Agrahar an Register No 1

Dodda Kalrayan [illegible] in the Attur Taluk in the Salem District.

Spectre No 92

~~Attur Village~~
Attur Taluk
Dodda Kalrayan Nad
Salem Dist

Lr to Govt 121 2/70

This village is a division or Nad of the Range of Hills known by the name of Kalrayan Hills. The Hills extend from [illegible] in the Attur Taluk [illegible] as far as [illegible] in the Kallakurichi Taluk in the South Arcot District. It consists of [illegible] Polliams, or estates namely —

In the Attur Taluk of the Salem District
1 Chinna Kalrayan estate known by the name of [illegible] Nad.
2 Peria Kalrayan estate known by the name of [illegible] Nad.

In the Kallakurichi Taluk of South Arcot District
3 Jadayagoundan estate consisting of 2 Nads viz [illegible] Nad & [illegible] Nad.
4 Kurabi [illegible] estate consisting of the 2 Nads viz Attipatti Nad & [illegible] Nad.
5 [illegible] estate consisting 92 Nads of the same name.

Total 5 estates — consisting of 8 Nads. It is not known how the lands of the South Arcot District were settled. The South Arcot proceedings does not include them. There are no accounts of any kind ~~kept~~ on record for these hill villages. They were neither [illegible] nor even included in the list of villages. The existence of the estate as a jaghir was brought to the notice of the authorities by a suit in the Civil Court [illegible] report was made by the Tahsildar in 1843. It is evident that in former days the Bedar caste people took [illegible] to the hills & established themselves there under the command of their chief [illegible] Naidu, giving the name of the hills [illegible] in Perikalrayan [illegible] in the Jadayagoundan hills [illegible] in the shape of [illegible] or in the shape of carved stone cylinders, that all the Bedars in consequence [illegible] away, & that a [illegible] of a dream the [illegible] people came up from Kanchi & settled themselves on the hills under the rule of 5 Chieftains. The new settlers married the Bedar women & the [illegible] mixed population was inhabiting the hills [illegible] the [illegible] in which [illegible] is called by the [illegible]. Uppam [illegible] and [illegible]; & the other is called [illegible]. [illegible] rent of any kind was ever paid by the 5 Poligars before. They collect on each [illegible] or ( ). The report also states that the festivals of the [illegible] are [illegible] that the [illegible] of the [illegible] are [illegible]. The Zemindar [illegible] copy of an engraving [illegible] "Kallakurichi" [illegible] limits & all "Kesava Perumal," in Salivahana [illegible] 1016) — the engraving on the [illegible] of the temple [illegible] 1094, [illegible] of Kalrayan [illegible] under".

16 21

[illegible] Kalrayan [illegible] Goundan [illegible]

[illegible] Nad

102 — 12 —
61 — 14 —
155 — 6 —
19 — 10 —
5 — 4 —
53 — 6 — 32 — 6 —
15 —
68 — 6 — Total

[illegible] the hills [illegible]

A D 1016 [illegible] engraving [illegible] that the [illegible] of the [illegible] belonged to [illegible]

Ordered — a decree of the [illegible] 1808 of [illegible] the [illegible] Rama [illegible] of the hills.
23 — a decree of [illegible] 1851 [illegible] of [illegible]

The [illegible] village [illegible] accounts [illegible] the [illegible] at the [illegible] uniform rate in the village, and [illegible] in Col. 6 [illegible] in 1840 — Each [illegible] to a copy [illegible] assessed at a [illegible] of 10 [illegible]. That is each plough pays 4 — & each hoe [illegible]. The Total amount of Revenue was [illegible] in 1841 at Rs 1324-6-0. The Zemindar's [illegible] customary to keep any accounts for the Revenue [illegible] he cannot therefore say what the [illegible]. It appears from a Court's decree of 1838 produced that the [illegible] of the Patta [illegible] the amount of 1841 [illegible] a fair approximation of the actual extent of cultivation. But it does not include the waste & the Poligars [illegible] have been [illegible] taking [illegible] extent [illegible] of waste to be 25 per cent of the [illegible], the value [illegible] amounts to 336 Rs — Adding this to the [illegible] of 1841 [illegible] amounts to 1,680 Rs.

I [illegible] this as the average permanent [illegible] of the village.

See Collector's letter to the

The only support he could produce is a copy of the Inscription on a stone on the hill. The [illegible] as he says it is according to the copy produced, dated, 15 – or ~~It declares that~~ the 21st [illegible] of Roudri Salivahan 942 & it declares that Kalrayagounder ~~has~~ gave [illegible] & Poojai with the limits of the Kana Pavunal [illegible]. The inscription on the other side is dated Salivahan 1224 (AD 1302) which ~~was~~ contains the following words "To Kallaraya Gounder, 8 Kane Nadu".

The Poligar's Vakil pleads on the strength of the above Inscriptions, that the grant was a Religious grant & adds that the Religious [illegible] only kept up the Pattakar receiving a part of the Income for his own maintenance, & for the support of his State ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] the hill itself proves no formal grant, [illegible] the inscription of AD 1016 that the Gounds gave [illegible] Poojai (how much it does not explain) to the [illegible]. The question then is how the Gounds ~~[illegible]~~ who are alleged to have [illegible] the taxfree right, & ~~[illegible]~~ has their taxfree right been recognized [illegible] authorities. He produces no ~~[illegible]~~ letter of Grant. The village [illegible] [illegible] discovered, Rayas the only of homage to Govt. In the Report of 1841, the Poligar described that ~~[illegible]~~ a part of the Rent went to his own use, & that the remainder was appropriated to the temple. In the Courts Decree of 1838, ~~[illegible]~~ nothing was stated of the nature of the grant, & only one pa[illegible] Pattakarship to the present enjoyer's father against an encroacher. In the plaint [illegible] recited in the Courts Decree, the Plaintiff is shown to have stated his engagement as to [illegible] the hereditary Patta~~[illegible]~~kar of the [illegible] of the [illegible] "[illegible]" – "He & his ancestors have been the [illegible] of religious [illegible] [illegible] received [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] duly [illegible] [illegible] their lands, that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]". [illegible] this explanation [illegible] & Revenues of the hill & [illegible], & [illegible] [illegible] the Devasthanam [illegible] is certainly not the property of the Devasthanam ~~[illegible]~~. But the Devasthanam [illegible] established & supported by the Pattakars. Hence I determine that the [illegible] [illegible] a portion of [illegible] personal & charitable. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] make no mention of [illegible] the Inscription of Salivah 1224 (~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]) The [illegible] that the 8 Nads belonged to Kallaraya Gounder [illegible] [illegible], but it clearly describes that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the Devasthanam [illegible]

I w^d however, in respect to the prescription [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] & [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ make a reduction for them to the extent of ~~[illegible]~~ ¼ of the Beriz [illegible] [illegible] to 1/D for the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

The Beriz proper	Rs 1680
Deduct for the Devasthanam	420 Rs
Remains Rupees	1260
Personal Beriz.	
Deduct ¼ on this	315 Rs

Compared

15/9/53

Camp [illegible]

Salem [illegible]