Register of the Sarva Inam Village of Nadapanahalli No 539 in the [illegible]

[illegible] Register [illegible] 28

D— VII TK Salem

* For we have not got any deeds in the Circar showing the holding of each person. The Survey work & the Abstract of the Survey prepared in [illegible] shows the fields forming each Kani or cluster of 4 Vrittis & details the enjoyment of these fields, such as ¼ Vrittis, ½ Vrittis &c. This cannot enable us to give T.D.s for each separate holding & subdivision of fields that now exist in each of the old Kanis. The Apaharadars produce an account of these now prepared in Hoob, showing the individual holdings. But it does not seem to have been ever recognized in the Collector's Office. Nor can we conveniently treat each Kani for a separate Title Deed. The number of shares in one Kani occur in the other Kanis also but with different proportion of shares. This would entail a repetition of names in the Register & would give the advantage [illegible] for [illegible] holdings [illegible] to all the 6 Kanis.

This is a Sarva Inam Village. The original grant included this & 5 other villages. The original grant was made in Salivahan 1687 (A.D.) for a consideration of 2458 [illegible] Pagodas (i.e. 2½ [illegible]) & it comprised the Sarva Maniam villages of Kati Nagadanahalli & its hamlet of Gullahalli; & a tank. 2. Nadapanahalli & its hamlets of [illegible]; Nagaragudalu with its suburb Kottehalli & tank, Bevinamaradahalli, & the Venkatasamudram tank & [illegible]. The original grantee was one Venkataramaiya. He sold the 5 villages of Nadapanahalli, Kumbalapadi, Nagaragudalu, Bevinamaradahalli & Bayankova a century back to 24 Brahmins in the 24 Vrittis in one lot & at one & the same time; & sold the village of Kaliyanahalli to other people.

All these 6 villages were surveyed each separately; & the Kayam Davarat accounts made out accordingly. I had therefore made a separate register for each of these villages. In the Survey & in the Kayam Davarat the extent of each Kani (or 4 Vrittis) was shown in terms of fields, & the Apaharadars shall keep to that arrangement of fields in their present enjoyment, & they request that, as the lands of each Vritti were individually distinguished at the survey in the Kayam Davarat, & as Vrittis differ in values or [illegible], separate Title Deeds may be granted for each separate enjoyment, in order that they may be enabled to pay the proportion of Quit Rent according to their [illegible] of the land actually in their possession. But this cannot be granted under the present orders *

1 2 3 4 Common 5 [illegible] 6 [illegible] 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

Inc

Ayakat

Personal — Total Extent 657-35-2 657·88

Deduct Porambokes 68-7-6 48·18

Remains Ayacut area 589-27-12 589·70 — 449-9-5

Deduct [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ 37-3-5 39·09 — 18-1-9

Remains ~~552-24-7 550·60~~ — 431-7-8

Ayacut area ~~[illegible]~~ — ~~440-6-9~~ 431-7-8

Particulars

Dry — ~~513-6-12~~ [illegible] — 345-6-11

Wet — 37-17-11 37·46 — 86-0-9

Total — ~~[illegible]~~ 550-24-7 550·60 — 431-7-8

All assessed at the Survey. No Inamdar's [illegible] [illegible] unassessed.

For Subsistence as Charity & in consideration of a large sum paid in by the Mysore Rajah as its price.

Mysore — Key 6

Granted in by Mysore Rajah Krishna Raja Odayar

Register No. 23
Sheet No. 142

An original Copper-plate Grant dated Salivahan 1687 (or Vishu) by Mysore Immadi Krishna Raja Odayar, granting, in consideration of a payment made of 2458 Pagodas, the villages of Kati Nagadanahalli &c. 6 villages as detailed in the prefatory notice, to Venkataramaiya who paid the money thro' the merchant Kotal Viri Chetti.

2d — An order of the same date on paper in the name of Venkataramaiya, Mutalik of Kotal Viri Chetty, approving [illegible] of the grant under

Kaliyanahalli & its hamlet of Gabbehalli valued 30 Pagodas —

Nadapanahalli } Kumbalapadi } Pagodas 120 value of land

Nagaragudalu & tank, & the hamlet of Kottehalli & Bevinamaradahalli & the Venkatasamudram tank constructed by Brahmans at their own cost — Pagodas 32 value of land / 30 Pagodas value of land

~~Bevinamaradahalli~~ Bayanhalli with its ayakat 93 Pagodas

& directing the grant to be a permanent & hereditary one with all powers of disposal of the property.

