 1 Son 2 married daughter
Letchmipuram 41 Rangappa nayakan 50	Al	(41) 1 Wife 3 Sons 1 Daughter in law 1 married Daughter 1 do unmarried
42 Ramasawmy Nayakan 35	Al	(42) 1 Wife 1 Son

VI --- One Meenatchy Sunderamyen claims two Vritties from the person No 1 to 4 of 16 which are in common with on the ground that his father rented out the lands 27 years ago to the father of the person No 1 of 16 — & that the person No 1 to 4 of 16 have no proprietary right ~~claim~~ in them — Again he says that of these two Vritties, one Pongos is in possession of the person No 1 & the rest in possession of the persons No 2-3 & 4 of 16 equally — Defendants deny every knowledge of the transaction — ~~Defendant~~ said Plaintiff also has failed to prove his claim. Mahajanams also deny every knowledge of the transaction. Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court. — The claim proved to be a fictitious one —

VII ---- The person No 60 claims 15/16 Vritty from the persons No 62-63 & 64 of 16 — on the ground that his grand father mortgaged the lands to the father of the persons No 62-63 & 64 about 25 years ago & that the defendants ~~[illegible]~~ entered the lands in the statement as if they were their own — Defendants deny every knowledge of the transaction — Mahajanams also deny every knowledge of the transaction. The father's elder brother of the claimant says that the claim is not true & the lands are in possession of the defendants — Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court.

VIII. The said person No 60 claims 6/16 Vritty from the person No 28 of 16 on the ground that the person No 28 of 16 usurped the lands 10 years ago — It is proved that ~~[illegible]~~ ~~that~~ the person No 28 of 16 ~~acquired~~ the lands entered of [illegible] to his name by purchase & deed in 1852 subsequently & that ever since he is enjoying them ~~[illegible]~~. Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court — There is an agreement & bill of sale to show the transaction. The documents proved to be genuine one —

IX --- The Widow No 65 of 16 claims ~~to~~ one Vritty from the person No 25-26 & 27 of 16 on the ground that she passed a bill of sale in A.D. 1863 in the name of the person No 25 of 16 as having sold one Vritty to him ~~[illegible]~~ (No 25) & deposited the document ~~[illegible]~~ with Subba Sawmy Iyer one of the Vakeels of the Moonsiff Court of Sivagunga who fraudulently gave the bill of sale to the person No 25 of 16 though the ~~money~~ value was not paid to her & that the one Vritty is in mortgage with one Sundara Mayen & not in possession of the person No 25 — Bill of sale is on a stamped paper. The Widow No 65 of 16 requests to register the one Vritty in her name on the ground that the transaction of ~~the~~ the sale is not complete — & that she never received the value of the Vritty — nor gave the Bill of sale to the person No 25 of 16.

The person No 25 of 16 says that he purchased the one Vritty in A.D. 1863 — 31st March for Rupees 1000 from the Widow No 65 of 16 & paid ~~to~~ a sum of Rupees 502 to Sunderamyen with whom the Vritty was in mortgage & redeemed the same & that he paid also a sum of ~~Rs~~ 498 Rupees to one Subba Lutchmy Ammal in liquidation of a debt of the Widow No 65 of 16 at her request — & as stated in the Bill of sale ~~[illegible]~~ (Vide next sheet)

The person No 25 to 27 are undivided Brothers

43 Venkatrama Nayakan 22	Al	(43)	none
44 Naranappa Nayakan 38	Al	(44)	1 Wife 1 Son 2 Married Daughters 1 Do Unmarried Daughter
45 Lingama Nayakan 35	Al	(45)	1 Wife 2 Sons
Vostipanar 46 Pichayi alias Parvatham 36	Al	(46)	1 Married Daughter
47 Arunachalamsetti 50	Al	(47)	1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter in law 1 Married Daughter 2 Unmarried Daughters
48 Sivanarayanamsetti 45	Al	(48)	1 Wife 1 Son
49 Muttu Karuppansetti 40	Al	(49)	1 Wife 2 Sons 1 Daughter in law
50 Subban Setti 30	Al	(50)	1 Wife 1 Unmarried Daughter
Vedakadi 51 Khadar [illegible] Ambalakaran 35	Al	(51)	1 Wife 1 Son 2 Unmarried Daughters
52 Kadar Sahib 32	Al	(52)	1 Wife 1 Unmarried Daughter
53 Nayna Mahomeed 22	Al	(53)	none
54 Kesavan Setti 35	Al	(54)	1 Wife 1 Son 1 Unmarried Daughter
Sivagangai 55 Sivasaila Modili 40	Al	(55)	1 Wife 2 Unmarried Daughters
Kulaganir 56 Venkatesa woroyon 55	Share holder	(56)	none
57 Narayanan 50	Do	(57)	1 Wife
58 Venkatesa woroyon 35	Do	(58)	1 Wife 1 Son
Paduvar 59 Sami Iyan Sevari 37	Al	(59)	1 Wife 1 Son

