

Reg. No
1366

Register No. 1366

Leng ar ai

ஒத்திசை

580. 1366. Teng ar au - 1874

This is one of the Purbani Villages in the Zamin saray of Durgam. It is not known from the public Accounts by whom to whom & for what purpose the Village was granted. From an Account of the Purbani Villages furnished by the Zamin saray to the Collector in A.D. 1860, it appears that this was granted to one Ravagnathu Toraya Taven for subsistence - being "Rajesh Bamshe" one of the Zamin saray's relations & that it was resumed in A.D. 1802 & some ready money allowance was fixed in lieu of it. It is further said in the said account that the resumption was attributable to the fact of the income from the Village being insufficient to meet the expenses of the Grantee Ravagnathu Toraya Taven. This account was prepared at the pleasure of the then Zamin saray's Manager & there is no ground to believe that the Village was resumed lawfully & resumption allowance was fixed in lieu of it. The Rang Vakil says that the Village is in possession of the Zamin saray since A.D. 1810 which passed 54 years ago & that he will prove this by the unmentioned accounts which are produced in this Office. He again states that the family of the Ogl Grantee is not extant - & since long - that he has no materials to prove how the Village fell in possession of the Zamin saray & how the Ogl Grantee is related to the Zamin saray. The Rang Vakil says as follows -

in that year -

Accounts produced by the Manager & Subaltern are as follows—

Accounts produced by the Assignee's Valuers are as follows—

1	Torture Settlement account of AD 1802.	showing that the entire was in possession of the Ogl Grantee & that it was reserved by the Government in that year—
2	" " " " AD 1805	showing that the entire was in possession of the Ogl Grantee & that it was reserved by the Government in that year—
3	" " " " AD 1806	showing that the entire was in possession of one Muthusamy Saver—who is not related to the Ogl Grantee—
4	" " " " AD 1807	showing that the entire was in possession of one Muthusamy Saver—who is not related to the Ogl Grantee—

Confirmed on
appeal.
Per J. G.

(Will next call)

Confirmed on 1/4
 agreement. 2 R
 Rs 176. J.W.

Le confessionnaire Rule VII 73/6/65

Genius an 169 - 8

Contd 24/6-176 one pound & Seventy Six p

Richardson
Numaliki
 30 y 60

(Fair copy)

Sheet No 1565

853-2-42

1818-1820 - 1821

May 1862

Colleges per Acre

More Min

3-9-9

10-13-3

Survey rates of Government

1-5-8

4-6-1

Average Value of grain of Melwani on wet land in Siravayal
Naganam consisting of 45 villages in Tirupattur Taluk
for the period of 15 years.

From 1856 to 1870	Cultivated area in Acres	Grass outturn	Of which Geminosa share at 45 per cent	Average prices of grains	Value of the quantity of grains given in Rs & p	Rates per Acres
Rs 10 5753-8	Ac 3 4827-52	Ac 3 38006-5-3	Ac 3 17552-2	Rs 8 1-8-3	Rs 26827-11-11	Rs 8 6-9-9

(Main exhibit)

Settlement account of A.D. 1808 showing that the entire Village was in possession of Muttar

during that year

1. 3-9-9 - of A.D. 1810 - showing that the Village was ~~renewed~~ directed the resumed by the gemina
in that year or in other words the holder of the Village named Muttarasingh Tamer was deprived from the same
in that year

Settlement Account from 17258 to 17270 showing that the Village was in possession of the gemina
during that period

II. The settlement accounts of 1802-1805-1806-1807-1808 & 1810 are in a paper roll - the settlement
accounts of 17258 to 17270 are on paper - I am not ground to suspect the genuineness of the settlement
accounts of A.D. 1802-1805-1806-1807-1808 & 1810 - The Rangis Vakkal says that the settlement accounts
of 1802-1805-1806-1807-1808 & 1810 were collected from several rolls of paper leaves in the gemina
Naganam, & from the long enjoyment of the gemina & that these are genuine ones - The writing of the paper leaves
seen to be of an old age - The settlement accounts of 17258 to 17270 are on paper - they are also genuine ones -
They are ~~not~~ ^{are} stated in books -

III. From the above accounts it appears that the Village was in possession of the Ogl Grantee after A.D. 1810
that it was resumed by the gemina in A.D. 1810 & conferred ^{the is ok} upon one Muttarasingh Tamer during the year
1805-1806-1807-1808 & 1809 & that it was resumed again in A.D. 1810 - Thus the Village is in possession
of the gemina since the last 62 years. I don't consider that this case falls within the scope
any of the sections of Rule XVI - The Village is at the same time not of a concess nature -
However as it is not proved that the gemina took possession of the Village lawfully, & as there are
no accounts for a period intervening the year 1810 & 17258 to show that the Village was in possession of
the gemina uninterruptedly, I recommend to confer the Village upon the Rang out of assessment

IV. In the Settlement Account, Pongu of Puffer 149-8 is entered opposite the Village -
No accounts to show whether the Pongu was collected or not ^{at all} during the years when the Village was in possession of
the Ogl Grantee & Muttarasingh Tamer respectively - The Rangis Vakkal pleads that as the Village was
in possession of the gemina, Pongu was not collected & that when it falls in possession of ^{the} strangers it should
be liable to the payment of Pongu - I think this is a judicious argument - With this view I adopt the Pongu
in the settlement

Valuation

II. Wet lands in the Village depend upon two Tanks of moderate size - They are in repair - They are fed by one of the branch channels of Many Muttar Nady or river - The supplying channel
is an influential one - The Tanks are filled annually - Scarcity of water is not felt generally - The Rangis Vakkal says that the Agr of Wet are of long waste but to be full water
that the remaining Dry & Wet lands are under plough - annually Some of the wet lands are sown annually & some - Soil is not of a very superior quality generally -
The Village is in flourishing state - No garden crops are raised in the Village - The average Income of the Village as per statement of the Rangis Vakkal is Rs 308 per annum
calculated for a period of
- 15 years previous to 17270 comes to Rs 4729 & 8-9-9 per acre
respectively - (Main exhibit)