

Sheet

No. 439

The informant Vanarsdine says that the Village was always in possession of the ^{family} of the person N^o 1 of 1816 since long and that the ancestor of the
 person N^o 1 of 1816 enjoyed the Village as Trustee of the ^{franchise} - One Vanarsdine says that their ancestors enjoyed half of the Village as Dammamane and
 the remaining half as ^{franchise} endowment, as far back as 30 years. & that the Village was granted to their ancestors by the ancestor of the person N^o 1 of 1816.
 He failed to prove the same. On the whole it is proved by all the accounts of 1812 that this is a Dammamane & it is proved by transaction & that this
 Village is in possession of the person N^o 1 of 1816 since long. The name of Vanarsdine is entered in the Account of 1822 & of 1815 by mistake.
 As there is no documentary evidence to show that the person N^o 1 of 1816 acquired the Village by purchase as claimed by the ^{franchise} of
 the person N^o 1 of 1816, as the name of one Vanarsdine is entered in the Account of 1822 & as this is said to be a ^{franchise} endowment originally, I recommend
 to confirm the Village upon the person N^o 1 of 1816 on 1/4 of assessment.

III. ... statement of the mother of the person N^o 2 of 1816 says that she the boy N^o 2 of 1816 was taken in adoption about 12 years ago & when her husband was alive; that the boy is the son of her husband & that her husband died about 88 years ago; that the funeral rites of her husband were performed in the name of her adopted son; & that the boy N^o 2 of 1816 is with her a Rajamanah filed in the civil Court of Tinianally in N^o 2 of 1854 by J. J. Defendants established that the adoption did took place actually. J. J. were cousins of the husband of the deceased Meerachy Ammal & Defendants were Meerachy Ammal & her husband's elder sister sons. This Rajamanah again shows that the adoption did took place when the husband of Meerachy Ammal was alive & that the property inclusive real & personal of the husband of Meerachy Ammal solely belong to the said Meerachy Ammal & her adopted son & the adoption is not legal under Hindoo Law as the adopted boy is neither divided or undivided cousin of the adopted father & the adopted mother of the person N^o 2 is a childless widow. But I doubt whether I may charge, $\frac{1}{4}$ of 2s for the person N^o 1 & $\frac{1}{2}$ for the person N^o 2. The former rate is for defectings in title & the latter is for defectings in title & in adoption & if I cannot charge, I think, ~~two~~ different rates for one village who is held right ~~than~~ persons equally, I charge $\frac{1}{4}$ as usual & leave the matter for the consideration of Reviewing officers.

IV. One Pankaralingam Setty pleads to register his name also with the boy N^o 2 of 1816 by reason that he is the younger brother of Meerachetty Annam
the adopted mother of the person N^o 2 of 1816, that he took great pains in securing the property for Meerachetty Annam from the ravages of her Husband's enemies;
that he spent considerable sum of money ¹⁸¹⁶ from his private funds when the friends of her Husband claimed for a share in the property; that the said
Meerachetty Annam filed a Rajamanam in the Zillah Court of Trinacvelly in civil N^o 2 of 1854 to the effect that all the real & personal property of
the Husband of Meerachetty Annam (as belong to the said Meerachetty Annam her adopted son & to her younger brother, ^{N^o 2} ~~Pankaralingam Setty~~ Pankaralingam Setty,
the Plaintiff - The Valuer of Pankaralingam Setty produced the Rajamanam dated 3 April 1854 - The Rajamanam is an authenticated copy of the Ogle -
The Plaintiff has not any documents than the Rajamanam.

Meenasthy Ammal's Vakeel pleads that the Rajenamah was not produced - either on the knowledge or consent of Meenasthy Ammal & that she was deceived by her Brother as she cannot appear personally in court or speak with her Vakeel - Again the Vakeel says that the Brother of Meenasthy Ammal has no not a shadow of right in the property of her husband; that the half of the Village which belongs to his share & other ~~several~~ & personal property is in her sole possession -

IV - The Valuel of Perkaradigen says that his friend has engaged in the Village as well as in all the property belonging to the husband of Minatchy Ammal. That his friend is living in one of the same house with the Minatchy Ammal - The Valuel of Minatchy Ammal says that as Perkaradigen's sister wanted a place to live in for some time, she gave him a portion of her house - 2 or 3 years ago - (This is not a rule)

