Register of Parmacoudy Village of Volakudipatti in Sripuvanam Taluq of Sivagangai Zemindary in the Madura District

Volakkudipatti.

	Patrimony acquired by purchase &c supported by documents	Patrimony unsupported by documents	Total shares
No 1 is enjoying	—	—	24-15/48
No 2 Leo	—	2/24	1/8
No 3 Leo	—	2/24	1/8
No 4 Leo	—	2/24	1/8
No 5 Leo	1/8	1/4	3/8
No 6 Leo	1/12	2/12	1/4
No 7 Leo	1/12	2/12	1/4
No 8 Leo	1/12	2/12	1/4
No 9 Leo	1/4	—	3/4
No 10 and 11 are Leo	1/4	1/2	3/4
No 12 and 13 Do Leo	1	2 13/24	3 13/24
No 14 is Do	7/8	—	7/8
No 15 Do Leo	1/2	—	1/2
No 16 Leo Leo	1	—	1
No 17 and 18 are Do	1/3	91/144	
No 19 is Leo	1/3	43/144	
No 20 Leo Leo	1/3	43/144	
No 21 Leo Do	1/2	—	91/144
No 22 Leo Leo	1/4	1/4	1/2
No 23 and 24 are Do	1/2	1/2	1
No 25 is Do	1/4	1/4	1/2
No 26 Leo Leo	1/8	2/16	3/16
No 27 is Leo	1/8	3/16	5/16
No 28 Leo Leo	1/3	—	1/3
No 29 Leo Leo	1/3	—	1/3
No 30 Leo Leo	1/2	1/2	1
No 31 Leo Leo	1/2	1/2	1
No 32 to 34 are Do	1	—	2
No 35 is Leo	1	1	1/4
No 36 Leo Leo	1/2	—	1/2
No 37 Leo Do	1/2	—	1/2
No 38 and 39 are Do	1/4	— 1 1/4	1 1/2
No 40 is Do	1/4	—	1/4
No 41 Leo Leo	1	1	2
No 42 Leo Leo	1	1/4 — 1/8	1 3/8
No 43 and 44 are Leo	1/2	—	1/2
No 45 and 46 Do Do	1/2	—	1/2
No 47 is Leo	5/16	—	5/16
No 48 Leo Do	1/48	—	1/48
No 49 Leo Leo	1/48	—	1/48
No 50 Leo Leo	1/48	—	1/48
No 51 Leo Leo	1/4	— 1/2	3/4
No 52 Leo Leo	—	28/48	28/48
No 53 to 57 are Do	—	3	3

Kudi Veeru

	Patrimony supported by documents	Unsupported	Total shares
No 55 is Leo	1	—	1
No 56 Leo Leo	—	7/16	7/16
No 57 Leo Leo	—	13/4	1 13/4
No 58 Leo Leo	—	17/8	1 7/8
No 59 Leo	—	—	1/2
No 60 Leo Leo	—	28/48	28/48
No 61 Leo Leo	—	28/48	28/48
No 62 Leo Leo	1	—	1
No 63 Leo Leo	1	—	1
No 64 Leo Leo	1	—	1
65 & 66 Do	1	—	1
No 67 is Do	—	45 30/144	45 30/144 - 47/8 - 68
Total	17 44/48		

Deduct Poramboke

(Red) Tank Kurk	200	17 —
Tank Punja	Do 150	84 —
Pattis	Do 20	11-20
River Bed	Do 50	28 —
Village site	Do 16	8 96
Pumplesite	Do 4	2 24
Threshing	Do 5	2 80
Burial Ground	Do 1	56
	446	249-76
River Bed	Varaijdi 10	7 —
		256-76

Remainder 287-19

Deduct Service Inam

Punja (Varaijdi)	11-2-3 7-88
Remainder	279-31

Punja (Varaijdi)

Cultivation	209 — 2 146-31
Do resp Do (Leo)	29-11-1 20-86
	238-11-3 167-17
Waste (Leo)	40 — 2 5 28-14
	279 — 2 195-31

Punja (Pasturage)

