626.

Register of Dharmásanam Village of Pudukóttai in the Táluq of Yemunéswaram of Sivaganga Zamindári Estate in Madura D.

Jennavarayen Pudukóttai

45 [illegible]

	Patrimony	Acquired by purchase supported by documents	unsupported by documents	Total shares
No 1 and 2 are enjoying	1 9/32	4 15/32	1/2	6 1/4
No 3 is Do	305/640	1 1671/2560	"	2 331/2560
No 4 Do Do	305/640	575/640	"	1 3/8
No 5 Do Do	305/640	575/640	"	1 3/8
No 6 Do Do	305/640	2 575/640	"	3 3/8
No 7 Do Do	1 29/32	2 649/5120	1/16	4 489/5120
No 8 to 10 are Do	1 29/32	2409/5120	"	2 2929/5120
No 11 is Do	455/640	1/2	"	1 135/640
No 12 Do Do	21/32	2 275/640	1 5/32	4 155/640
No 13 Do Do	1 1/2	1 35/64	"	3 3/64
No 14 Do Do	1 9/16	1/4	"	1 13/16
No 15 Do Do	7/8	"	"	7/8
No 16 to 19 are Do	1/2	"	1 5/16	1 13/16
No 20 is Do	1/32	"	"	1/32

	Patrimony	supported by documents	unsupported by documents	Total shares
No 21 Do Do	17/32	"	"	17/32
No 22 to 24 are Do	2 1/8	3 19/32	1/8	5 27/32
No 25 to 27 Do Do	2 1/8	3 19/32	1/8	5 27/32
No 28 is Do	25/32	1/8	"	29/32
No 29 Do Do	9/32	"	1/32	5/16
No 30 Do Do	1/4	5/16	1/16	5/8
No 31 Do Do	1/4	"	"	1/4
No 32 Do Do	1 1/2	11/16	"	2 3/16
No 33 Do Do	1	"	"	1
No 34 to 41 are Do	1	"	"	1
No 42 is Do	21/32	1/8	"	25/32
No 43 Do Do	3/4	"	"	3/4
No 44 to 47 are Do	1/16	"	"	1/16
No 48 to 52 Do Do	1/16	"	"	1/16
No 53 is Do	"	"	7/16	7/16
No 54 Do Do	"	1/4	"	1/4
No 55 to 57 are Do	"	10	"	10
No 58 to 60 Do Do	"	"	3/4	3/4

	Patrimony	supported by documents	unsupported by documents	Total shares
No 61 is Do	"	"	1/16	1/16
No 62 to 64 are Do	"	"	5/64	5/64
No 65 is Do	"	1/2	"	1/2
No 66 to 69 are Do	"	1	"	1
No 70 and 71 Do Do	"	2	"	2
No 72 is Do	1/16	1/2	"	9/16
Total	24 175/640	41 15/640	4 45/64	70

1 This is one of the Darmasanams in the Zemindary of Sivaganga. This was granted to the person of No 13 & others for subsistence. This is a hereditary grant. This is in uninterrupted possession of its holders since the date of the grant. This has no Patta. It was lost. The Village is supported by all the Accounts of No 12 –

No Tekkarar about the Area or about the boundaries on the part of the Ranys Vakeel. The boundaries now inserted in the vernacular statement correspond to those in the Account of F 1244. Hence the 461 Acres & 30 cents are confirmed here. These lands are situated within the proper limits of the Village – (Vide next [illegible])

As per acct of F 1211

[illegible]nja – (Virayadi)	288	201 – 60
[illegible] Excess – (Do)	35	24 – 50
	323	226 – 10
[illegible]nja Excess (Kurkam)	420	235 – 20
		461 – 30
Deduct Poramboke		
Temple site (Kurkam)	10	5 – 60
Bed of Tank – (Do)	200	112 "
Threshing ground (Do)	4	2 – 24
Village Site – (Do)	32	17 – 92
[illegible]nd – (Do)	6	3 – 36
Channels – (Do)	23	12 – 88
Road – (Do)	8	4 – 48
Burial ground (Do)	2	1 – 12
Channels of the other Villages – (Virayadi)	10	7 "
Do – (Kurkam)	15	8 – 40
		175 "
Remainder		286 – 30
Deduct Service		
[illegible] – (Virayadi)	10 – 4 2/4	7 – 22
Remainder		279 – 08
[illegible]nja – (Virayadi) cultivation	277 – 9 3/4	194 – 38
Excess unassessed	25	17 – 50
	302 – 9 3/4	211 – 88
[illegible]nja – (Kurkam) cultivation	70	39 – 20
[illegible] waste (Do)	50	28 "
Total	120	67 – 20
Grand Total		278 – 08

Deduced from the statement & a paper produced by the Inamdars.

