Register of Inam Village of Viragudi in the Zalug of Ranis of Sivagunga Zamindari Estate in Madura District

N 2
1330

Register No. 1330

Viragadi

Page 9

1 This is one of the Villages in the zemindary of Sivagangai. The Village is entered as Inam in the Account of F 1211. In the zemindari Account of F 1212, the Village is entered as Aiyen-
It is not known from the Account of F 1211, to whom, when & for what purpose the Village was granted. In an Account of Inams forwarded to the Collector in AD 1860-
by the then zemindar it is said that the Village was granted for the to one Maniyapher for rendering the services of a Peon to the zemindar & that it was resumed, when it is not stated
as the income from the Village was not sufficient to cover the Peon pay & the emoluments of the Peon. This remark is not worthy of credence as it is written generally
against all the Villages that were resumed by the zemindar arbitrarily & as there is no proof to substantiate the circumstances in the remarks.
The Ranys Vakeel failed to prove that the Village was not resumed illegally by the zemindar. In the zemindari Jumabundy Accounts of F 1212 to 1227
& 1228, the Village is entered as the Inam of Puchali Maniyapher (Orgl Grantee). In the Account of F 1224, the Village is entered as the Inam of one
Narumbavia Periyatambi. Further it is said in the Account of 1229 that the Village was resumed & incorporated with the zemindari Aiyen lands.
It is evident that the Village is in possession of the zemindar since the last 45 years & that the Village was resumed arbitrarily.
No one claimed title as descendants of the Orgl Grantee. The Ranys Vakeel says that the Village was granted by the then zemindar to his Mother Petchama Nachiyar
on "Sasvita" or permanent Cowle in F 1192; that Petchama Nachiyar held the Village for two years & that it was attached by the Rany Rattama Nachiyar
on the assumption of the zemindary by her, on the ground that the then zemindar had no right to dispose of the Village.
The Vakeel of Petchama Nachiyar claims the Village on the ground that the Village was granted to her for the support of a Chowltry built by her, on permanent
Cowle with the powers of disposing of the Village either by gift or sale (Dánádi Vinimaya Vikrayangalukku yogyamaga) & that she enjoyed held the Village
actually for two years & that it was resumed attached arbitrarily after the zemindary reverted to the Rany Rattama Nachiyar. The Vakeel of Petchama Nachiyar failed to produce the Cowle. However as the Ranys Vakeel admits that the Village was granted to the Mother of Petchama Nachiyar in F 1192 in the shape of Permanent Cowle & as the said Petchama Nachiyar enjoyed the Villages for two years & as the Village has been attached by the Rany arbitrarily, I would recommend to confirm the Village to Petchama Nachiyar on 1/2 assessment. I suggested the half assessment as the it was resumed arbitrarily 45 years ago.

(Vide next side)

Sheet No. 1523

As per acct of F 1211
Nanja (Viragadi) 105 — 73-50
Excess (Do) 10 — 7 —
115 — 80-50
Punja Excess (Kurkam) 20 — 11-20
91-70
Deduct Poramboke
Punja (Kurkam) 16 — 8-96
Remainder — 82-74

Nanja (Viragadi)
Cultivation 2-1-11
Waste (Do) 104-11-5 73-39
Excess Do (Do) 10 — 7 —
115 — 80-50
Punja (Kurkam)
Cultivation 1-6 — 77
Partly waste (Do) 2-10 — 1-47
Total 4 — 2-24
Grand Total 82-74 85-13

Inam Title Deed No. as per Detinedar acct Ro 12-11-4

The name of grantor and the Marata acct date of F 1223. grant is not known

Acct of F 1211 — Boundary acct of F 1246 — Ayakat acct of F 1263 — Board's Rept of AD 1815 — Zamindar acct of F from 1212 to 1217 — 1228 — 1229.

Maniyapher — peon

In F 1211 Inam Viragadi — Nanja (Viragadi) 105 — A C 73-50. In Marata acct of F 1211 Do Do. In F 1212 Ayan Viragadi.

In F 1223 None. In F 1246 Viragadi Nanja (Viragadi) 105 — A C 73-50; Punja (Kurkam) 3 — A C 1-68; Total A C 75-18. In F 1263 None. In Regr of AD 1815 None. From F 1212 to 1217 and 1228 (Viragadi) Puchali Maniyapher.