Cultivation	20 — 14 1-20

Partly waste (Leo) 130 — 72-80

Total 150 — 84 —

Grand Total 279-31

Deduct Poramboke

(Red) Tank Kurk	200	112 —
Tank Punja	Do 150	84 —
Pattis	Do 20	11-20
River Bed	Do 50	28 —
Village site	Do 16	8 96
Pumplesite	Do 4	2 24
Threshing	Do 5	2 80
Burial Ground	Do 1	56
	446	249-76
River Bed	Varaijdi 10	7 —
		256-76

Remainder 287-19

Deduct Service Inam

Punja (Varaijdi)	11-2-3 7-88
Remainder	279-31

Punja (Varaijdi)

Cultivation	209 — 2 146-31
Do resp Do (Leo)	29-11-1 20-86
	238-11-3 167-17
Waste (Leo)	40 — 2 5 28-14
	279 — 2 195-31

Punja (Pasturage)

Cultivation	20 — 14 1-20

Partly waste (Leo) 130 — 72-80

Total 150 — 84 —

Grand Total 279-31

Declared Gram Ola Adhinam Pasture Land

Register No 919

Sheet No 1059

1456-30

Parmacoudy Village Register

Name	Age	Description	Relationship	Remarks
Karuppa Tevar	40	Proprietor		(1) Grandson of the 1st Karuppa Tevar by his 2nd Wife Kanni Nachiar
Kanni Nachiar	70	Do	Wife of the 1st Karuppa Tevar	
Sivagnana Tevar	20	Do	Son of the 1st Karuppa Tevar by his 1st Wife Kaliammal	
Kaliammal	60	Do	Wife of the 1st Karuppa Tevar	
Periya Nachiar	40	Do	Daughter of the 1st Karuppa Tevar by his 1st Wife Kaliammal	
Sivagnana Tevar	20	Do	Son of the 1st Karuppa Tevar by his 1st Wife Kaliammal

Rates of Government Tolagy per Acre

	Mase	Mes
Dry	3-9-9	-1-7
Wet	10-13-3	-5-9

Average Rates of Government Tolagy per Acre

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

Average value of Grain of Retowram wet land in Pattamangalam Magavam consisting of Ayen Villages in the Taluq of Trippattur

Taluq for the period of 15 years.

A

From Fs 1256 to Fs 1270	Cultivated area in acres	Gross cultivation	Of which Government's share at 45 per cent	Average prices of Grains	Value of the quantity of grains given in Cash	Rates per Acre
Rs a	A C	Rs a	Rs a	Rs a	Rs a	Rs a
17484-7--	12239-15		7105 9-3-2	1-8-3	10790 6-2-7	8-13-7

Note — As the figures in Col 4 include "Varisapall" or the quantity of grain given for which some of the lands have been rented out & as the gross cultivation of the Villages when rented out in kind is not known, the Col 3 is left blank.

II This Village is entered in all the Accounts as Darmasanam — This & 3 other Villages noted in the margin were granted on one of the same date under one & the same Patta to the members of one & the same Family — No Talkaran about the area or about the boundaries on the part of the (Vattavalattiyinsel — Sockiyerinadal — Tennavarki — Cherinakunnukudi) — Ayan's Vattavel. The boundaries now inserted in the revenue enter statement correspond with those in the Account of Fs 1264. Hence the boundaries are confirmed here & the 543 Acres 95 Cents situated therein are registered here. The boundaries of the Village not only are recited in the Account of Fs 1264, but also they are recited in the Account of Fs 1244 containing the boundaries of the Village. (Vide margin). The Revenue does not has an Account of Fs 1244 & Fs 1922 & in the Patta. The Revenue Collection during

Vide preceding side

Forecast

Sheet No. 2 Jamaseeran Valiakoodu Patti in Periyakulam Taluq of Tevagiri Zemindary in Madura District

Register No. 919

Sheet No. 1060

II. All these boundaries differ with each other - The Mahajanams say that this difference is confined only to words & that the boundaries are one & the same on the spot ——

They entered also a written remark to this effect in the vernacular Register ——

Hence the boundaries entered in the Inam Register Accounts of Fl 1944 are confirmed here -