1351 4 –

Dharmasanam as per Istimirar acct 249 – 14 – 5

Karnam 32 – 10 – 5

217 – 4 "

Dharma Sódi Her Muttu vaduganáta Tiver Dated S S 1662 A D 1740

Acct of F 1211 Marata acct of F 1223 – Boundary acct of F 1244 Board Regr of A D 1815. No Patta

Venkata Narasimmayen

In F 1211 Dharmá sanam Jennava Ráyen Pudukóttai Nanja Virayadi 288 A C 201 – 60 In Marata acct of F 1211 Do Do

In F 1223 Dharmá sanam Jennava Ráyen Pudukóttai Nanja Virayadi 288 A C 201 – 60 1 Bálava dáni 2 Sóma sundara mayen &ca

In F 1244 Pudukottai Nanja Virayadi 250 A C 175 "

In Regr of A D 1815 Dharmásanam – Pudukottai 1 Bálava dáni 2 Sómasun dra mayen &ca

Pudukóttai

1 Minákshi Subbayen 42	Son of Daughter's son of Daughter's son of person in Col 13.	(1)	1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter unmd 1 Mother
2 Gurumúrti Ayyen 24	Do	(2)	1 Wife
3 Dhorasámi Ayyen alias Rámasámiyen 53	Son of No 2 in Col 15	(3)	1 Wife 4 sons 2 Daughters in law 2 Daughters md
4 Sómasundara mayen – 8	Grand son of No 2 in Col 15	(4)	1 Mother
5 Sundarama yen – 38	son of No 2 in Col 15	(5)	1 Wife 1 Daughter unmd
6 Subbayen 30	Do	(6)	1 Wife
7 Kuppayen alias Rámasámi Ayyen 40	son of Elder brother of No 2 in Col 15	(7)	1 Wife 4 sons
8 Pichayar Suppusámi Ayyen – 55	Do	(8)	1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter in law 1 Daughter md
9 Nágurayen 45	Do	(9)	1 Wife 4 Daughters md
10 Sundarama yen – 34	Do	(10)	1 Wife

Alienation Family & lands are Divided – One Patta is recommended

To be confirmed under Rule II of 9.

Agreed & under Rule VII for alienees

Jennava Doss – 217 – 6 – a as Confirmed as recommended in the T. D on a Q R of Rs 142 –

Govt Q R 1/8 = 142 Rupees

10/3/65 W.H.

T.D. 1661

A. Sudarshana Rao D.I.

Ráikar 16 – 5 – 64

Sheet No 810

Register No 626

Fair copied

Rates of Government Táluqs per Acre

	max	min
Dry	3-9-9	—1-7.8
Wet	10-13-3	—5-9

Average Rates of Government Táluqs per Acre

Dry 1-5-6

Wet 4-6-1

Average Value of grain of Mélvaram on wet land in Nattur Mahajanam Consisting of Ayen Villages in the Táluq of Yemmeiswaram for a period of 15 years

From Fs 1256 to Fs 1270	Cultivated area in acre	Gross out turn	Of which the miradar's share at 45 percent	average prices of grains	Value of quantity of grain given in col. 4	Rates per Acre.
K M P	A C	K M P	K M P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P
14270—9—5.	9989— 49.	85458—7—5	37417—9—4½	1—8—5	57111—14—7.	5—11—6.

II. This Village consists of 70 equal Vritties. They are enjoyed as shewn in the margin— The lands are divided. Beriz is paid on the number of Vritties equally & permanently. The lands are exchanged once in 10 years. But this was not done during the last 30 years.

III. Of the persons of col. 6, No 1 & 2 are descendants of the Orgl Grantee— The Mahajanams say that this Village was granted originally to the Bramins of various families or of Nana Gotra & Nana Sutra & that the persons No 1 to 52 of col 6 are descendants of the Orgl Grantees. They produced "Naramaul" Account or a list containing the names of the shareholders in the Village, dated as far back as 60 years. ~~[illegible]~~ This Account is not much to be depended upon regarding the details mentioned therein, because these accounts generally contain wrong entries— However they contain the names of all the shareholders inclusive of mortgagees. This "Naramaul" account of this Village contains the names of the ancestors of the persons No 1 to 52 of col 6— Hence these individuals may be classed as descendants of the standing shareholders of the Village— Others are alienees— The persons No 55-56-57-65-66-67-68-69-70 & 71 of col 6 purchased their lands in A.D 1839-1841-1843-1845 ~~[illegible]~~ 1850-1858-1859-1861 & 1863 for Rupees 733 from one Meenatchy Subbyen & shareholders in the Village. Ten bills of sales are on plain Cadjan leaves & one bill is on a stamped Cadjan leaf. The persons No 58 & 61 of col 6 acquired their lands in gift in A.D 1855, 1840 & 1850 from one Latchmy Ammal, & Subbramayen shareholders in the Village. Deeds of gift are on plain Cadjan leaves. The persons No 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-13-14- [illegible]-23-24-25-26-27-28-29-30 & 31 of col 6 purchased some of their lands in A.D 1804-1814-1818-

(Vide next sheet)