3d An order of the same date on paper to Obali Superintendent Lakshmikantaiya giving the particulars of the grant.

Original Venkataramaiya

In the Survey Hoob: Venkatakrishnaya Do — 2; Venkataramaiya's [illegible] — 5 — Krishnappa — 6. During the survey in 6 Kanis with names of 6 [illegible] above — for each Kani — [illegible] each field, the enjoyments are also noted. Each Kani was composed of 4 Vrittis & the 6 Kanis included 24 Vrittis. In the Average Abstract, Vrittis are classed as to the enjoyment of each individual.

1 — Venkatakrishnaya — 2 1/16 V.
2 — Seshaya — 2 1/16 V.
3 — Kasi Narasimha Chary — ½ V.
4 — Srinivasa Chary — 2 V.
5 — Narasimha Chary — ½ V.
6 — Subbaraya — 1 V.
7 — Venkatesa Chary — ¾ V.
8 — Krishnappa — 2¼ V.
9 — Kuppa Chary — 1 V.
10 — Narasimha Chary — ½ V.
11 — [illegible] Chary — ¾ V.
12 — Adavani Venkata Chary — ½ V.
13 — Narasappa — ½ V.
14 — Srinivasa Chary — 1 V.
15 — Venkataramaiya — 1 V.
16 — Harinidaya — 1 V.
17 — Dasappa — 1 V.
18 — Ramaiya — ½ V.
19 — Kodi Krishnaiya — [illegible] V.
20 — Dodda Krishnappa — ½ V.
21 — Chinna Krishnappa — [illegible] V.
22 — Venkataramaiya — ½ V.
23 — Lakshmi [illegible] — 1½ V.

Total [illegible] 23 — Vrittis 24
Kanis 6

The same Dowle Kosam of Hoob

I — Venkatakrishnaya — 2 10/16 Vrittis — particulars as follows.
In Venkatakrishnaya's 1st Kani — 2 V.
In his 2d Kani — ½ V.
In Venkataramaiya's Kani — ⅛ V.

Venkatakrishnaya's brother Seshaya — 2 4/16 Vrittis — as particulars
In Venkatakrishnaya's 1st Kani — 2 V.
In his 2d Kani — ½ V.
In Venkataramaiya's Kani — ⅛

Total for both brothers — 5 4/16 Vrittis.
In Venkatakrishnaya's 1st Kani — 4 V.
In his 2d Kani — 1 V.
In Venkataramaiya's Kani — ¼.

II — Kosa Dowle of Hoob. Kasi Narasimha Chary — ½ Vritti in the Kani of Venkatakrishnaya

III — Kosa Dowle of Hoob — Dalkode Subba Rao 1 Vritti in the 2d Kani of Venkatakrishnaya

IV — Pymoish Average showing Kosadowle in Hoob — Venkatagiriaya ½ V. in Venkatakrishnaya's 2d Kani.

V — Kosam Dowle of Hoob — Venkatesa Chary — In Venkatakrishnaya's 2d Kani } ½ V. In Venkataramaiya's Kani } ¼ V. Total ¾ V.

VI — [illegible] 1206 — Krishnappa — In Venkatakrishnaya's 2d Kani } ¼ V. [illegible]

Induer

Nadapanahalli: — 1 Raghavendraya 45 — Venkatakrishnaya's 3d son's grandson — not adopted son; brothers 3 & their sons 4

2 Raghavaya — 1st son's grandson — brother — not brother

Paparapatti: 3 Venkata Ramaiya 8 — 1st son's son (3) — Brother 1, widow 1

Kolagondahalli: 4 Ramaiya 16 — 2d son's grandson — (4) mother 1, brother 1, uncle's 2 brothers widow 1

4 Vrittis

Paparapatti: 5 Honnukutam Gowda Rao 58 — 1 Vritti — Daughter's son (5) & Donee — wife [illegible] Do 2