Sivagunga Rani Kattama Nachiyar Avergal 40 — AC

1 Pichama Nachiyar — AC

1 Son, 2 Daughters in all, 1 Do in law
(1) 2 Sons, 3 Daughters in law

(Hair copied)

To be confirmed under Rule XVI Cl III
Zemindari Tax 12 11 6
R 36-8-11
Govt 1/2 Rupees

Confirmed to the Rani Kattama Nachiyar Avargal on 1/2 assessment 2R, Rs 37.
23/6/65 LMS

TD No. 1783

A. Swaminadha...
22-11-66

Rates of Government Tirwugs per Acre

	Max	Mini
Dry	3-9-9	-1-7
Wet	10-13-3	-5-9

Average Rates of Government Tirwugs per Acre

Dry 1-5-6
Wet 4-6-1

Average Value of grain of Mélwaram on wet land in Pillai Mahanam Consisting of Ayen Villages in the Talug of Hanur for a period of 15 years

From F1 1256 to F1 1270	Cultivated area in Acre	Gross out turn	Of which the Zemindar's share at 45 per cent	Average price of grain	Value of quantity of grain given in Col 4	Rate per Acre
K M P	A C	K M P	K M P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P
4568-3-3	3197-77	32943-9-4	14450-10-1	1-7-5	21337-5-4	6-15-11

(True Extract.)
for Secretary,
Board of Revenue

(Fair copied)

Virayadi
105 —
A C
73 — 50
In F1 1279

Viragudi

Te Karum
alavar
Periya
Lambe

Iraiya
Virayadi
105 —
A C
73 — 50

II No Talk arose about the Area or about the boundaries on the part of the Roy Vakeel. The boundaries now inserted in the area acre statement correspond with those in the Accounts of F1246 - Since they are conformable to the 91 Acres & 70 cents situated therein are registered here.

III The Roy Vakeel first claimed the Settlement Poruppu & then argued that the Cowle amount should be adopted in the settlement as Poruppu. The Cowle sum being quite distinct from Poruppu, the Settlement Poruppu is adopted in this settlement. The Cowle amount of the Village is 114 1210 per annum. It appears from the Enamdar's Talked dated July 1862 that Petchamma Nachiyar is to enjoy this Village free from all Tax in F1 1272 & 1273; that she is to pay 1/8 of the said sum of Rupees 114 1/2 for F1 1274, 1/4 for F1 1275, 5/16 for F1 1276, 1/2 for F1 1277, 3/4 for F1 1278, & full Tirwah of Rupees 114 1210 from Fasli 1279 for ever. It further appears that this Village was granted on progressive Cowle as the lands were waste ever since long. In fact this is not Cowle. The Enamdar fixed out the sum of Rupees 114 1210 as the Poruppu of the Village and granted the Village to his Mother to be enjoyed for ever. This new and arbitrary Poruppu was not as yet paid by Petchamma Nachiyar. Hence it is not adopted in this settlement. Copy of the Talked above alluded to is placed with this. In this Talked mention of another Village named Muriel Patty is made. It is an Aiyen Village. The Enamdar fixed a new Poruppu on it a sum of Rupees 114 1210 [illegible] with reference to the Readers or whether Poruppu was fixed to other entire Inam Villages originally with the area they were brought to account.

Valuation

IV The lands of the Village are lying waste ever since long. Petchamma Nachiyar, who received the Village in F1 1272 from her son the Enamdar, never improved the Village by bringing the lands under cultivation by improving Tanks &c. It is said that the Village may be improved by bringing the lands under plough within the next 15 years. It appears that 11 Cents of Wet & 77 [illegible] of Wet are [illegible] Petchamma Nachiyar [illegible] Tirwah from F1 1274 being now cultivated annually. As Petchamma Nachiyar [illegible] & full Tirwah from F1 1277, she [illegible] will improve the Village beyond that. The lands are generally fertile. I consider that the Poruppu of Rupees 114 1210 fixed by the Enamdar is arbitrarily high with reference to the present state of the Village. In consideration of the fertile soil &c. I frame the Valuation of the Village as follows. The average income of this Village 184 per annum.

Wet 1 Acre cultivated at 5 Rupees — 5
Wet 79 1/2 Acres Waste fit to be cultivated only at 1 Rupee — 79 8 0 — 84 8 0

Totally the [illegible] yearly Petchamma [illegible] year

to the proposed [illegible] of 1 Acre cultivated at 1 Rupee — 1
of Dry [illegible] Wasteland [illegible] — 0 3
1 5 [illegible] 13