11 Yegyiya Rámayen 39	Do—	(11) 1 Wife 3 Daughters md 1 Do unmd
Pudukóttai		
12 Padmanábayen —55	Shareholder	(12) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter in law 1 Grandson
13 Venkatasubbayen —65	Do—	(13) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter in law 1 Grandson 1 Do Daughter
14 Náranayen 50	Do—	(14) 1 Wife 3 sons 2 Daughters in law 2 Daughters md
Madurai		
15 Subbayen 30	Do—	(15) 1 Wife 1 Daughter md 1 Mother
Bramanakurchi		
16 Venkatarámasubbayen—47	Do—	(16) 1 Wife 1 Daughter md 1 Mother
17 Sangaranárayen 41	Do—	(17) 1 Wife 1 Daughter md
18 Rámaswámi Ayen 32	Do—	(18) 2 Elder brothers
19 Kristnayen 25	Do—	(19) 1 Wife
20 Akhilándamayen —63	Do—	(20) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter in law 2 Daughters md
21 Sítárámayen 45	Do—	(21) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter in law
Pudukóttai		
22 Káluvayen alias Sinnarámaswámiyen 50	Do—	(22) 1 Wife 2 sons 2 Daughters in law 4 Daughters md 1 Do unmd
23 Annátturayen —48	Do—	(23) 1 Wife 3 sons 2 Daughters unmd

—— Vide preceding side

Fair copied

She

Dharmasanam Pudukottai in the Taluq of Gemuneswaram in Sivaganga Zamindari Estate in Madura District

Register No. 626

Sheet No. 811

1820-1821-1826-1827-1829-1830-1831-1835-1837-1838-1840-1841-1842-1843-1848-1849-1850-1852-1856-1857-1859-1860-1861-1863 & 1864- for Rupees 6000--

Eleven bills of sale are on stamped papers - & 6 bills are on stamped Cadjan leaves - & 37 Bills are on plain Cadjan leaves - The ancestors of the persons No 22 to 27 purchased two Vritties on the 7th February 1829 from one Subbaroya Iyer &c for Rupees 175-2-6 under a bill of sale on a stamped Cadjan leaf. The sellers sued the purchasers for the recovery of the lands on the ground that the lands were not sold but mortgaged. The Moonsiff's Court of Sivaganga confirmed the sale in suits No 355 & 1487 of 1857-

The lands are in possession of the persons No 22 to 27 of 016- The transaction proved to be bonafide-

The Widow No 72 of 016 purchased 3 Vritties in A.D. 1827-1839-1840 & 1858 for Rupees 256- from one Barety Vadyar, Nagalingamayen &c- One bill of sale is on stamped Cadjan leaf & another is on a plain Cadjan leaf. She sold 2 1/2 Vritties retaining 1/2 Vritty in addition to 1/16 Vritty of her Patrimony- In the Village 4 odd Vritties are enjoyed by the Mahajanams without documents-

The Mahajanams say that these Vritties were purchased partly by gift & partly by purchase & the bills of sale were lost. All the above transactions proved to be bonafide. Enjoyment proved--

IV The Mahajanams of the Village are very litigious persons as usual. The details of their Takrars are given below-

Takrars

The Widow No 72 of 016 claims one Vritty [the 3/16 only a Vritty] from the persons No 1 & 2 of 016 on the ground that her late Husband, who died 30 years ago, mortgaged the lands to the father of the persons No 1 & 2 of 016, who died 23 years ago. The defendants plead that the claim of the Pff is not true. The Mahajanams deny any knowledge of the transaction. The persons No 1 & 2 of 016 produced a deed of exchange executed by the Widow No 72 of 016 to them in A.D 1857 on a stamped Cadjan leaf - giving 2 1/16 Pongoos to the persons No 1 & 2 of 016, ~~[illegible]~~ of the lands which she had in this Village & receiving certain lands in exchange in the Darmasanam Village of Permmanendal, which the persons No 1 & 2 of 016 had possessed- In this document it is said that she gave 2 1/16 Vritties out of 2 Vritties & 13/16 of a Vritty which she has in this Village [to the persons No 1 & 2 of 016]- This document is also attested by her Son in law Ramaswamy Iyer, who comes now with her to claim the [lands] ~~Vritty~~- On the whole as the claim of the Widow No 72 of 016 is not proved- Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court. The [lands] ~~one Vritty~~ in dispute are in possession of the persons No 1 & 2 of 016- It appears that the father of the persons No 1 & 2 of 016 acquired [one Vritty out of the lands in dispute] ~~the Vritty~~ in gift in A.D 1835 from the Widow on the eve of the death of her Husband- It appears that this was granted to perform the funeral rites of her Husband. Deed of gift is on plain Cadjan leaf. The document shows that it was [executed] ~~granted~~ by her Husband & attested by her as her Husband died before signing it - The father of the persons No 1 & 2 of 016 did perform [the funeral] ~~his~~ funeral rites of the ~~husband~~ Widow- The document proved to be [genuine one] ~~bonafide~~ by the Mahajanams in Enjoyment proved-

(Vide next side)