Pennagaram: 6 Kasi Narasimha Chary 38 — Donee's [illegible] — Mother 1, wife 1, Do 1

7 Narahari Achari 30 — ¼ Vritti — Do — brother, wife 1

The total Vrittis of 1 & 2 brothers were 5 4/16 Vrittis. Seshaya died without issue 50 years ago — his widow Kaveramma gave 1 Vritti as gift to the father of No 5; & ¼ V. to the grandfather of No 6 & 7 — The remaining share of her [illegible] Vrittis went to Venkatakrishnaya's heirs. Their enjoyments are now as follows. In Venkatakrishnaya's Vrittis — [illegible] — 1 ⅝ V. [illegible] No 2 — 3 & both enjoy 1½ V. [illegible] ¼ V. [illegible] In Seshaya's Vrittis ¼ V. has been [illegible] No 1 & 3 — 1½ V. [illegible]

No 6 & 7 [illegible] Ramaiya? [illegible]

Pennagaram: 8 Kasi Narasimha Chary 38 — ½ V. — grandson — Father wife Do 2

Palkode: 9 Narasimhapuram Ramakrishnaya 35 — 2d son's son — father, wife [illegible] brothers

10 Kistnaya 50 — 3d son — wife 2

11 Narsaya 30 — 4th son's son — [illegible] 1

Paparapatti: 12 — Narappa — 5th son — wife adopted son

12½ — Akkamma 30 — 1 Vritti — 1st son's daughter's widow — None

Palkodu Subba Rao was the only son [illegible] had 5 [illegible] [illegible] his [illegible] his brother [illegible] to be divided to [illegible] among his sons, [illegible] Vritti, & [illegible] share at [illegible]

The old man [illegible] years ago & his wife died 4 years ago — [illegible] of the Vritti for the present [illegible] [illegible] to be [illegible] as the [illegible] of the funeral of these [illegible]

Paparapatti: 13 Talvadi Seshagiriraya 55 — ½ Vritti — an alleged purchaser — wife, son 2

Her brothers have no share in her — This Vritti was given to Seshagiri as the Supplemental share of primogeniture. Produce a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of 128 [illegible]

Chamalur: 14 Tanivalam Purna Pragnya Chary 65 — ¾ Vritti — son — wife, sons 2

Produces a [illegible] [illegible] (1849) by [illegible] to his [illegible] Purna Pragnya [illegible] [illegible]

Pennagaram: 15 Gutti Gopal Rao 50 — [illegible] — [illegible] 1 [illegible]

To be Confirmed in one T.D. — But as the different Vrittidars enjoy their lands separately — & the [illegible] a common Survey was made for the fields of each Kani separately & as these ~~[illegible]~~ Vrittis were purchased by each family separately some 100 years ago, I would fix the value of the reversionary right ~~[illegible]~~ for each ~~[illegible]~~ holding separately, tho' a single T.D. will of course be given, for as much as we have no means of distinguishing the fields in each ~~[illegible]~~ individual holding. The Apaharadars are anxious that if the Quit rent shd be charged on the village, the liability of each shd be distinctly made known to them in sum. For answering this purpose, it has appeared to me to be the simplest course, to estimate the value of holdings ~~[illegible]~~ with the value of the Kanis to which the whole or part of each holding may belong. In cols 14 & 15, I have detailed the fractions of each holding which belong to the several Kanis — & under the head of Remarks I have shown the value of each Kani. A Kani consists of 4 Vrittis. As the value of the Kani is thus determined in reference to the Tarram of Hoob, the fractions of Kanis can be represented by sums in due proportion. In the Survey ~~[illegible]~~ the enjoyments of each field of the Kani are distinctly given, & for the whole lot of fields in each Kani the same Vrittidars are noted as enjoyers in the same proportions. But it appears that the Apaharadars have since made a new partition of the fields of each Kani among the respective Vrittidars. The whole Ayakat was assessed in Hoob — including both the dry & wet lands. The Ayakat [illegible] is Rs 426-7-6. The cultivation at the Survey was Rs 241-15-1 & wet 55-3-6 — 297-2-5; as the remaining waste [illegible] as [illegible] Banjar, i.e. Immemorial waste. In 1864, the cultivation amounted to the same amount but 297-2-5. [illegible] particulars [illegible]