& the 543 Acres 95 Cents situated thereon are registered here -

I. ..... This Village consists of 68 Patties - of an equal balance - They are enjoyed as shewn in the -

The Lands marginal of the first side of the first sheet of this Register - The Lands are divided & they are - were exchanged

exchanged once in 16 years - Pompu is paid on the number of Patties equally & permanently - about this - The Mahajanams entered into an agreement at Sammatipuram in July 1813 to exchange lands once in 16 years - agreement is on stamped paper

II. ..... Of the persons of 16, Nos 1 & 52 are said by the Mahajanams, to be descendants of the - Of Grantees who were of Nava Gotra & of Nava Sutra & others are aliences - The person - No 17 & 46 is through a descendant of the Original Grantee the remainder has possession of the lands acquired by his ancestors originally

III. ..... The persons Nos 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-10-11-12-13-17-18-19-20-22-23-24-25-26-27-30-31-41-42-52-53-54-55-56-57-58-60-61 of 16 - purchased the Lands entered in the marginally noted statements & the deeds of sales supported by documents in A.D 1804-1810-1813-1815-1818-1820-1821-1825-1827-1828-1831-1836-1838-1841-1842-1843-1845-1848-1849-1852-1853-1854-1855-1856-1857-1858-1859-1860 & 1861 - for Rupees 18725 from the shares in the Village - Forty bills & sales are on plain paper, 20 bills are on stamped paper & two bills are on stamped papers -

The persons Nos 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-12-13-17-18-19-20-23-24-25-26-27-30-31-32-33-35-36-37-40-41-42-43-44-45-46 - had Dana Pattayams granted to them ancestors by the Grantee in A.D 1798 ——— bestowing to them 1 or one Pongo each - These Dana Pattayams are in a very Curious style They contain no date of the grant - It is merely said therein that only so many Patties in the Village, so many Pongos were granted to each a person - The Genuine signature was affixed to them in the words Sree Rama Dayem &c. This is the old practice - These Dana Pattayams are genuine ones as appear from the Puranja at their place -

In the Village among the shareholders are enjoying certain shares without documents - These shares are said to have acquired by their ancestors partly by gift & partly by purchase ——

All the Mahajanams avoid their right to these shares ——

Sheet No. 1060 Takarai

IV. One ——— Rain Anicut for flowing one Patty from the person No 1 of 16 on the - ground that he purchased the Patty in A.D 1860 for Rupees 1330 - 2 - grows one Puttavaral, - that he enjoyed on that year the Rabi Makasool or 2d crop of that Patty; that one Muduk - Kaiyagan & the meantime prevented him from enjoying this Patty on the ground that it is - his property; that the Sub Magistrate of Periyakulam awarded him the land; that in appeal the - Full Deputy Collector reversed the decision of the Sub Magistrate & awarded it to the said - Village Christnayen. But the Land is now in possession of Muduk Kaiyagan since the date of the - Collectors decision dated 1867 & enjoyed by him the Patty in his name -

22 Pachoko Peruvalai Iyengar 30 — Shareholder — (22) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter 4 Married Daughters 1 Mother

23 Lavanya narayanayan 30 & 33 — do — (23) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Mother

24 Verasami Iyengar 29 — do — (24) 1 Wife

Nedumara

25 Alamelu Ammal 40 — do — (25) 1 Husband 2 Sons & 1 Daughter

Periyakattiyar

26 Lirinu vasamal 35 — do — (26) 1 Son 1 Daughter 3 Married Daughters

Nedumaran

27 Ranolai ammal 30 — do — (27) 1 Husband 1 Son 2 Married Daughters

Marayan

28 Straran Zachori 30 — do — (28) 1 Wife 1 Mother — See previous page

Sheeranayan in Periyakulam

29 Sivaven gadachori 40 — do — (29) 1 Wife 3 Married Daughters

Periyakattiyar

30 Lavanya narayana Avadhani 20 — do — (30) 1 Wife 1 Mother

31 Gurumurti Avadhani 35 — do — (31) 1 Wife 1 Mother

Ramanadi

32 Laborer narayan 25 — do — (32) 1 Wife 1 Married Daughter 1 Mother

33 Padmanadhayan 20 — do — (33) 1 Wife

The person N 1 C 16 says that he purchased the one Vritty in A D 1861 for Rupees 1920 — I have one Ramanayagen & Muddukrishnayen & Pattie is enjoying it ever since — uninterruptedly — Bill of sale is on a stamped paper —