Fairly copied

24	Subbayen	35	Do	(24) 1 Wife 2 sons 1 Daughter unmd
25	Vengevayen	60	Do	(25) 1 Wife 2 sons 2 Daughters in law
26	Ramayen	55	Do	(26) 1 Elder brother
27	Sinnachamiyen	35	Do	(27) 1 Daughter unmd
	Neduvattam			
28	Nagusayen	60	Do	(28) 1 Wife
29	Anantanarayanayen	50	Do	(29) 3 sons 1 Daughter in law 1 Mother
30	Vengusastri	40	Do	(30) 1 Wife
	Vilanjanени			
31	Supparamayen	58	Do	(31) 1 Wife 4 sons 4 Daughters md 2 Daughters in law 1 Mother
32	Appatturayen	50	Do	(32) 1 Wife 3 sons 2 Daughters in law 1 Grand Daughter 1 Daughter md
	Tengaree			
33	Narayanayen	40	Do	(33) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter in law
	Nadamangalam			
34	Sittannavayen	75	Do	(34) 1 Wife 2 sons 2 Daughters md 2 Daughters in law 4 Grandsons 4 Granddaughters
35	Minakshisubbayen	70	Do	(35) 1 Wife 2 sons 2 Daughters in law 1 Grandson
	Paneyur			
36	Muttuvayen	60	Do	(36) 1 Grandson

Vide preceding side

~~[illegible]~~ One Venkatesuwaryen claims 1 Vritty from the person No 22 & 27 of 016 - by reason that his Grand Father, who died 25 years ago, mortgaged it to the father of the person No 22 of 016 - 45 years ago - He failed to prove the same. The Mahajanams deny every knowledge of the transaction. It appears that the father of the claimant sued the person No 22 & others for the recovery of 1 Vritty in dispute & before a decision passed on the case, ~~[illegible]~~ he has withdrawn the suit - The land is in possession of the person No 22 & 27 of 016 - Hence the claim is rejected & the party is referred to Civil Court -

VII. The Mahajanams ~~of that~~ formed two parties in the Village & produced two statements ~~[illegible]~~ exhibiting the names of the ~~Vrittees~~ sharers ~~[illegible]~~ in the Village & the shares held by them therein ~~[illegible]~~ so as to not correspond with each other. After long & troublesome enquiry, I prepared a fresh list of the Vrittees individually with reference to the documents & in possession of the parties ~~[illegible]~~ to the satisfaction of all the Mahajanams. These Mahajanams signed the list & admitted its correctness. In framing the list, enjoyment of all the parties is carefully respected -

VIII. The person No 6 of 016 claims to 1/2 Vritty from the person No 12 of 016 on the ground that he purchased it on the 20 April last from ~~[illegible]~~ one Venkata Subbyen for Rupees 200 & produced a bill of sale said to have been executed ~~[illegible]~~ on a stamped paper by the said Venkata Subbyen. The Elder Brother of the person No 12 of 016 pleads that the half Vritty in question fell to the share of his ~~[illegible]~~ younger brother No 12 in ~~[illegible]~~ dividing the family property - & that Venkata Subbyen had ~~[illegible]~~ or has any authority to dispose of the lands which belongs to his brother who is ~~[illegible]~~ dangerously ill - The person No 6 & the alleged seller Venkata Subbyen admit that the half Vritty is in possession of the person No 12 since the last 38 years & that it was mortgaged by the father of Venkata Subbyen to the father of the person No 12 of 016 about 40 years ago & that the half Vritty belongs to the said Venkata Subbyen - Venkata Subbyen & his brother Gurusawmy failed to prove that the land is his property & that it was mortgaged to the father of the person No 12 of 016. The Mahajanams deny every knowledge of the transaction of the mortgage. Hence the claim of the person No 6 of 016 & the said Venkata Subbyen is rejected & they are referred to Civil Court - The person No 6 of 016 has no enjoyment of the lands - Hence the transaction is not complete ~~though~~ even if the lands were the property of the said Venkata Subbyen.

IX. ~~The~~ The person No 30 & 31 has entered 1 Vritty & 3/16 of a Vritty ~~[illegible]~~ of the land entered opposite to the person No 22-27 of 016 in the name of one Bhaskaraiyen, who is not unknown to the people of the country. It is proved that the said 1 Vritty & 3/16 Vritty was purchased by the Grand Father of the person No 22 & 26 in AD 1826 from one Sree Venkataramayen & bill of sale is on a plain palm leaf - The Mahajanams admit the genuineness of the document & the enjoyment of the person No 22 of 016 of the lands - (Vide continuation)

37 Sundara sastri	50	Do	(37) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter md
38. Appusaimi Iyen	35	Do	(38) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter md 1 Mother
39. Balakristnayen	30	Do	(39) 1 Wife
Sivaganga 40 Mahadevayen	20	Do	(40) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Mother
41 Pattabiramayen	40	Do	(41) 1 Wife 2 sons
Vattirakosamangei 42 Ponnusaimi Ayyen	38	Do	(42) 1 Wife 2 sons 1 Daughter md 1 Do unmd
Kachattanellur 43 Sundaramayen	25	Do	(43) 1 Wife 1 Mother
Neduvattava 44 Ramayen	35	Do	(44) 1 son 3 Daughters md 1 Mother
45 Ramavayen	25	Do	(45) 1 Wife 1 Daughter unmd 1 Mother
46 Seshayen	12	Do	(46) 1 Elder brother
47 Ramalinga Iyen	22	Do	(47) 1 Wife 1 Mother
Kachattanur 48 Anantayen	60	Do	(48) 1 Wife 2 sons 1 Daughter md 2 Daughters in law 2 Grand Daughters
Haleyirkunil 49 Sundaramayen	43	Do	(49) 1 Wife 1 Mother

Vide preceding side

Fair copied

Sheet No 3. Dharmásanam Pudukóttai in the Táluq of Yemuneswaram of Sivagenga Zamindári Estate in Madura District

Register No. 626

Sheet No. 812

X The persons No 3 & others who formed one party in this Village entered 1/2 Vritty belonging to the persons No 1 & 2 of old in the name of one Venkatapathy Ayen — It is proved by Witnesses & others that it is altogether forged & that these lands belong to the persons No 1 & 2 of old — Hence the lands are entered in the name of the persons No 1 & 2 of old.

