Register of Darmasanam Villages of Punnangudiyendal in the Talug of Tirupattur in Sivaganga Zamindary in the [illegible]

Register No. 1213

Punnangudiyendal -

4ாணங்குடி [illegible]

Sheet No. 1376

I This is one of the Darmasanam Villages in the Zemindary of Sivaganga. The name of the Orgl. Grantee is not known from any of the Accounts. Half of the Village is entered as Darmasanam in the Account of F1211 & the remaining half as ~~Darmasanam~~ Ayen. In the Maratta Account of F1223 & in the English Account of AD 1815, the distinction is ~~was~~ not made & the entire Village is entered as Darmasanam. The Rany's Vakeel states that half of the Village alone should be treated as Darmasanam & the rest is Ayen. Again I consider that more confidence may be placed upon the Accounts of F1223 & of AD 1815 than that of F1211. Again the entry in the Account of F1211 is proved to be false by the two Accounts. Hence I cannot but arrive at the conclusion that the entire Village is Darmasanam & treat the Village accordingly. The ulterior fate rests with the Reviewing Officer.

II No Talk even about the Area or about the boundaries on the part of the Rany's Vakeel. The boundaries now inserted in the vernacular statement correspond to the recognized boundaries of the Village. Hence the boundaries are confirmed here & the 78 Acres & 54 parts situated therein are registered here. The boundaries of this Village are not recorded in any of the Accounts.

III This Village is in possession of the Rany Zemindar. The Rany's Vakeel pleads that this Village was purchased a century ago by the then Zemindar & that bill of sale was lost. In proof of this he ~~produced~~ appeals me to an Account of Nollkrayam or property purchased by the Zemindar & forwarded to the Collector in AD 1830. In this Account, ~~the~~ half of the Village is entered as Nollkrayam property. ~~Half~~ ~~[illegible]~~ half of the Village alone is entered as Nollkrayam property because the remaining half of the Village is entered as Ayen in the Account of F1211. This account is of no use in determining whether half or entire Village is Darmasanam. It is certainly very [illegible] to prove that the Village was purchased by the Zemindar. ~~[illegible]~~ With reference to the entry in this Account, I think that this Village was purchased by the Zemindar legally & recommend to confirm the entire Village to the Rany = one 1/8 of assessment. The Vakeel has not any other materials than the Accounts of F1211 & F1240 to show that half of this Village is Ayen. Both of these are less importance because the Accounts of F1223 & of AD 1815 ~~[illegible]~~ were prepared under the superintendance of the Collector of the D[illegible]

(Vide next side)

[illegible] 561-74
Punji Nunja [illegible] 30 - 16-80
[illegible]

Darmasanam Jodi now as per Statement	No.	Seewarna Peruja Vudaya Tevar	Acct F1211 Kundivi [illegible]	The name of the original Grantee [illegible]	In F1211 Darmasanam Punnangudiyen [illegible]	In F1223 Darmasanam Punnangudi [illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible] Nunjai — 11-7-2 8-08
Cultivated
waste — Do — 76-9-2 53-66
88-2-4 61-74
waste (Nunjai) 10 - 5-60
Total 67-34

172 142

Board's Regtr of AD 1815 No. Vatta

Acct of F1240 Zamindari Jamabundi acct of F1259

naya (Sivayadi) 64-1-2 1/2 A. C. 30-87. In Marata acct of F1211 Do Do In the acct of F1240 forwarded to the Collector Punnangudi Kolkrayam Half Village

In Regtr of D 1815 Darmasanam Punnangudi Nagasal [illegible] In F1244 none In F1259 Zamindari Ayen Punnangudiyendal

Sivaganga
Stree
1 Kattama Nachiyar Avergal
Ram [illegible]
Sivaganga Zamindari
40

1 son
1 Eunded Daughter
2 Daughter widowed

AC

In 11 boundaries and of 1815 the Village appears to have been granted by the Zamindar Peria Udaya Tevar, the [illegible] before A. D. [illegible]