Vide next & preceding side —

e 3 - Darmasanam Poonthadi in Partipatrun Taluq in Sivaganga Zemindary.-

Register No. 949

Sheet No. 1108

60 Sunnomoni alias Veromes woreyan 16	Al	(60)	1 Mother 1 Younger brother
61 Verungaroudi Perumalayangor 60	Share holder	(61)	1 Wife 1 Son
62 Ramaswami Iyengar 49	Al	(62)	1 Wife 2 Sons 1 Daughter in law
63 Ananta Kristnayangor 46	Al	(63)	1 Wife 2 Sons 2 Daughters in law
64 Sundara Rajayengar 42	Al	(64)	Wife & Son
65 Minakshi Ammal 47	Share holder	(65)	1 married Daughter

Vide preceding side -

	Patrimony	Shares acquired by purchase &c		Total
		Supported by documents	Unsupported by documents	
No 1 is enjoying	" 11/16	2 25/64	" "	3 5/64
No 2 do	" 1/4	" 59/64	" "	1 11/64
No 3 do	" 7/32	" 47/64	" "	" 61/64
No 4 do	" 7/32	" 47/64	" "	" 61/64
No 5 do	1 "	" 13/64	2 27/32	4 3/64
No 6 do	" "	" 125/2560	1 "	1 125/2560
No 7 do	" "	" 49/64	" "	" 49/64
No 8 do	" "	" 25/64	" "	" 25/64
No 9 do	" "	" 25/64	" "	" 25/64
No 10 do	" "	" 25/64	" "	" 25/64
No 11 do	" "	" "	" 5/32	" 5/32
No 12 to 16 do	" 1/2	1 5/32	" "	1 21/32
No 17 to 19 do	" 29/64	" 11/16	" "	1 9/64
No 20 do	" 39/64	3 25/64	" "	4 "
No 21 do	" 27/64	" 1/32	" "	" 29/64
No 22 & 23 do	1 "	" "	" 3/64	1 3/64
No 24 do	2 5/64	2 7/64	"	4 3/16
No 25 to 27 do	" 27/32	8 45/64	" "	9 35/64
No 28 do	" "	" 43/64	" "	" 43/64
No 29 do	" "	" 97/320	" 63/320	" 1/2
No 30 do	" "	" "	1/64	" 1/64
No 31 to 33 do	" "	" 59/64	" "	" 59/64
No 34 do	" "	" 1/8	" "	" 1/8
No 35 do	" 25/32	" 11/64	" "	" 61/64
No 36 do	" 5/8	" 3/16	" "	" 13/16
No 37 do	" 25/32	" 21/64	" "	1 7/64
No 38 do	" 25/32	" 21/64	" "	1 7/64
No 39 do	" 61/64	" 5/64	"	1 1/32
No 40 do	" "	1 1/4	3 3/4	5 "
No 41 do	" "	3 1/2	" "	3 1/2
No 42 & 43 do	" "	" 575/640	" 125/640	1 "
No 44 do	" "	" 14/320	" 291/320	" 61/64
No 45 do	" "	" 14/320	" 226/320	" 3/4
No 46 do	" "	1 7/8	" "	1 7/8
No 47 do	" "	2 73/96	" 1/48	2 25/32
No 48 do	" "	2 73/96	" 1/48	2 25/32
No 49 & 50 do	" "	2 73/96	" 1/48	2 25/32
No 51 to 53 do	" "	6 33/64	" "	6 33/64
No 54 do	" "	" 17/64	" "	" 17/64
No 55 do	" "	2 9/64	" 1/16	2 13/64
No 56 to 58 do	" 70/320	" "	" 15/2560	" 575/2560
No 59 do	" "	" "	1/16	" 1/16
No 60 do	" "	" 15/640	" 125/640	" 14/64
No 61 do	" 1/2	" 15/640		" 335/640
No 62 to 64 do	" 27/32	2 115/640	" 60/640	3 75/640
No 65 do	" 25/64	" 225/640	" "	2 525/640
Total	14 5/32	55 1405/2560	10 755/2560	80

(X) That he paid the sum of Rupees 502 to Sundaramayen 3 months after the date of the bill of sale; that he paid ~~further~~ sum of Rs 498 to the said Subba Latchmy Ammal on the very day he purchased the Vritty, at the request of the Widow No 65 & according to one of the stipulations contained in the bill of sale & that the Vritty is in his possession since the date of the purchase