XI Again the persons No 3 & others who formed ~~one~~ a party entered 1/4 Vritty belonging to the person No 22 of old in the name of the person No 33 of old. The person No 33 of old says that the 1/4 Vritty does not belong to him. Hence the 1/4 Vritty is transferred in the name of the person No 22 of old. The person No 33 of old [illegible] that 1/4 Vritty is entered in the name of the ancestors of the person No 33 in a "Karanam" account dated so far back as 60 years. I told already that the entries in the Karanam Account are not correct.

XII Again the persons No 3 & others who are very troublesome fellows entered 1/8 Vritty belonging to the person No 22 in the name of the persons No 62-63 & 64 of old — This is proved to be fraud. Hence the land is transferred to the person ~~No [illegible]~~ 22 of old who has possession ~~[illegible]~~ right of the lands — No claim on the part of the persons No 62-63 & 64 — to this 1/8 Vritty —

XIII ... One Muttammal alias Alamelammal pleads that the persons No 55-56 & 57 are her brothers; that she sold 3 Vritties to them in A D 1858 for Rupees 315 — & gave 7 Vritties ~~the Village~~ out of 10 she had in this Village to them in A D 1863 December 31st — receiving in exchange from them one Vritty in Pattanur, a Dharmasanam Village in Ramnad, & a Village of Pattamendal in Sivaganga Zemindary & executed the bill of sale in A D 1858 on a plain cadjan leaf & deed of exchange of 1863 on stamp papers worth 30 Rupees — She again pleads that the Vritties Ten which she had in this Village are in possession of the persons No 55-56 & 57 of old & that she is enjoying the lands she received in exchange both in Ramnad & Sivaganga Zemindaries, & that these Vritties which she had in this Village fell into her possession under a Razeenamah — & Petitions filed in ~~[illegible]~~ the Civil & Subordinate Courts of Madura on the 12 December 1844 & 20th June 1845 — by her & ~~[illegible]~~ by the guardians of her adopted son Venkatachary —

The persons No 55, 56 & 57 of old claim 10 Vritties in this Village on the above grounds stated by Muttammal alias Alamelammal — Venkatachariyar the adopted son of Muttammal — [illegible] that she has or had no authority to dispose of the lands consisting of 10 Vritties in this Village in the above manner & that the guardians who were his ~~[illegible]~~ Elder brother & Father-in-law produced the above Razeenamah & the Petitions in the Civil & Subordinate Courts granting to his adopted mother (Vide [illegible])

50 Muttuvayen 60	Do —	(50) 1 Wife 1 son 3 Daughters md
Káraikudi		
51 Muttusámi Ayen — 32	Do —	(51) 1 Wife
52 Subbayen 18	Do —	(52) 1 Elder brother
Madurei		
53 Sundarama Ayen — 35	Al	(53) 1 Wife 1 Mother
Brámanakurchi		
54 Virarágavayen alias Pérayen 60	Do —	(54) 2 sons 1 Daughter unmd 1 Grandson 1 Daughter md
55 Tiruvengada Mayengar 40	Do —	(55) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter unmd
56 Rámánuja Iyengar 35	Do —	(56) 1 Wife 1 son
57 Sadagopayengar — 26	Do —	(57) 1 Wife
Nálukóttai		
58 Rámuvayen 40	Do —	(58) 1 Wife 1 son 1 Daughter md
59 Mahádevayen	Do —	(59) 1 Wife 1 Daughter md
60 Anantayen 25	Do —	(60) 1 Wife
Kalladipatti		
61 Viswanáda yen 35	Do —	(61) 2 sons
62 Padumanábhayen 30	Do —	(62) 1 Wife 3 sons 2 Daughters unmd
63 Sinnasámi Ayen — 45	Do —	(63) 1 Wife 2 sons 1 Daughter md

Vide preceding side

Fair copied

the power of disposing of the 10 Vritties in the Village, without considering his interests while he was in minority. He again says that his adopted mother may enjoy the lands herself as long as she is alive without disposing them contrary to the provisions of Hindoo Law — He argues that his guardians misused the trust reposed in them, by granting any Authority to his adopted mother the authority of disposing the 10 shares in the Village —