Remarks of the Revenue according to the Apaharadar's Statement

The Revenue according to the Returns of the Apaharadars is Rs 297-12-[illegible] for this village. Each Vrittidar specified in the Returns the amount of Revenue against his Vritti in the enjoyment. Their average receipts for [illegible] are very irregular & unaccountable, [illegible] from 13 Rs a Vritti to 1-8-0. ~~[illegible]~~ Their first declaration was that they had almost at the division of Kanis divided the Vritti lands equitably & equally. If so, there could be no grounds ~~[illegible]~~ for such absurdly varying ~~[illegible]~~ differences. ~~[illegible]~~ In the Inam Tarram of Hoob the values of each Kani are separately shown — & they are as follows.

		Survey Extent	Assessment	Value [illegible]	Reduced Value [illegible]	Reduced Value	Remarks
1	Venkatakrishnaya's 1st Kani	Acres 59·61 14	40-7-2	10-0-9	[illegible]	40-7-2	All the lands are under cultivation — & are well cultivated [illegible] In the Kanis of the 2d 3d 4th 5th & 6th Kanis I would allow a reduction of 3 annas in the Rupee — for good portions of the area are waste immemorially & the [illegible] in their present enjoyment from 50 years [illegible] [illegible] well. The [illegible] Chary's Kani [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
2	2d his Kani	Acres 83·44	74-7-8	18-9-11	18-2-0	60-8-0	
3	Adavani Chary's Kani	Acres 146·09	114-10-8	28-10-8	28-5-0	86-4-0	
4	Krishnappa's Kani	Acres 80·25	66-5-1	16-9-3	[illegible]-7-0	52-12-0	
5	Venkataramaiya's Kani	Acres 89·21	59-0-0	14-12-0	12-0-0	48-0-0	
6	Krishnamadhava Kani	Acres 89·46	68-15-6	17-3-10	14-0-0	56-0-0	
7	Samudram	Acres 1·36	2-9-7	0-1-9	0-1-9	2-9-7	
	Total	550·95	426-7-8	—	—	342-8-9	

The Ayakat value is 426-7-8. I propose to remit [illegible] on the whole Ayakat as explained in the above calculation. Being a Sarva Inam village, the whole Ayakat was assessed — & I do believe [illegible] differently too — as to principles of assessment. In the Kayam Davarat [illegible] 128 [illegible]. I would [illegible] Immemorial waste [illegible] [illegible]

9/12/64 Nadapanahalli [illegible] 5 Pagodas [illegible] Venkatakrishnaya [illegible]

Register [illegible] of [illegible] in the Daramapuri Taluk - in the Salem District

Register No. 23

Sheet No.