The complainant Ramanayagen states that his bill of sale is produced in the Moonsiffs Court of Sivagangai — where a suit is pending for recovery of the Vritty & that the said Bill of sale is on stamped paper worth 20 Rupees —

The complainant produced the following documents

A — Decision of the Police Ameen of Tirpattoor dated 2d March 61 establishing the right of the complainant to the Vritty in question & referring Muddukrishnayen above alluded to, to the first Court —

B — Deposition given by Subbammal before the Police Ameen on the 2d February 61 stating that she was enjoying the Vritty which is intended to be given her father, that she sold it to the Complainant Ramanayagen with "Kodey Mahsool" for Rupees 1330 — executed a Bill of sale & received the value being unable to manage the affairs of the house, & made over the lands to the purchaser Ramanayagen, that the purchaser enjoyed the "Kodai Mahsool" or 2d crop. & is preparing to enjoy also the same different crop produce, that in the state of Pasy the said Muddukrishnayen prevented the purchaser from enjoying the lands & that he had not shown any right to, & enjoyment of the Vritty in question — or any concern therein —

C — Deputy Magistrates decision dated 22d April 61 in which he awarded the lands to Muddukrishnayen —

Documents produced by the person N 1 C 16 are as follows —

D — Deputy Magistrates decision above alluded to & on which is marked C —

E — Bill of sale executed by Muttukrishnayen & Ramayen — to the person N 1 C 16. in A D 1861 — selling one Vritty & have for Rupees 1920 — 2 — This is on stamped paper

The Maharajamum says that Subbammal was enjoying the Vritty since long & sold the said it to the Claimant Ramanayagen in A D 1860 & that he sold the Vritty to Ramanayagen who enjoyed Kodai Mahsool for one year, that Muddu Krishnayen, the son of Subbammal's brother Subbammal & Ramayen, the son of Subbammal's Elder Brother Subbammal had not any right to or concern in the said Vritty — One Thiruvengadathayen, the person N 16, & Thadayappa Ayengar, the Vritty did sell it to the said person — Muddukrishnayen —

34 Venkatesa mayen 16	Shareholders	(34) 2 Elder brothers 1 younger brother	
Sivagonga			
35 Brahmanayaki alias Varijo Velammal 50	do	(35) 2 Married Daughters 1 Son & do 2 Daughters do	
Vedeyengadu			
36 Kuppa mayengar 50	do	(36) 1 Wife 5 Sons 2 Daughters in law 3 Married Daughters	
Sivakasiyar			
37 Sivani vasayagee 43	do	(37) 1 Wife 1 Brother	
Sivagonga			
38 Ananta Narayanayengar alias Pero Samayangar 30	do	(38) 1 Wife 1 Brother	
39 Ramasawmy 30	do	(39) 1 Wife 1 Married Daughter	
Melavannadhori in Sivagonga			
40 Sadeshwa Ammal 25	do	(40) none	Vide preceding side —
Ramanaden 41 Seshayen 40	do	(41) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Brother 2 Married Daughters	
Sivakasiyar 42 Sadasiva Chari 40	do	(42) 1 Wife 2 Sons 2 Daughters in law 1 Brother 2 Married Daughters	
Sivagonga 43 Ramaik Thevendaren Veerasastri 34	do	(43) 1 Wife	
44 Subba monyasastri 29	do	(44) 1 Wife	
45 Dikshathar mayen 45	do	(45) 1 Wife 1 Married Daughter	