From the results of my enquiry it appears that there was one Streenevasiengar holding the District Moonsiff of Paramagudy — in Madura District. He [illegible] had married 4 Wives & died in A D 1843 — leaving the Widow Muttammal alias Alamelammal — & the adopted son Venkatachary, who were then 17 & 11 years old respectively; that the said Venkatachary is the son of a divided Brother of Streenevasiengar; that he was taken in adoption ~~while~~ when he was in [illegible] in AD 1836; that after the demise of Streenevasiengar — the guardians of the Venkatachary sued Muttammal alias Alamelammal & some others who were her councillors for the recovery of certain produce which they are said to have them appropriated; that the No of the suit was No 126 of 1826 on the file of the Zillah Court of Madura; that Muttammal pleaded that Venkatachary was not taken in adoption by her late Husband, that her brother Sadagopaiyengar was taken in adoption by her Husband; that on the 12 December /44, a Razeenamah was filed in the Zillah Court of Madura by ~~the~~ the guardians of Venkatachary & by Muttammal alias Alamelammal — to the effect that Venkatachary is to pay within a month a sum of Rupees 2000 to Muttammal in addition to 2500 Rupees already paid to her in Jewels, & in lieu of a house & 7 Vritties in the Village granted to her for maintenance; that Venkatachary is to become the sole proprietor of the moveable & immoveable property of the deceased Streenevasiengar; & that upon this, there must no connection or concern whatever with each other — It appears that on the 2nd June /45, a Petition was presented to the Subordinate Court of Madura by the guardians of Venkatachary to the effect that ~~they~~ Muttammal ~~should be~~ [illegible] permitted to enjoy with full power of alienation the 10 Vritties which the deceased Streenevasiengar held in the Village purchasing them for Rupees 9838, as they failed to pay her a sum of 2000 Rupees within a month as stipulated in the Razeenamah; that these Vritties are to revert to Muttammal in the shape of a purchased property in ~~[illegible]~~ satisfaction of 2000 Rupees due to her. Accordingly the 10 Vritties fell in possession of Muttammal & she disposed them after enjoying ~~[illegible]~~ a portion of them for about of a period of 13 years & the rest for [illegible] 18 years — The genuineness of the bill of sale of 1858 & of the deed of exchange of 1863 is satisfactorily proved by the Witnesses who attested them — Some of [illegible] 20 [illegible] the Vritties are still in possession of Muttammal & that the transfer is a nominal one. They again admit that Muttammal & her brother [illegible] living [illegible] house ever since the last 20 years. (Vide next sheet)

Fair copied

about

64 Lokanadayen 10	Do —	(64) 1 mother
65 Venkatachai 31	Do —	(65) 1 wife 3 sons
Sakkottai		
66 Subbayen 32	Do —	(66) 1 wife 1 son 1 Daughter unmd 1 mother
67 Sokkalingamayen 30	Do —	(67) 1 wife 1 Daughter unmd
68 Somasundaremayen 25	Do —	(68) 1 wife
69 Alaguvayen 20	Do —	(69) 3 elder brothers
Pudukottai		
70 Kodangi Tevew — 16	Do —	(70) 1 wife 1 mother 2 younger brothers
71 Ponnusami Tevew — 5	Do —	(71) 1 mother
Nattur		
72 Vengalakshme Ammal 60	Daughter widow — daughter's son of person in Col 13	(72) 2 daughters md 2 do sons

N.H.D.

— Vide preceding side

The elder Brother of the person No 70 who is father's elder Brother of the person No 71 transferred the lands entered opposite to the said persons No 70 & 71 under an agreement dated 1861 — Agreement is on a stamped paper Under the agreement, 3½ Vritties fell in possession of the persons No 70 & 71 (Col 16 — of these 1½ Vritties were sold —

Head of Tannavarayen Pudukkalai

Register No. 626 Sheet No. 813

It appears that the persons No 55-56 & 57 Col 6 who are brothers of Muttammal are living under the protection of Muttammal. As these persons are living together it is impossible to say who is the enjoying the lands actually. It is true that it is said in the Hindoo Law that a Widow in respect of property derived by inheritance from her Husband is little more than tenant for life & trustee for the ulterior heirs. She cannot alienate immoveable property ~~to~~ but with the consent of her chief heirs saving when driven to necessity. In Rule 159 of Mr Strange's Hindoo Law it is said that a Widow cannot alienate immoveable property but without the consent of her chief heirs." In this case it is evident that the adopted son who is the chief heir of Muttammal did give his consent to dispose of the immoveable property in question ~~in the~~ as found before the Courts of all cases. Venkatachary says that his guardians were not in right in granting Authority to ~~[illegible]~~ Muttammal to alienate the 10 Vritties in this Village. The guardians were his Elder Brother & his father in law. I do not think that anyone is more interested in him than ~~them~~ these. He made confirm all the acts of his guardians. Under the above Circumstances I register the lands in the names of the persons 55-56 & 57 Col 6 & refer the said Venkatachary to Civil Court.