Two of the Witnesses who attested the bill of sale say that they never saw when the money was paid either to the Widow No 65 or to her debtors & that they saw when the bill of sale was delivered to the son of the person No 25 by the Widow No 65 after affixing her mark to it. The said Subba Latchmy Ammal gave a Receipt stating that the person No 25 &c. paid to her a sum of Rupees 498 on the very day on which ~~he~~ he purchased the Vritty in question, in ~~[illegible]~~ satisfaction of a debt due to her by the Widow No 65, at the request of the said Widow 65 &c. The son of Sundaramayen above alluded to states that, the person No 25 paid a sum of Rupees 502 to his father a year ago - in liquidation of the mortgaged sum due to him by Naranayen - [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ who sold the Vritty in A.D 1861 - June, to the Widow No 65 & that this sum was paid at the request of the Widow No 65 ~~[illegible]~~ ~~to [illegible]~~ an equal sum that was due to ~~to~~ Naranayen.

On the whole it is proved that Naranayen had one Vritty in this Village; that he mortgaged it to Sundaramayen; that before the Vritty was ~~un~~redeemed, ~~she~~ he sold it in A.D 1861 to the Widow No 65 for Rupees 800; the Widow No 65 paid 298 Rupees to the seller & ~~paid~~ failed to pay the remaining sum of 502 Rupees to the mortgagee as desired by the seller; that therefore the Widow. No 25 had no possession of the Vritty; that in this state of things, the Widow No 65 sold the Vritty to the person No 25 in A.D 1863 - for Rupees 1000 ~~and~~ & executed a bill of sale with stipulations that the person No 25 ~~&~~ should pay 498 Rupees to Subba Latchmy - Ammal, one of her debtors & a further sum of Rupees 502 to the mortgagee Sundaramayen; that the person No 25 &c. paid the said sums accordingly to Subba Latchmy Ammal & Sundaramayen ~~&~~ redeemed the Vritty from mortgage - & took possession of the same in last year & that the person No 25 &c. enjoyed the produce of the last & current years -

Under the above circumstances I reject the claim of the Widow No 65 & register the share in the name of the person No 25 ~~—~~ to 27 &c.

The

The Widow N 65 sued the person N 25 & 16 for the recovery of the Vritty in the Moonsiff's Court of Sevagunga in suit N 36 of 18[illegible]

a year ago but no decision was passed as yet by the Court. In the bill of sale executed to the person N 25 by the Widow N 65 it is said distinctly that the

person N 25 paid 498 Rupees to Subba Letchmy Ammal & 502 Rupees to Seenevasamayen & thus made good the one value of the Vritty. Genuineness of the bill of sale is proved

X ...... ~~The~~ Appadhorainayen, the late Vakeel of the Rany of Sevagunga & Periya Karuppanan Servai another Vakeel of the Rany

N.B. ~~Claimed to 27½ N.B. out of 270 shares~~ ~~[illegible]~~ 26¼ Vritties & 18 Acres 81 Cents of Wet Lands in this Village that Srimathi Puvanalinga Tavar ~~purchased~~ the [illegible] Grand Father of the

late Husband of the Rany purchased these lands 60 years ago from the Villagers; that the said Tavar gave these lands about 50 years ago to her younger sister

Vella Attal as "Streedhana" or Pin Money; that the said Vellattal gave them 45 years ago to her daughter Irlattal as Streedhana; that Irlattal gave

them 40 years ago as pin money to her Daughter Rattama Attal, who gave them 35 years ago to Vélu Nachiyar, her daughter & Sotimrany Zemindarin the Wife

that Vélu Nachiyar gave them about 30 years ago as pin money to her Daughter Rattama Nachiyar, present Rany Zemindar; that Rattama

Nachiyar enjoyed them for 5 or 6 years & repaired to Ramnad & other places to Claim to the Zemindary & that after her departure or in her absence, the

Mahazanams usurped these lands about 25 years ago. The Vakeel Periyakaruppanen Servai gave a written Ryfeyet first, to the above effect

on the 5 May/64. Some time after this, he again ~~or~~ gave another Ryfeyet, which was ~~not~~ mislaid by one of the Gumastahs on the Establishment who had charge of it

stating that these Vritties &c were in possession of the Rany Zemindar so far back as 5 or 6 years. In the meantime, Sawmy Iyengar, "Manóverty Karbar of the Rany

issued improperly a Takeed to the Curnum & Ambalagar a Pedda Canpoo of the Darmasanam under settlement on the 29th May/64, directing them to take possession of

the Lands in dispute with the produce thereof of the current year (1273); to harvest the produce of ~~[illegible]~~ the same; to thrash the corn ~~&~~ to collect Fisheries &c

The Vakeel Periya Karuppanen Servai, named 5 Witnesses in support of his Claim. The Vakeel Appadhorainayen presented a Petition on the 9th July/64 stating that

repeating the above Circumstances & stating that the bills of sales produced by the Mahazanams shewing that the lands in dispute were purchased by them are not genuine ones

The Mahazanams gave a Ryfeyet stating that, these 26¼ Pongoos out of 70, which are equal to 27 Vritties & $\frac{615}{1280}$ of a Vritty, out of 80 Vritties are in possession of

the Mahazanams as shewn below & that they fell in possession of these Mahazanams by purchase.