Sheet No. 1061 Register No. 919

Claimant Ramanuzyengar executed a bill of sale after receiving the value of the same & the day did attest the bill of sale & witness the payment of the value of the same to Subbammal. The Last Deputy Collector, who deprived the said Ramanuzyengar from the possession of his Vritty, in his Capacity of the Deputy Magistrate never enquired the Case thoroughly. I cannot but mention here that his decision injured Ramanuzyengar to a vast extent. He paid the money & purchased the Vritty & left it in possession of the person till 1816 - when the decision of the Deputy Magistrate. Subbammal omitted to represent the Hd of Police that the Vritty was of her own property that she did sell it to Ramanuzyengar that it was inherited to her grandmother Gollu. She is proved now by a large body of the Malayanans who are present for the settlement. The Deputy Magistrate never enquired the Malayanans. The decision of the Deputy Magistrate which is placed with this shews that he had no ground to award the Vritty to Muddukrishnayen & reverse the decision of the Hd of Police but passed a decision in favour of the Muddukrishnayen just enquiring a few words or reading a few words. The Deputy Magistrate in his decision states "Appellant Muddukrishnayen being aggrieved by the decision of the Hd Police which awarded the land to the Ramanuzyengar appealed an appeal to him by reason that the Vritty is in his possession" "On perusing carefully the record & proceedings connected to the case it appears that it is proved by 13 witnesses that the Respondent Ramanuzyengar enjoyed the Rents" "Mahasom on the permission of Subbammal who was the owner of the land" "& Vritty in question. The said Subbammal on in contravention to what she and" "before the Police ameen passed a Petition there (Deputy Magistrate) stating that she" "never received the value of the land from Ramanuzyengar & that the appellant" "Muddu Krishnayen should enjoy the land. She also appeared in person & reported" "the same words. From this it is evident that the Subbammal who had enjoyment of" "the Vritty of the last year does not consent to the transfer of the" "land to the Respondent Ramanuzyengar. Appellant Muddukrishnayen says" "that the Vritty is in his possession & that the respondent purchased it forcibly from" "the said Subbammal - It is proved by 18 witnesses, 10 of whom have signed a Mahazer" "the possession of the land." "Appellant Muddukrishnayen has

46	Sundara mayan 48	Shore holder	(46) 1 Wife
47	Sirakostiyar 47 J. Sreeni vasayangir 30	do	(47) 1 Wife 2 Sons 1 Daughter also 4 Married Daughters also
48	Padmasini Ammal 24	do	(48) 1 Son 1 Married Daughter
49	Adamaran Alomelu Ammal 12	do	(49) 1 Husband
50	Sirukostiyar. Lakshmi Ammal 10	do	(50) 1 Husband
51	Nallor Jagannadha yar 55	do	(51) 1 Wife 1 Married Daughter 1 Son 2 Daughters 1 Daughter also
52	Raglia -varjangar 55	do	(52) 1 Wife 1 Son
53	Sirukostiyar R. Sowrin yanarayana Iyangar 27	do	(53) 1 Wife 1 Brother
54	Ramana yayango 16	do	(54) 1 Wife
55	Sérusa- tago payango 57	do	(55) 1 Wife 2 Married Daughters 1 Brother
56	A Sowan yanarayan "nayango 30	do	(56) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Married Daughter
57	R. Gowin dayango 60	do	(57) 1 Son 1 Daughter also 3 Married Daughters 1 Grandson

These preceding aide

Four

From the above circumstances the Respondent Ramanuzzegan is agreed to the civil Court & the land is put in possession of the appellant. The Deputy Magistrate never made any fresh enquiry but a Mahazer was presented by the Village officials when the case was before him, to the effect that the Vritty is in possession of the appellant Muttukistnayen. The evidence of the Village officials in the case of the Damasanam Villages is of no use because the Mahazanams are not allowing any person to intigen with any thing in the Village affairs. The Mahazanams could be better informed. The Mahazer was undoubtedly presented at the instigation of the appellant. I arrive at the conclusion that the Vritty may be registered in the name of Ramanuzzegan who purchased the Vritty & enjoyed it actually & who was removed from the possession of the same by the decision of the Deputy Magistrate, because Muttukistnayen & Ramudnayen who sold it subsequently to the person who had not any right to or concern therein. The merits of the case is this - Ramanuzzegan purchased the Vritty for 1330 - The person who disputed with a view to purchase it for himself being an influential person - Thereupon offered a larger sum than the valuation & then Muttukistnayen came forward & claimed to the Vritty - Under the above circumstances I registered the Vritty in the name of Ramanuzzegan & respondent the person who filed a suit in the civil court - Ramanuzzegan already brought an Action against Muttukistnayen to get the recovery of the Vritty in the Moonsiffs Court of Tevagunga in A.D. 1861 or as soon as the Deputy Magistrate passed deprived him from the possession of the land - But result of the same is not known as yet - Thus Ramanuzzegan is numbered 63 of 016 - (X)