14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
XIV Andeiver Vencatageraya In Kistnappa's Kane - ½ V.		31 Kate [illegible] 40 ¼ V 33 Subba[illegible] 30 ¼ V	Pennagar	[illegible] daughter [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] 1846 [illegible]	In Cl. No. XIV. 3 - 6 - [illegible] 2 - 6 - 3 - 6 - [illegible] 2 - 6 - [illegible]	
V Naranappa In Kistnappa's Kane - ½ V		34 Venkata Rao 60 35 [illegible] 57 ½ V	Mysore Tottamatalli	one	say	[illegible] have not appeared [illegible]	Tole Cole ½ V in [illegible] No. 34 & 35 6 - 11 - 6 - [illegible] ⅛ 2 - 14 - [illegible] on her behalf	
VI Narasimhachary In Swigachary's Kane ½ V.		36 Varakur Kistnachary 40 ½ V	Pennagaram	[illegible]	[illegible]	—	In Cl. No. XVII. Tole Cole ½ V in [illegible] 10 - 2 - 6 [illegible] ⅛ 1 - 4 -	
Kodialam Kistnachary In Swigachary's Kane ½ V		37 Vanivalam [illegible] 61 38 [illegible] 56 39 [illegible] 48	Demkanikotta	say	one	[illegible] produce in equal shares	In Cl. No. XVII Tole Cole ½ V in [illegible] No. 39 10 - 2 - 6 [illegible] ⅛ 1 - 4 -	
[illegible] In Swigachary's [illegible] 1¼ Vrithi		40 Vanivalam Subbaraya Chary 1¼ V	Pennagaram	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] (1269) by Ramaya & Venkatarangu [illegible] ¼ V - to Subbaraya Chary for 351 Rs [illegible]	Tole Cole 1¼ V in [illegible] No. 40 25 - 10 - 3 [illegible] ½ 3 - 4 -	
China Kistnappa In Swigachary's Kane ¼ V		Malthavi 41 Sivappa 50 42 Puttaya 35 ¼ V	Hindupur [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	—	Tole Cole ¼ V in [illegible] No. 42 5 - 2 - 1 [illegible] ⅛ 2 - [illegible]	
Kistnavadhani ½ V. [illegible] Kane		Kambam 43 Narahari Achary 30 ½ V	Pennagar	[illegible]	[illegible]	—	Tole Cole ½ V in [illegible] No. 43 7 - [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible] ⅛ 2 - 14 - 0	
[illegible] In Kistnavadhani's Kane 1 Vrithi		Bedarhalli Brahmagyam 44 Narasimhachary 20 45 Vasudeva Chary 30 46 [illegible] 30	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	In Cl. No. XXI [illegible]	
[illegible]		47 Varadachary [illegible]	Pakarapatti	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	In Cl. No. XXII [illegible]	

14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
VII Kosam [illegible] Swiga Chary In Venkatakistnaya's 2d Kane ¼ V. In Swiga Chary's own Kane 1½ V. & in Kistnappa's Kane ¼ V. Total Vrithi 2		16 Varakur Amaji Rao 45 17 [illegible] Sama Rao 68 1 V 18 Chengi Srinivasa Rao 40 19 Babu Rao 30 ¼ V	Pennagaram Kattakalli Hubbali	Purchase one	[illegible]	The 2 Vrithies are enjoyed in common - in the produce. [illegible]	To be Confirmed [illegible] In Cl. No. II 4 V [illegible] 44 - 10 - 1 [illegible] ⅛ 5 - 8 - 1 V [illegible] 2 - 6 - [illegible] ⅛ 1 - 8 - & ¼ V [illegible] 2 - 12 - 7 - [illegible] ⅛ 2 - 6 - 2 ½ V [illegible] 7 - 9 - [illegible] ⅛ 1 Rs 1 V [illegible] 15 - 2 - 0 [illegible] ⅛ 2 Rs ¼ V [illegible] 7 - 9 - [illegible] ⅛ 1 Rs	22
VIII Kosam [illegible] Venkataramaya ¼ V In his own Kane [illegible]		Kandachar 20 Gopanna 50 21 Narsaya 22 22 Venkanaya 56 23 Venkataramaya 48 24 Naranaya 45 1 Vrithi	Pennagaram	Do	[illegible]	The produce of the Vrithie is [illegible] No. 20 & 21 [illegible] No. 22 & 24 [illegible]	In Cl. No. II ¾ V [illegible] 10 - 9 - [illegible] ⅛ 1 - 4 - [illegible] No. 15 30 - 16 - 6 [illegible] ⅛ 3 - 12 - In Cl. No. III [illegible] No. 16 16 - 1 - 9 [illegible] ⅛ 1 - 11 - ¼ V [illegible] 18 - 12 - 11 [illegible] ⅛ 2 - 6 - ¼ V [illegible] No. 19 4 - 11 - 3 [illegible] ⅛ 2 - 10 -	
IX Kosam [illegible] Hiranaya In Venkataramaya's Kane 1 V.		25 Narani [illegible] Srinivasa Rao 45 1 V	Sudur	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	In Cl. No. VIII 1 V [illegible] No. 24 [illegible] 12 - 0 - 0 [illegible] ⅛ 1 - 8 - In Cl. No. IX 1 V [illegible] No. 25 12 - 0 - 0 [illegible] ⅛ 3 Rs	Confirmed as [illegible] recommended [illegible] 2 R of Rs 4 [illegible] 21/3/68
X Kosam [illegible] Dasappa 1 Vrithi In Venkataramaya's Kane		26 Vangiper Lakshmaya 50 27 Kistnaya 30 1 V	Gaubalti	Do	[illegible]	[illegible] appeared before [illegible]	In Cl. No. X 1 V [illegible] No. 26 & 27 2 - [illegible] [illegible] ⅛ 1 - 8 -	8 H. Oro 1618
XI Paparapatti Jannaya In Venkataramaya's Kane - ½ Vrithi		28 Kalukote Apparamaya 20 ¼ V 29 [illegible] Ragavendraya 40 ¼ V	Paparapatti Sudur	[illegible]	—	[illegible] (1843) [illegible]	In Cl. No. XI ¼ V [illegible] No. 28 3 - [illegible] ⅛ 2 - 6 - & ¼ V [illegible] No. 29 ¼ V - 3 - [illegible] ⅛ 6 -	
XII Kuppachary In Kistnappa's Kane ½ V. In Kistnavadhani's Kane ½ V Total 1 V.		30 Dambalam Kuppachary 50 1 V	Darmapuri	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] Kuppachary's 1 V - [illegible] Kuppachary from 40 years [illegible]	In Cl. No. XII & XIII 1¾ V [illegible] No. 30 & 31 24 - 13 - [illegible] ⅛ 3 Rs	[illegible] 1866 [illegible]
XIII Guruaya Chary In Kistnappa's Kane ½ V. In Kistnavadhani's Kane ½ V Total ¾ V		31 Ranga Chary 75 1¾ Vrithi	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	