Rule 158 & 159

Valuation

XIV .... Wet lands depend upon one large Tank. It is in repair. It is fed by one of the branch Channels of Vaigayar. The Tank is filled annually. Scarcity of Water is not felt generally. The Mahazanams shewed 194 Acres of Wet & 40 Acres of Dry as Cultivated lands & 17 Acres of Wet & 27 Acres of Dry as waste. They say that the Waste is of 5 or 6 years uncultivated lands fit to be cultivated & that a portion of the Waste is Cultivated as "Mattukkad". Some of the Wet lands are cultivated annually 2d time. 1/5 or 1/6 of the Wet area is said to be Cultivated 2d time on an average. Nanjah & Punjah lands are of a superior quality generally. Soil is of Regur description. Harvest is good. No garden lands are cultivated in this Village. The Village is in a flourishing state like the surrounding Villages. I saw this Village myself. It is in flourishing state. Soil is good. The average income of this Village as per statement of the Mahazanams is 700 Rupees per annum. This is not true. The Contiguous Ayan Villages are Nettur & Kotchaday. The average Wet assessment of these Ayan Villages calculated for a period of 15 years previous to F1270 comes to 5-7-11 & 7-2-9 per acre. The Dry average assessment of these Ayan Villages varies from 2-4-8 to 0-13-5 per acre. The Mahazanams say that the soil of this Village may be placed on par with the the contiguous of these Ayan Villages. The gross wet average assessment of the two contiguous Ayan Villages comes to 6-8-0 per acre. This is a fair rate compared with the fertility of soil. The highest Dry rate is charged for Cotton plants. The Mahazanams say that Cotton is not grown in this Village. In consideration of the fertility of soil &c I frame the valuation of the Village as follows.

Wet 195 Acres Cultivated at 6 1/2 Rupees per acre — 1267-8-0
Wet 17 Acres Waste rated at 1 Rupee per acre — 17
1284-8-0
Dry 40 Acres Cultivated at 1 1/2 Rupees per acre — 60
Dry 27 Acres Waste rated at 4 As per acre — 6-12-0
66-12-0
Total — 1351-4-0

[illegible]
17-5-64

Fair copied

A. S[illegible] Rao

1397 14
217 4
1195-10-0
2
2270 14 2

Register of Inams in the Village of Puduckotai in Amaravati Talug of Sivaganga Zemindary in Madura District

Register No. 47

Puduckotai Devadayam Village

44 [illegible]

1 Cattle	Personal	Nanja Varaydi 1 Agilandavayakkal Cheyi	1 75/4 1 10	Succession as per statement of Inamdar 8 —	Panchangi [illegible]	As the date of the original grant & date is unknown	Act of F 1211	Seshappayan	In F 1211 [illegible] Puduckotai Panchangam Seshappayan Nanja Varaydi 1 75/4 A 1 10	"	Gelavankotai 1 Seshappayan 30 2 Chinnasami Iyan 45	Great grandson of the grantee 6013 Grandson of the grantee 13	(1) 1 Wife 2 Sons 1 Daughter	[illegible] to Agree [illegible]	Cal 21/8 1 4 [illegible]	Conf'd [illegible] 17/12/64

Complete

CS.

Sheet No. 1649

5 12 63

1-4 [illegible] 17 [illegible]

Register of Devadayam Village of Pudukotai [illegible] Amaravaty Taluq in the Zemindary [illegible] Sevagangai [illegible]

Sheet No

Register No

Pudukotai

Register No. 25

Sheet No. 31

1 This is one of the Devastanam Villages in the Zemindary of Sevagangai. This was granted by the Zemindar [illegible] for the support of Stre Viswanatha Swami
in Yelavankotai. This is a permanent grant. No Pottah. No Tukrar about the area nor about the boundaries on the part of the Zemindari Vakeel
Hence the area of 146 acres 30 cents is confirmed here. The Temple is efficiently kept up. The Villages belonging to this Temple are under the management
of the Zemindar. One Aroonachellam Setty is managing the affairs of the Temple on behalf of the Zemindar. The Setty & others improved the
Temple by erecting compound walls &c at their own expence of about 2000 Rupees. There are Nattkotai Setties who always spend most of their
profits for charities. The Poruppu that is collected now by the Zemindar is adopted in this Settlement. At 2 in lump at 2

II..... The Zemindar ~~now~~ is collecting a Poruppu of Rupees 167-4-10 for all the Villages belonging to this Temple. This exceeds the sum in the Palmirah
by Rupees 40-10-7. This is collected since the last 40 or 50 years. No Tukrar now about the Poruppu either on the part of the Zemindar or on the part of
the Temple people. Wet lands depend upon two Tanks. Soil is of a superior quality generally. Average profits of the Village are 845-8-9 per annum

Confirmed on present tenure. One T D to the [illegible] for this & the ~~four~~ six following villages as the Zemindar collects the Jodi of Rs 167-4-10 on them in the [illegible]. The particulars of each village to be entered on the back of the T D. 10/2/64 [illegible]

Idem 30

Coll

As per Accounts of F 1211 Kaiya Verayadi	189-11-5	132-89
Excess	4-12-0	3-41
	194-9-5	136-30
Excess Punja (Theerwam)	10-0-0	9-90
	—	146-20
Deduct Poramboke Pond (Verayadi)	4-7-2	3-17
Tank Do	37-6-4	26-48
Village Sites Do	15 —	10-50
Temple	0-2-2	0-12
Burial ground	0-4-2	0-22
Unarable Land Punja Theerwam	10-0-0	9-90
	—	50-39
Remainder		
Kaiya Verayadi	136-12-1	95-81
Deduct Grams Bhatruvurty Verayadi	1-7-5¼	1-09
Service	9-5-1½	6-56
	10-13-¾	7-65
Remainder		
Kaiya Verayadi Cultivated	67-2-3¾	47-03
Na[illegible] Waste	58-10-2½	42-13
	125-13-¼	88-16