VIII ..... Some of the Mahazanams pleaded that the Vritty entered in the name of all the Mahazanams in No 62 of 016 was some forty years ago by the Mahazanams to the person who may be teaching "Ashtanda" in the Village to the young lads - & others opposed it & pleaded that it was a Vritty of one Ramasawmy Vaiyen, who sold it & one Ramasawmy Sastry some 60 years ago & the latter sold it to the shroff in the Village - After all, the Mahazanams admitted that the Vritty is in joint possession of the Mahazanams who are persevered in age &c. & who swore among themselves that the Vritty was purchased by the Mahazanams jointly - Hence the Vritty is entered in the joint names of all the Mahazanams - (Vide next sheet)

58 Chinno Lavanya Nerayanayen 80 6 12 — A.C. (58) 1 Brahmin

59 Rama Subbayen 28 — A.C. (59) 1 Wife

60 Letchapayen 80 8 50 — A.C. (60) 1 Wife 1 Son

61 Pulluvo yongor 62 — A.C. (61) 1 Wife 2 Sons 2 Daughters-in-law 1 Grandson 1 Granddaughter 1 Deceased Daughter

62 Mahazanam of the Village — (62)

63 Ramanuzzegan 36 — M 1 Wife.

64 Pallavan 20 — (64) 2 Sons 1 Wife.

65 Vaiyan 27 — (65) 1 Son 1 Grandson

66 Vedanta nayagan 50 — D — (66) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter (unmarried)

67 Ranagen Sastry 30 — A.C. (67) 1 Wife. 2 Sons (Illegible)

68 Tatayengar 84 — D — (68) 1 Son. 1 Grandson 1 Daughter-in-law 1 Wife of Grandson

69 Rangayen 55 — D — (69) 1 Wife 2 Sons 2 Daughters-in-law 3 Minor Daughters

70 Vedanta nayagan 54 — D — (70) 1 Wife 1 Son 1 Daughter (unmarried)

4 Chalk Velichiyatty Dammaranam Continued

Register No 919 Sheet No 1062

All the Mahajanams intend to appropriate the proceeds of the Vritty to the use of Rakkiwa Teacher. The Mahajanams entered into a written agreement in A.D 1863 - to appropriate the proceeds of the Vritty to the use of the teacher. As the Vritty was not originally granted for the use of Rakkiwa Teacher, I treat the above as a personal grant - or a parcel by the Dammaranam - Sometimes the Mahajanams are appropriating the proceeds of the Vritty for their own use -

IX The persons N 1 & two others plead part of the lands entered against the persons N 52-60-61-66, our Vritty was granted by the Mahajanams about 45 years ago to their ancestors for teaching Sama Veda to young Lads - & that they are teaching "Vedas" even now - They again say that the said persons N 52-60-61-66 are to enjoy the Vritty as long as they are punctual in their duties - The persons N 52-60-61-66 plead that their ancestors acquired the Village from the Granter of the Village - as a personal grant & not as an emolument for teaching Sama Vedals - The Majority of the Mahajanams say that it is entered in the Accounts of the Village as, as Veda Vritty Pongors & that they are not aware of the persons N 52-60-61-66 or their ancestors having taught Vedas to any person - From a Talcud of the Collector dated 1832 in which is proved by the persons N 1, 9, 16 it appears that there are Pongors in the Village for the support of the teachers of Sama Veda, Rakkiwa, & Yajur Veda - In this Talcud it is said that the holders of these Pongors are to be punctual in their duties & not to deprive of the lands. The persons N 1, 9, 2 also plead that the Vritty entered in the names of the persons N 64-65-66, 9, 16 was granted by the Mahajanams about 65 years ago as an emolument for teaching Yajur Vedas to young Lads - & that they are teaching Vedals - The other Mahajanams & the persons N 64-65-66, 9, 16 - plead that it was not granted for the service of teaching Vedals - The Talcud of 1832 of the Collector just above referred to before also to this Case. In the Village accounts it is entered that the persons N 52-60-61 & the persons N 64-65-66 are enjoying Veda Vritties - It is plainly proved that the holders of these Vritties are not teaching Vedals at all - one or two of them are not fit to teach Vedals - Hence the Vritties enjoyed by these persons N 52-60-61-66-65-66 are registered in their names & their descendants are referred to the Civil Court - As these Vritties are now granted by the Mahajanams, even if they were Veda Vritties, they are also liable to be taxed under Rule II - As it is clearly proved that the persons N 52-60-61-64-65-66 are enjoying these lands since long, none would deprive them from the same - On the other hand who could assert of one here to teach Vedas while they are not - inclined to do so - & while they are not doing the service they are not disputed - The Jemindars servants named above & the Village Curnam & certain others in their or their defendants as Veda Vritties & hence under dispute - give arise - Such cases are of no use - If there were Veda Vritties in any Village, they should be mentioned in any of the public or Jemindars Accounts In this Case, the mention of Veda Vritties is not made in any Account - Hence there is no proof for saying any portion of the Village as Veda Vritties - In other part of the Country, people bully the Mahajanams by raising such disputes - with the connivance of the Jemindars servants - The Village Accounts & the agreement prepared by the Mahajanams are not worthy of reliance - because some of the influential shareholders in the Village endeavour to cook a tale of preparing accounts so to deceive some of the shareholders in the Village by adding their names to their names & by getting them signed by some of the shareholders who are quite ignorant of any thing - By entering some of the names as Veda Vritties & as one the Collector in 1832 A framed on a report of the Servants of Tandavan - when the Tittle was under the management of the Collector - It is not known who is holding Veda Vritties - It is said that the proceeds of the Veda Vritty lands are not to be misapplied - The evidence of the majority of the Village accounts, 3 Pongors are entered in as Veda Vritty Karei - Mahajanams say that there were no Veda Vritties in reality three years before