[illegible] 12/4/[illegible]

Inam Register of Kadappanahalli No 550 in the Darampuri Taluq in the Salem dist

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

Sarva Manian Village

The accounts commence with Fs 1207

Nadaya [illegible] 3 31 3 3 75
Kadara [illegible] 1 8 6 7/10
Perumalgadutan
Punji

Nadappanahalli Village
Supplimental Sheet No. 228
Case No. 1

2-10-8

For the support of Kadari perumal at Nadappanahalli the temple is in good order

Dx Permanent not known

No Sanad It appears in all the accounts ~~from~~ in Fs 1207 as Inam

In Fs 1207 Kadari perumal

Nadappanahalli Kadari perumal Archa poojari Venkataramanayen 45 Peddasengenaga 35 Gattaputti

No 1 Father brother wife son 1
No 2 Wife 1 son 1
They enjoy the ~~[illegible]~~ produce of the Inam in 2 equal portions

To be continued tax free Id in Inam of the Deity

7/3/63

R.N 1416

27/4/64

[illegible]marudayam 7 31 0 7 78
No 2 5 9 3/16
Ettimaramutan
Punji

Reg. No. 23

4-7-2

For repairing the tank of Samayanakare at Kumbalappadi; the tank is ~~[illegible]~~ out of repair from 40 years

00 60

No Sanad It appears in all the accounts in Fs 1207 as Inam

In Fs 1207 Kattukodige

Papparapatti Govinda Rau 60
Deskankotte Srinivasachar 60
& Agrahar Community

To be confirmed Id in Inam to Agrahar whose interest it is to keep the tank in repair

7/3/63

R.N 1417

Closed 27-2-63 Case No 2

Reg. No 25

Inam Register of Kumbalappadi No 541 in the Darampuri Taluq in the Salem dist

Sarva Inam Village

Register No. 25

The accounts commence with Fs 1207

[illegible] 10-27 5 10 68
[illegible] 1 5 12 8
5-5-4

[illegible] 33-14 [illegible] 84
0-9-4

11-27 11 52
5-14-10

[illegible]alemar [illegible] 3-32 4 3 81
[illegible]rambanji [illegible] 1 6 2
4-8-4

15-13-7 15 33
10-7-2

For repairing the tank of Samayanare at Kumbalappadi the tank is out of repair from 40 years

Pt not known

No Sanad It appears in all the accounts in Fs 1207 as Inam

In Fs 1207 Kattukodige Inam

Papparapatti Govinda Rau 60
Deskankotte Srinivasachary 60
The Agrahar Community

To be confirmed Id in Inam of the Agraharadars

7/3/63

R.N 1418

27/4/64

Closed 27-2-63