1 The person N 12-13-14-15 & 16 of 016 are enjoying $\frac{19}{328}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 17 18 & 19 D D D — D — $\frac{2655}{5120}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 20 — D — 2 Vritties $\frac{243}{1280}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 25-26 & 27 — D D D D — 5 $\frac{1311}{5120}$ Vritties
1 The person N 28 of 016 — D D D — $\frac{351}{1280}$ of a Vritty
1 The person — N 29 of 016 — D D D — $\frac{1005}{5120}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 31-32 & 33 of 016 — D D D — $\frac{2356}{2560}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 40 of 016 is enjoying — D D D — $\frac{1185}{1280}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 41 D D — D D — D D 2 — $\frac{703}{5120}$ Vritties
1 The persons N 42 & 43 of 016 are enjoying — " — $\frac{2527}{2560}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 44 — D D — D D — " — $\frac{9119}{10240}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 45 — D D — D D — " — $\frac{7571}{10240}$ of a Vritty

1 The person N 46 is enjoying — " — $\frac{3920}{5120}$ of a Vritty
1 The persons N 51-52 & 53 are enjoying — $\frac{2087}{2560}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 56 of 016 is enjoying " — $\frac{335}{1280}$ of a Vritty
1 The person N 59 of 016 — D D " — $\frac{1}{16}$ of a Vritty
1 The persons N 62-63 & 64 — D D D " — $\frac{335}{2560}$ of a Vritty
1 The ~~person~~ the Widow N° 65 is — D D D " — $\frac{295}{1280}$ Vritties

Total — 27 $\frac{615}{1280}$ Vritties

The above 18 & 81 Cents to which the Vakeels claim ~~[illegible]~~ in addition to the above Pongoos —
~~these~~ have been added to 80 shares formed newly in this Village in A.D. 1863. These
18 Acres ~~&~~ 81 Cents were sold ~~[illegible]~~ by the ancestors of the Mahazanams to Puvanalinga Tavar
~~Grand~~ Father of the Husband of the Rany Rattama Nachiyar 70 years ago

6. Darmasanam Village of Pudukudi in Parthipanur Taluq in Sevagunga Zemindary —

Three Vittus & shares, were, Mahazanamsay purchased as follows — The annexed statement shews the names of the ~~sellers~~ purchasers, the names of the sellers, the years in which the shares were sold &c

Register No. 949

Sheet No. 1109

Names of the purchasers —	Names of the sellers —	Years in which the shares were purchased —	Relationship existing between Puvanalinga Taver & the persons in Col 2 — as per statement of the Mahazanamas —	Remarks —
1	2	3	4	5
N° 12-13-14-15-16-17-18 & 19 of 016 —	(1) Senkarayen & (2) Sinnasawmy Taver —	1832-1839 & 1861 —	The person No 2 of Col 2 is the Daughter's son of Puvanalinga Taver	Three bills are on plain Cadjan leaves —
N° 20 of 016 —	(1) Sevvana Taver — (2) Parameswara Sastry (3) Rekkya Rajah Taver — (4) Subbramanaya Sastry —	1832-1839 & 1867 —	The person No 1 of Col 2 is the adopted son & the person No 3 of do is the Daughter's son of Puvana Linga Taver —	Four bills are on plain Cadjan leaves —
N° 25-26 & 27 of 016 —	(1) Senkarayen — (2) Sayed Meera Ambalam (3) Sundara Taver — (4) Sawmya Taver — (5) Dorasawmy Taver (6) Kandapany Naickyan (7) Sinniah Taver — (8) Sinna Tamby Taver (9) Meenachy Ammal	1832-1867-1835 & 1863 —	None — None — The person No 3 of Col 2 is the son in law of Puvanalinga Taver — The person No 4 of Col 2 is the Grand Son of the Daughter of Do — The person No 5 of Col 2 is the Son of the Daughter of Do — The Woman No 6 of Col 2 is the Grand Daughter's Daughter of Do — The person No 7 of Col 2 is the son of Daughter of Do Do — The person No 8 of Col 2 is the adopted grandson of Do Do Do None —	Four bills are on plain Cadjan leaves — One bill of sale is on a ~~plain~~ the stamped Cadjan leaf & another is on stamped paper —
N° 28 of 016 —	Parameswara Sastry —	A D 1832 —	None —	One Bill of sale is on a plain Cadjan leaf —
N° 29 of 016 —	Subbramanya Sastry —	Seven years —	None —	No bill of sale —
N° 31-32 & 33 of 016 —	Rekaya Rajah Taver —	A D 1832 —	Daughter's son of Puvanalinga Taver —	One bill of sale is on a plain Cadjan leaf —
N° 40 of 016 —	His Grand Father's Eldest wife Periya Maraty Attal — acquired the lands from her father Puvanalinga Taver as Streedhana	Long ago —	The person N° 40 is the Grand Son of the Daughter of Do —	No documents —
N° 41 of 016 —	(1) Periya Maraty Attal — (2) Rekaya Rajah Taver (3) Sundara Taver	A D 1832 — A D 1837 1847 & 1848	The Woman No 1 of Col 2 is the daughter of Puvanalinga Taver — N° 2 of Col 2 is the son of Daughter of Do Do — N° 3 is the son in law of Do Do Do	Three bills are on plain Cadjan leaves — & one is on a stamped Cadjan leaf —