(Vide next side)

X - - - - One Ramasamy Pillay claims to own thirty cents of land from the person No 1 of 16 by reason that his father purchased it in A.D 1840 produced a deed of sale from the person No 1 of 16 for Rupees 336. Bill of sale is on a plain foolscap long - The person No 1 of 16 admits the genuineness of the document but says that he got from an extinguished mortgage bond dated 1843 which is executed by his Father Muhaiyanam & the father of the claimant that the bill of sale was annulled - & admits that the Claimant is enjoying the Property - The Muhaiyanams say that the father of the person No 16 did sell the land to the claimants father & that it is in possession of the family of the purchaser since the date of the purchase.

I read the extinguished mortgage bond most carefully & I cannot find a word in it which annuls the bill of sale & which conveys the land in any manner to that effect. It is proved satisfactorily that the father of the present claimant did purchase the one thirty & that it is in possession of the family of the claimant since the date of the purchase - Hence the One Thirty is registered in the name of the claimant who is numbered No 67 of 16. & the person No 1 of 16 is ordered by the Civil Court

XI - - - - - The person No 1 of 16 was taken in adoption in about 24 years ago by his Mother Father Savia Pillay Vyengar when he was 3 years old - The adopted father died 12 years after the adoption & the adopted Mother died about 12 years ago - Since the date of the demise of the adopted Mother, the property of the adopted father is in possession of the person No 1 of 16 - The person No 1 of 16 was the eldest son of his natural father - The person No 1 of 16 has two natural younger brothers. The person No 1 of 16 was given over by the natural relatives of his natural father as he was adopted by his Mother Father - The natural brothers of the person No 1 of 16 are enjoying the property of their father & the person No 1 of 16 had not received any share in the property of his natural father nor has given any share to his natural brothers in the property of his adopted father - - - - -

5 Shelly Vellakudipatty

Sheet No. 1663

The results of my enquiry do not show that there is any difference between the wet of this Village & that of the contiguous Ayen Village - However I consider that the average Wet assessment of the Contiguous Ayen Village is a little higher - Hence I recommend some concession in it as follows

- Wet 170 Acres at 8 Rupees per acre — 1360-
- Wet 25 1/2 Acres Saste & at 7 Rupees per — 25-8-0

1385-8-0

Dry 60 Acres full assessed at 1 1/2 Rupees per acre - 60 —

Register No. 979 Dry 44 Acres Saste assessed at 1/4 per acre - 11 —

71 —

1456-8-0

Sheet No. 1663

~~Lands~~ under the Channel

Tumbanadu