Register of Inams in the Village of Vidupoki in the Taluq of Amarantu[illegible]

Register No. 299

Vidupoki

Ayan Village

Personal Grant (Virayadi) 1 Kadu[illegible] [illegible] 1-3-3 a 88

Average Income as per statement of the Inamdar: 1 — Bhatta Vidi vartty 1-15-8

Ten Acres. Patta Muttu Sirurunga-dayā Tever. dated S.S. 1629 A.D. 1707. Palmira leaf. Act of Fusly 1211 Act of Fusly 1223. 1211. Patta Muttayen. In Fusly 1211 none. In Fusly 1223 none.

Bhadastodi[?] Sangolam:
1 Muttammal 70 — Widow of great grandson of person in Col 13 — (1) son & daughter
2 Sundaraja yengar 60 — Great grand son of person in Col 13 — (2) 1 Wife 1 Daughter
3 Srinivasa vayangar 54 — Do — (3) 1 Wife 2 Daughters
4 Tiruvengada mayangar 65 — Do — (4) —
5 Narayanyengar 55 — Do — (5) 1 Daughter
6 Streenivas vayangar 35 — Do — (6) 1 Wife 1 Daughter

Shares
No 1 is enjoying — 1
No 2 and 3 are Do — 1
No 4 and 5 Do Do — 1
No 6 is Do — 1
4

No other Family Dumb Landsare and one Patta is recorded

To be confirmed under Rule II Clause 3.

Agreed.

Zemindari Jodi — 1-15-8

Govt. 2 R/8 — 1 Rupee —

A Swaminath[illegible]

Reconsidered 1764 —

The Inam being evidently older than the P.S. or the date of the said Settlement can be confirmed

29/7/64

Completed

Sheet No. 1916

The Inamdars plead that this Inam was granted to their ancestors in AD 1707 by Muttu Sirurunga Tever. In support of this, they produced the Patta alleged to have been granted by the Grantor. This document is on two plain Cadjan leaves. This is not a registered one, nor its existence is mentioned in any of the accounts. The Rany's Vakeel says that this Patta is a forged one & that the Inamdars copied this from a Patta granted to them for an Inam in Nachingolam, Ayan Village. On examining carefully the Patta, I cannot but arrive at the conclusion that it is a forged one because the Cadjan leaves on which it is written are new & because it is ~~[illegible]~~ coloured newly. This Inam is not found in any of the Accounts ~~[illegible]~~ furnished from the Collector's Office. This is entered in the Zemindari settlement Accounts which are available only for a few years since Fusly 1247. The Rany's Vakeel says that he ~~[illegible]~~ is unable to say whether this Inam was granted previous or subsequent to the Permanent Settlement. The Inamdars produced receipts granted for the payment of Porupu of this Inam & of an Inam in Nachingolam for AD 1802-1803-1804-1805-1806-1807-1808-1809-1810-1811-1812-1813-1816-18[illegible] 1817-1818-1819-1820-1821-1822-1823-1825-1826-1827-1828-1829-1830-18[illegible]-1833-1834-1835-1836-1837-1857 -1861-1862-1863-1864- The Vakeel admits that these [illegible] genuine [illegible] is [illegible]

(x) These receipts [2] that this Inam is in possession of the family of the present holders thereof since the time of the Settlement & as this is entered in the Zemindari annual settlement Accounts, I am of an opinion that this is an Inam deducted from the assets upon which the Permanent settlement was based & ~~[illegible]~~ treat ~~it~~ the same as such. The account of Fusly 1211 is neither a genuine nor perfect one.

1764

Pn

Framed