Deduced from the Statement of Disposes [illegible] by the Trustee

845-8-9

For the support of the Pagoda of Stre Viswanadha swami in Yelavankotai in Amaravati Taluq in Sevaganga Zemy

Now [illegible] Reply

Pudukotai Vayalo vayal Dose As per Taluq 61-5-0

As per Taluq Jodi for 7 Villages of the Temple 126-10-1 Excess 40-10-9 Total 167-4-10

Vijeya Raghunadha Sate [illegible] No date is unknown

Accounts of F 1211 Hindani Act of F 1223 Boundary Act of F 1242

Yelavankotai Viswanadhaswami

In F 1211 Devastanam Yelavankotai Viswanadhaswami Pudukotai Verayadi 189-11-5 Acres 132-89

In Hindu Act of do do Area do do In F 1244 Pudukotai Area None

In F 1223 Devastanam Yelavankotai Viswanadhaswami Pudukotai Kaiya Verayadi 189-11-5 Acres 132-89

Board Register in AD 1815 of Pudukotai

Yelavankotai

1 Stre Viswanadhaswami Trustee

Stre Kuttey Vijeya Raghunadha Booka Guruswami Periya Udaya Tevar Zemindar of Sevaganga 40 ~~22~~

Katama Nachiyar Avergal, Rani of

Vide Dy Collr's Yadast 0/26/7 [illegible]

Zemindar's Jodi for all the Villages belonging to the Temple | 167-4-10

To be confirmed under Rule VII

D Swaminatha Rao

Karakudi 3-11-63

These Villages [illegible] at these [illegible] Temple [illegible] each Villages [illegible] on the back of the title deed

Fair copied

Register [illegible] the [illegible] in Natarsenkotai of [illegible]

Puducotai Ayen

440

Register No. 440

Sivagunga [illegible]mindari Madura &c

1 Devadayam	Nanja Varaydi Natthayi Tolai ..13-1--66 Vilackhaluki Tolai ..4-2--22 1-3-3 0-88	5	For the godi ver support ..12-6 of Temple of Ramudayanayaki Amman in Natarsenkotai Now appy 1a[illegible]	The name of the original grantor & date is unknown	Account of F1211	Ramudaya Nayaki Amman	In F1211 Ramudaya nayaki Amman In Vadukadi Nanja Varaydi 1-3-3 A --88	In F1223 none	Natarsenkotai Ramudaya Nayaki Amman Worshippers 1 Ramayanam 45 2 Virapusari 30	To be [illegible] under Rule III 6th one [illegible] [illegible] 1828 H Sreenivasa Rao

Certified
23/7/65
1823

completed

Sheet No. 2056

F. Copied

Register of Inams in the Village of Pudukottai in the Talug of Nattarasankottai of Sivagenga Zamindari Estate in Madura District

Register No. 276 Pudukottai Ayan Village [illegible]

Sheet No. 1893

Personal

1 Inet

	Virayadi C.	M.	A	C
1 Jakkiliyan Talai	"	9	" "	45
2 Peyechi Talai	"	13	" "	65
3 Sambachi	1	3	3 "	87
4 Konamanganan	"	12	" "	60
5 Konnayichi	"	12	"	60
6 Avarangachi	"	6	3 "	33
	5	"	3	50

Income as per Inamdar's statement

35

Tirvai Jodi Ver

Jodi as per Istimrar acct Rs 3-14-2

Izafa 4-0-9

7-14-11

The name of grantor and the Date is unknown

Acct of Fs 1211.

This is an Inam granted to the ancestors of the persons of col 16 for subsistence as appears by the tradition & the persons of col 16 pleaded that this is a Tannir Pandal.

As per Inamdar's statement 1 Muttukristna Vastad

As per Zemindari Account of AD 1800 Tannir Pandal Inam – [illegible] Subramaniya Vastad

In Fs 1211 [illegible] in Pudukottai Nanja Virayadi 5 – 0 – A C 3 – 50

In Maratta acct of Fs 1211 Do – Do –

— — Sivagenga

1 Ramasami Vastad 32 } Grandson of person in Col 13 — (1) 1 Wife 2 Daughters md

2 Muttukristna Vastad 30 } Do. — (2) 1 Wife 2 sons

3 Gurusami Vastad 25 } Do. — (3) 1 Wife 1 Daughter unmd

E. S.

No Male Family [illegible] Lands are under one Patta [illegible]

To be confirmed Rule II Cl. 3 Ayan

Zemindari Jodi – 7-14-11

Govt 2 R 1/8 = 3-8-0 –

J. Sudarsana Rao

Runnulaar 18-8-64

[illegible]
1047

Cert. [illegible]

208 20

27

& referred me to the Account of AD 1800 Manigar which was prepared & furnished to the Collector by the Zemindar. It is true that this Inam is entered as Tannir Pandal Inam. But the Inamdars themselves say that the Tannir Pandal was established by them in the Village of Vastupetty only a few years ago. Hence this is a personal grant. It is not stated in the Account of F 1211 in which this Inam is entered, why, when, & to whom this Inam was granted. J. Sudarsana Rao

Sheet No. 1893

Completed

3 5 -14-11
8 27 -1-1
3-8-2
3-8

Francis

Plms