Only half the village of Punnangudi is confirmed to the Zemindar on 1/8th assessment, as that is all that appears as Inam in the acs of F1211 & the Nollkrayam acs of 1830. The original sum of Rs 38-4-3 will be retained as the Jodi

2 R As 6 -

Vide paragraph III

Jamdar Jodi - 13-5-3

Quit Rent 20 1/8 - 20 - . -

1/7/65 - DMS

[illegible] Sivaraman Rao

Numbered
11 11 66

[illegible] 1791

~~Does the Zamindar's Vakeel say that the whole was Darmasanam which was purchased? Can he prove it by any of his Jamabundi accounts that half was ever subsequently [illegible] to the [illegible] settlement~~

(Fair Copied)

II

Against the Rent of Vakeel ground set the sum of Rupees 38 43 entered in the Statement Accounts as
- Poruppu of the Village is entered. No accounts are shewing the Poruppu ever collected when the Village was the property
of the family of the Royal Grantee - In the English Account of A.D 1815, C.E 1736 which is governed by the Board of Revenue
1353 is given as the Poruppu of the Village - the Peishcar whose superintendence the Account of A.D 1815 is prepared,
wrote the following remark -

"In preparing the Sewagunga Jamabundy Accounts I have experienced considerable difficulty, as there does not appear
"to have been at any time a regular Register of the Dharmasanam Villages for the Jamabundy but merely
"a statement signed by the Zemindar, shewing the amount paid for each Fallen of each grain crown in these Villages
"without pointing out the amount Poruppu paid in cash - The sums Rent grain was laid down, are those which are
"stated by the Dharmakarars to be fixed Poruppu which they pay yearly for their villages - I have endeavoured to procure
"a detailed statement from the Zemindar of the fixed Poruppu as well as the estimated value of the Villages but have
"as yet obtained one."

- Under these circumstances I would recommend to adopt in the settlement, the Poruppu of Rupees 13-53 given in the Account of A.D 1815 which is more than twenty Star the Account of Fl 1211 -

Valuation

II - - - What Lands in the Village are upon our Table A - is given by Angle Sheets -

Rental amount

Fl 1172 — 3-26
Fl 1173 — 16 —
Fl 1174 — 29 —
Fl 1175 — 62 —
Fl 1176 — 55 —
Fl 1177 — 68 —
Fl 1178 — 81 —
Fl 1179 — 94 —
Fl 1180 to 1186 — 106 —

The Census of the Ryots Vakeel stated to be as follows Lands the Village - among 52 Acres as Sale
It appears from a Register given by the Servants of the Village that the Lands therein were first cultivated for a period of 40 years
previous to Fl 1172; that it was rented on Bowe Payir upon Settly in Fl 1172; but the Lands respected the second Fasle of Settlement
about 8 of - which were rented; that of the remaining 15 Acres are now waste of the rest are grown up with date trees
that all these Sale Lands may be brought under plough within the next 4 years that the soil of this Village is fertile -
The Vakeel supports this statement - From my enquiry it appears that all the Lands were not waste previous to Fl 1172; that the Fasle being an
ancient merchant against the Village on a low rent, that he expended the Lands with the intention that all the Lands will be full rented within the next 4 or 5 years -
If once the Zemindars property against Lands is given out - Survey the Wet Lands are being full rented now & have annually - the average Sel assessed
the country over Rupees Village is 6 Rupees per acre - In consideration of the present state of the Village & generally of wet & I have the
valuation of the Village as follows.

Wet 12 Acres Sel rented at 6 Rupees per Acre 72 —
Wet 69¾ Acres Sel get blue fallowed only at 2 Rupees per Acre 99-8-0 } 171-8-0

Dry 5 Acres 00 Cents Sel at ¼ Rupee 1-6-4

Fal 172-14-4