	(2)	(3)	4	(5)
No 42 & 43 C°16	(1) Sundara Tavier (2) Rangapa Naik	AD 1848	The person No 1 C°2 is the son in law of Puvanalinga Tavier	One Bill of sale is on a stamped C[illegible] leaf - Another bill of sale for the lands sold by No 2 C°2 is not forthcoming
No 44 C°16	(1) Rangapa Naik (2) Ramaswamy Naik (3) Venkatarama Naik	AD 1863	None	No bills of sales — they were lost -
No 45 C°16	Rangapa Naik	Date is unknown	None	No bill of sale
No 46 C°16	Subbramanya Sastry	In AD 1857	None	One bill is on a stamped Cadjan leaf -
No 51 - 52 - & 53 C°16	(1) Javana Tavier (2) Parameswara Sastry (3) Rekaya Rajah Tavar (4) Subbramanya Sastry	In AD 1832 - 1836 - 1839 & 1848	The person No 1 C°2 is the adopted son of Puvanalinga Tavier Person No 3 C°2 is the son of Daughter of [illegible]	Five bills are on plain Cadjan leaves -
No 54 C°16	(1) Senkarayen (2) Subbramaniya Sastry	1860 & 1848	None	Two bills are on plain Cadjan leaves
No 59 C°16	The Mother of the father of the person No 59, whose name was Tillai Attal - acquired his share as Stridhana	Date is unknown	Tillai Attal mentioned in C°2 - was the Daughter of Puvanalinga Tavier	No documents
No 62 & 63 & 64 C°16	Pitchukuppa Sastry alias Narayana Sastry	In AD 1843	None	One bill of sale is on a plain Cadjan leaf -
No 65 C°16	(1) Subbramanya Sastry (2) Naranayen	In AD 1861	None	One bill of sale is on plain Cadjan leaf -

The above sales relate to 27 Vutties & $\frac{615}{1280}$ of a Vutty, out of 80 — shares - formed in AD 1863 —

The 18 Acres & 88 cents to which the Rany's Vakeel claim in addition to the above Vutties were purchased in AD 1856 by the person No 25 for Rupees 1560 - from Sinna Tamby Tavier, late Husband of Kattama Nachiyar - Bill of sale is on a stamped Cadjan leaf - The document was registered in AD 1857/6 - in the Sub Court of Madura -

The Mahajanams produced all the bills of sales above ~~[illegible]~~ quoted — in addition to the following documents in proof that they acquired the lands - in question legally - & lawfully -

A 1 An Authenticated copy of an Arza presented by the late Husband of the Rany Kattama Nachiyar to the Civil Court of Madura - on the 24 December 1856 - In that it is stated that the Arzeedar Sinnah Sinnah Tamby Tavier who holds 3-8/16 Vutties out of 70 in the Village, sold them in AD 1856 &c to the person No 25 C°16, that ~~the~~ one Subban Setty to whom they were mortgaged, refuses to make the lands over to him & that he should be instructed to transfer the lands to the person No 25 C°16 - (Vide next sheet)

5th ... of the Damasan[illegible] ... younger ... many – Partiphanie Laley

× No 46 & 26

B 1 One authenticated copy of a Razeenamah filed in the Sub Court of Madura in No 12 of 1857 by the Vakeel of the person No 25 of 16 & by the Vakeel of Pitchay alias Parvatam, heir of the mortgagee Subban Setty alluded in the Arzee cited just above this, ~~[illegible]~~ agreeing to make over the 3 Vullies & 6/16 Vully to the person No 25 & stating that the person No 25 sold to her half of these lands just before the Razeenamah