11. It appears that some of the following the Husband of Minatchy Ammal died in N 29/1854 on the file of the final court of
 of the real & personal property of her husband on the ground that she has right only to receive interest on the fund from the time of the
 filed by Minatchy Ammal & her Opps on the 3 April 1854 - According to the Progenamash a sum of 36000 Rupees went to the Opps from the property of
 the Husband of Minatchy Ammal - Amongst things it is said at the early part of the Progenamash that her husband's property ~~does~~ does not belong to any
 other than to her & her adopted son - In the concluding part of the same Progenamash it is said that the names of Minatchy Ammal, her adopted son & her
 younger brother Sankaralingam Selly should be entered ~~in~~ for certain lands in Palavin in Tinianelly District & in the accounts of a stock belonging
 Minatchy Ammal. Thus the Progenamash was closed - On the very day on which the Progenamash was filed the Judge passed a Decree in which it is said that
 the Deed of Minatchy Ammal explained that she, she, her adopted son & her younger brother Sankaralingam Selly have equal right in all the property
 inclusive real & personal of her husband - The said Sankaralingam Selly bases his claim ~~on~~ for $\frac{1}{3}$ of the share of the property of the Husband of
 Minatchy Ammal, upon the simple Decree of the Court for $\frac{1}{3}$ share in half of the Village belonging to the person N 2 of 1850, who is the adopted son
 of Minatchy Ammal - I am unable to register the half Village belonging to the person N 2 of 1850, the adopted son of Minatchy Ammal, jointly with
 names of Minatchy Ammal, her adopted son & her younger brother Selly & Minatchy Ammal had intended to give a share in the property to her 3 brothers
 & though the Brother has enjoyment in the said property; because under Rule 115-116-117 & 118 of the Madras Law Code she has no authority to
 of her husband's property & because the adopted son is the rightful and sole owner of her adopted father's property - Again there is no ground to say the
 Minatchy Ammal expressed her consent before the Court to give a share in her husband's property to her Brother on the knowledge or understanding
 the adopted son because he is in minority - Under Rule 158 of the Madras Law Code a Widow in respect of property derived by inheritance from her husband
 is held to have a life interest for life & trustee for the uttermost heirs - The Deed of Sankaralingam Selly finds that the adoption took place two or
 after the demise of the Husband of Minatchy Ammal - This stands against the claim of Sankaralingam Selly - Because it is said that on adoption
 being made by a Widow (Under Rule 117 of the Madras Law) the property of the deceased husband passes at once from her to the son adopted -
 Under the above circumstances I refuse to register here the names of Sankaralingam Selly & refer him to the final court -

Vulcania -

12. Wet lands depend upon one Tank of large size - It is in a plain - It is fed by a single stream or by the water falling from the adjacent Agri Villages
 The Tank is filled annually - Scarcity of water is not felt generally - The Tank of the person N 2 of 1850 is a large Tank as lands full water annually
 & 33 Ams of 1850 & 17 Ams of Dry as waste - The Tank says that 33 Ams of Wet & 17 Ams of Dry land as waste are 500 years old lands & are
 fit to be cultivated within 4 or 5 years by improving the Tanks & from the very statement of the Tank & of the reports of the adjacent Villages it appears
 that there is much exaggeration in the matter of Tanks - Some of the Wet lands are cultivated annually 2 times - Mangala & Pungu the Cudds are of a superior
 quality generally - The Tank is raised - The Village is in good state - Like the surrounding Agri Villages - The contiguous Agri Villages are
 Gedayathur & Pedarising. The average Wet assessment of the Villages comes to 5-34 8 to 5-5 per Acre - The average Dry assessment varies from
 1-2 to 0-136 per Acre - The average income of the Villages is 265 Rupees per Acre as per statement of the Tank of the person N 2 of 1850 -
 This is not true - In considering the fertility of soil & I from the statement of the Villages as follows -
 The Tank says that the lands of the Village may be placed on par with those of the contiguous Agri Villages -

Wet 70 Ams full water at 5-9 per Acre	402-8
Wet 19 1/4 Ams of soil in grain quality at 2-8 per Acre	38-8
at 2 Rupees per Acre	441-0
Dry 30 Ams full water at 1-10 per Acre	30-
Dry 14 3/4 Ams of soil in grain quality at 1-10 per Acre	21-

11-2-54