C 1 List executed to the person No 25 of 16 by the late Husband of the Rany Rattama Nachiyar detailing therein the ~~[illegible]~~ spots of lands where come the 3 6/16 Vullies. This is dated 1856 –

Register No. 949

D 1 Talleed issued by the late Husband of the Rany Rattama Nachiyar to the Curnums of the Village intimating them of his having sold the 3-6/16 Vullies to the person No 25 of 16. This is dated 1856 –

Sheet No. 1110

E 1 Talleed issued by the late Husband of the Rany Rattama Nachiyar to the Curnums of the Village in A D 1856 directing them to redeem from mortgage the 3.6/16 Vullies & 18 Ams & 81 Culis of Wet lands sold to the person No 25, by making the person No 25 of 16 to pay the mortgage money to Subban Setty & make the lands over to the person No 25 & to deliver to the person No 25 the extinguished mortgage bonds.

F & G } II Bills of sale executed by Sinnich Sinna Tamby Tevar, late Husband of the Rany Rattama Nachiyar to the person No 25 of 16 in A D 1856, on stamped Cadjan leaves – selling 3 Vullies & 6/16 of a Vully & 18 Ams & 81 Culis of Wet which he had in the Village –

Both of these documents have been registered in the Sub Court of Madura on the 24 January 1856 –

XI ---- From the above papers it is evident that the Rany Rattama Nachiyar or her Husband had only 3 6/16 Vullies & 18 Ams & 81 Culis of land in the Village in A D 1856 & that they were sold to the person No 25 of 16 & that the person No 25 sold a portion of these lands to the Widow No 46 of 26 & is retaining the rest in his possession up to this day. The Mahajanams say that Puvanalinga Tevar had really 26/4 Vullies out of 7 ... & 18 Ams & 81 Culis ... about half century ago, that he ~~[illegible]~~ distributed these 26/4 Vullies amongst his 3 daughters, to his younger brothers daughter & to his youngest wife ... Marudattal equally ... 5/4 Vullies ... dead, that the ... son of Puvanalinga Tevar ... married the Velu Nachiyar, the daughter of the younger brother of Puvanalinga Tevar & acquired ... the 5/4 Vullies belonging to his adopted Mother ... the Mahajanams ... leaving 3 6/16 Vullies & 18 Ams & 81 Culis ... Marudattal with 18 Ams & 81 Culis from his adopted ~~[illegible]~~ father ... the late Husband of the Rany & the adopted son ... of Wet lands – These lands were sold to the person No 25 by Sinnich ... Tawana Tevar. Thus the claim of the Rany to the lands in dis... unfounded & unjust one & an improper one

... and
... husband
of Rattama
Nachiyar

1

Of the above documents, those marked C, D, E, F & G are in the hand writing of Sawmy Iyengar who wrote an improper Talleed to the Curnums & other Villagers a few months ago to take ~~possession~~ resume the lands in question with their produce ~~Offices of~~ [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ in his capacity of "Maniamenty Karbar" of the Rany. As the Mahajanams ~~[illegible]~~ named this Sawmy Iyengar as their Witness, I have tried my best to secure his attendance over the last 3 months but in vain ~~seen~~ from the papers filed with this. He is delaying by reason that he is ~~[illegible]~~ sick – Mr Fischer, the Rany's Agent's Agent, wrote to me on the 16 June/61 that he will send Sawmy Iyengar at once to me but in the meantime, the Iyengar was dismissed from the Rany's service – Here I ~~[illegible]~~ tried by other means to secure his attendance but in vain – It is proved satisfactorily by the Mahajanams & others that the documents C to G ~~[illegible]~~ were writ... by him or they ... in his own hand writing – Muttusawmy Iyer, the Da[illegible] Pumpretty in the Rany's Court was called upon ... evidence ~~[illegible]~~ regarding the lands in dispute & pro... such Accounts as he may have in ~~the~~ his possession in the Rany's ... bearing on the dispute ... ~~[illegible]~~

He appeared before me with large bundles of Cadjan Accounts, on the permission of the Rajah's [illegible] agent. I have examined these Accounts most carefully & at a loss of considerable time – The results of my examination go to prove that, in 1244 the father of the person N 25 & the Curnum of this Village produced a list of the holders of the Poygoos in the Village & in which 53½ Vritties ~~[illegible]~~ out of 70, were inserted in the names of the Mahajanams & 16½ Vritties in the names of "Tevamars" or Rajah Bundoos – as follows:

- Taivana Tever – Father in law of Rattamia Nachiyar had then 5-6/16 Vritties –
- Puduvar Iyga, Brother in law of Taivana Tever do is uncle do Father in law of Rattama Nachiyar — } 4-6/16 Vritties –
- Sundanodayu Iyga – Brother in law of Taivana Tever above alluded to — } 3 Vritties –
- Pulakdura Iyga, Grand Father of the person N 40 & brother in law of Taivana Tever above alluded to — } 3¾ Vritties

Total – 16½

[illegible] family 70 shares

From the above it is evident that previous to 30 years, 9¼ Vritties out of 26¼ Vritties which the family of Puvanalinga Tever, one of the ancestors of the Husband of Rattama Nachiyar do said do were disposed of subsequently & that the Vritties that were then in possession of that family were in possession of those who sold most of them subsequently to the Mahajanams – as shewn in the preceding paras – Now out of these 26¼ Vritties ~~[illegible]~~ do do, 3 13/16 Vritties are in possession of the person N 40 & 59, descendants of Puvanalinga Tever, & the rest fell in possession of the Mahajanams by purchase. The person N 40 acquired some lands by purchase recently – do [illegible] do ~~[illegible]~~ from the [illegible] [illegible] do [illegible] do [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ the father of the person N 25 died about 28 years ago & the Curnum who do signed do ~~wrote~~ the list of Poygoos do with the father of the person N 25 do in 1244 died 7 years ago. The Vak [illegible] Servaikaren argued that Puvanalinga Tever had no daughters. This proved to be terrible lie – Though I was in a position to prono [illegible] the claim of the Rajah's Vakeel is an unjust & an unfounded one, still I was expecting for Sawmy Iyengar who wrote an imp [illegible] gers to take possession of the 26¼ Vritties & other lands in dispute which are in possession of the Mahajanams – On the 18 August 1854, o [illegible] [illegible] of Mr Fischer, the Rajah's Agent, delivered a letter addressed to me by that Gentleman in the following tone –

x equal to 18 acres & 81 cents

"With regard to the dispute about the 26¼ shares in the Poodoorkudy Village, Vanamadura Talooq (new arrangement) & 16x & odd fleys Oombalam land in said Village, I hear that my name is mixed up with the gross forgery & fraud attempted by Sawmy Iyengar in respect to said lands against the Mahajanams of said Village, I therefore beg emphatically to repudiate the same and to request that strict enquiry might be made & the offenders punished –" From this I infer that Mr Fischer finds fault with Sawmy Iyengar do his do for having written an improper Takeed to the Curnum & other officers of the Village to attach or take possession of the lands that are in possession of the Mahajanams since long legally & for his having insinuated the Rajah's Vakeel to ~~[illegible]~~ prefer the claim to the lands in question – I sent a reply immediately telling him that I have neither means nor necessity to prosecute the said Sawmy Iyengar but he may bring a charge of abusive of authority against the Sawmy Iyengar before ~~proper~~ a Competent Authority if he is offended with his proceedings

Vide next shee

6 [illegible]

Register No. 949

At the same time, I requested him to tell me clearly whether the Ranee has or has not claim (Takarar) to the lands in question - He sent a letter dated 22d August/64 so as to reach me on the 24 Do. This letter is in the following tone - "I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th Instant & I am much obliged" "to you for the ready attention that you have paid to my letter to which it is an answer - I am glad to find that the report that my name is mixed up" "with the Poodoocoody Case is not true - I must decline to have any thing to say to the discreditable proceedings & leave Samiyengar to answer" "for himself -" This is tantamount I think that the Ranee has no Takarar or claim to ~~the lands~~ any portion of the Village under settlement -

It is true that Sawmyengar who was a Manager on a salary of 6 Rupees & who afterwards was raised to a newly created post of "Manisvenity Karbar" soon after the Ranee acquired the possession of the Estate, on a monthly salary of 350 Rupees per annum, insinuated, as usual in the zemindaries, ~~to~~ the Vakeels to prefer a claim to the 26/4 Pongoos in the Village, which are worth about 30,000 Rupees - but I cannot keep silent here without saying that Mr Fischer was not aware of the dishonesty & injustice of the Claim preferred by the Vakeels - which gave much trouble both to the investigating officer & to the Mahajanams -

It is Mr ~~Fischer~~ Fischer who wrote to me the following letter - on the 21st May/64 -

Sheet No. 1111

"To the Darmisanam [illegible] P [illegible] thookudy please grant [illegible] seven days more to put in evidence & shew cause"

-Sawmy Iyengar is not in the service of the Ranee - I see no reason to [illegible] him being ~~regarding~~ Wakil in behalf of the Ranee - I asked Chokalinga Pillai, who ~~[illegible]~~ is ~~in~~ the Ranee's Vakeel now, to tell me whether he has any thing to say ~~now~~ now regarding the Claim preferred by his predecessors - He said in the first part of his Ryfeyet that ~~to~~ the Ranee has not any claim to the lands in the Village & ultimately murmured that he must ask the Ranee regarding this - I found he is waiting to bully the Mahajanams & extort something from them -

Whatever may be the opinion of the Ranee or of her subordinates, it is clearly proved that she has not slightest claim to the lands in question -

Hence the Claim is rejected & the Ranee is referred to the Civil Court.

Five Witnesses were examined on behalf of the Ranee at the early stage of these proceedings - All of them said that the lands in dispute are not in possession of the Ranee now - The Ryfeyets of these Witnesses shew that they are quite ignorant of the details of this Village - The evidence is on the whole in favour of the Mahajanams - These Witnesses are Ambalagars of this Village - It appears they were richly rewarded ~~[illegible]~~ to give this evidence -

XII - All the transactions above alluded to & all the documents produced by the Mahajanams proved to be genuine -

-Valuation-

XIII - Wet lands in this Village depend upon 8 Tanks - Of these one is large & others are small in size - They are in repair - They are fed by one of the important channels of Vaigayar - one of the influential rivers in the District - The Tanks are fed annually - Scarcity of Water is not felt generally - The Mahajanams claimed 280 Acres of Wet & 196 Acres of Dry as cultivated la[illegible] Acres of Wet & 235 Acres of Dry as waste - They say that the 50 Acres of Wet claimed as waste are of 10 years uncultivated lands from the soil being impregnated [illegible] uncultivated lands. They further say that the Wet waste may be brought under plough within the next 10 years & that the Dry lands [illegible] Dry -

— brought under plough & converted into Wet within the next 20 years. The results of my enquiry go to prove that there is some exaggeration in the matter of Waste

as usual, because every Inamdar would wish to buy the reversionary right of Govt as cheaply as possible — Some of the Wet lands are cultivated 2d time annually —

The Mahajanams say that the Wet lands thus cultivated with double crop ~~[illegible]~~ rest annually may be estimated at 1/4 or 1/5 of the Wet area on an average —

One or two Acres are cultivated with Garden crops under Wells. This is Nerarambour Village ~~[illegible]~~ Garden Wells may be ~~[illegible]~~ sunk in the earth —

Nanjah & Punjah lands are of a superior quality generally — The soil is generally black or Regur — The Taluq in which the Village under settlement is situated

is noted for fertile lands — The Village is in flourishing state — The Village is open to much improvement as the Mahajanams say that 235 Acres of

Dry Waste may be converted into Wet within the ~~next~~ next 20 years — I see no defects in this Village because the soil is fertile & the supplying channel

is a flourishing one — The average income of this Village as per statement of the Mahajanams is 1060 Rupees per annum — This is not true.

The contiguous Ayan Villages are Rungapalem, Virapalem & Rolandapury. The average Wet assessment of these Villages calculated for a period of 15 years

intervening the F 1256 & 1270 comes to ~~6~~ 6-4-5, 7-9-6, 8-6-0 per acre respectively. The average Dry assessment of the Ayan Villages varies from 1-2-0 to

0-13-6 per acre — The highest rate of Dry assessment is charged for Cotton, Pulse &c which are grown in this Village —

The Mahajanams say that the Dry & Wet soil of this Village may be placed on a par with that of the Village of Rolandapury, the average wet assessment of

which is lower ~~than~~ than that of the two other Villages — The soil may be pl[illegible] par with that of the 3 surrounding Villages —

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

Wet — 300 Acres cultivated annually once in full & partly 2d time at 7 Rupees per acre } 2100-0-0

Wet 30 1/4 Acres — Waste &c ~~at~~ fit to be cultivated at 1 Re per acre } 30-4-0

Total — 2130-4-0

Dry 250 Acres cultivated at 1-2-0 per acre — 281-4

Dry 182 Acres Waste, fit to be converted into Wet Acres brought under plough ~~at~~ within the next 20 years as Mahajanams say at 1/2 Rupees per Acre } 91

Total 372-4-0

Grand Total 2502-8-0

Note — one of the Mahajanams complained that the Mahajanams concealed 105 Acres of Wet in this Village — ~~But the~~ the Mahajanams some complainant say, that they never concealed any lands & that if it is proved that they have concealed any, they are ready to pay full assessment for the same — They gave also a written agreement to this effect — R. G. H.

Kummumett
3rd
September 1864

J. Sivambara Rao