2 [illegible] of [illegible] Sarva Inam Village Inam Register of [illegible] No 101 in the [illegible]

3 [illegible] 1884 2.26
150 [illegible]
[illegible] Nanje 1788 5/16 [illegible]

28 10 8 For the [illegible] Kolla [illegible] Kola Land [illegible]ahalli, which at ~~[illegible]~~ includes also the land [illegible] to Agrahara the village [illegible] the whole Agrahar [illegible]

[illegible] It appears [illegible] 1281 as Inam

At the [illegible] 7/1209 not found Gopala [illegible] Krishnaya [illegible] Malle [illegible]

The Agrahar [illegible] 1830 [illegible] that the Inam [illegible] in the name of Gopala Krishnaya Mallegowda [illegible]

In 1232 Malle [illegible] Gopala Krishnaya Appajgowda Manjegowda

In 1257 Gopala Krishnaya Manjegowda

~~Gopala~~ [illegible] Malle Gowd Manne Gowd

[illegible] in [illegible] as having been [illegible] in 1122 by the Polygar [illegible] the Pollam was under [illegible] attachment from 1118/32 [illegible] confirmation can be looked upon as an act on behalf of the Polygar [illegible] managing the Pollam [illegible] strike the [illegible] out of the Inam [illegible] & leave it at the disposal of the ~~Polygar~~ [illegible]
28/5/[illegible]

[illegible] as a Personal Inam

Register No 27

Sundry Agraharam Supplement

Sheet No 532

Register No 28 Sarva Inam Village Inam Register of Bhimanahalli No 102 in the [illegible] Pattapatta [illegible] Taluk Salem Dist

Register 28

This is a [illegible] village
[illegible] to the [illegible] of the village

9	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
[illegible] [illegible] Nanje [illegible] Nanje	[illegible]	2212 120 142 2415 0 21 24 15/16 4 37 11 141 105 4/16	3.56 [illegible] [illegible] 0.79 [illegible] [illegible] 4.19 [illegible] [illegible]		6 10 8 2 5 1 8 15 9	For the support of Basavanna at Bhimanahalli ~~The~~ The temple is in good order	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] The attached [illegible] a [illegible] of the [illegible] field [illegible] as Inam	[illegible] It appears first to be a [illegible] as an old Inam [illegible]	At the [illegible] of Basavanna	In 7/1209 not found In 7/1212 not found [illegible] as [illegible] 8-15-9	In 1232 Nagumdaya In 1265 [illegible] name is not entered [illegible]	Drawida [illegible]	Bhimanahalli Basavanna Pujari Sulagheri Dasheumma 5/ Daughter in law Gumastah Vadama Subbadixit	Daughter in law			[illegible] [illegible] 12/5/62	1876 7 [illegible] 1190

[illegible]	[illegible]	6 30 2 231 1/2 275 2/16 20 26 2 2 6/16 6 33 8 233 1/4 277 8/16	6.88 [illegible] [illegible] 0.06 [illegible] [illegible] 6.94 [illegible] [illegible]		12 11 3 0 3 6 12 14 9	For the support of [illegible] Devaranamany at Bhimanahalli The temple is in good order	~~do~~	~~do~~	do [illegible] attached [illegible]	[illegible] do	At the [illegible] Devara Pujari [illegible]	In 7/1209 not found In 7/1212 not found In 1257 [illegible]	In 1232 [illegible] Devara In 1257 [illegible] name is not entered		Bhimanahalli [illegible] Devara Pujari Vallala [illegible]				[illegible] 12/5/62	7 [illegible] 1191

Fair Copied

Fair Copied

Register No 29 Sarva Inam Village Inam Register of Mavinamadi No 119 in the [illegible] Pattapatta [illegible] Taluk Salem Dist

Register No 29

[illegible] to [illegible] Inam village [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] Pagoda	[illegible]	7 8 9 240 285 9/16	7.14 [illegible] [illegible]		13 3 4	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] of 1209	[illegible] It appears [illegible]	At the [illegible] Ramanna	In 1209 [illegible]	In 1231 Ramanna In 1257 [illegible]		Devichettipalli Bagavanta [illegible] 50 2 [illegible] 30	[illegible]			[illegible]	7 [illegible] 1192

Fair Copied

23-

Regr No 23

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible] [illegible]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	[illegible] [illegible] Punji	Dry	0 11 9/16 11/16	0.02 Ac Es		0 0 8	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of Venugopalaswamy at Venkatesapur [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 1228 Venugopala swamy Pujari Varadappa	[illegible] Gopala [illegible]	[illegible] 1231 Venugopala swamy [illegible] 1257 Arehalli Varadaraja	Venkatesapur Venugopalaswamy Pujari [illegible] 40 2 [illegible] 35 3 Venkataraya 32 [illegible]	—	—	—	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] 1193 [illegible] 1886
	[illegible] Punji	Dry	14 232 490 683 2/16	12.57 Ac Es		14 8 4															
			14 10 18 490 2/16 672 12/16	14.59 Ac Es		14 9 0															
	[illegible] Punji	Dry	1 14 2 45 2/16 54 2/16	1.35 Ac Es		11 11 10															
			15 3 7 15 686 1/16 683 15/16	15.92 Ac Es		26 4 0															

9/5/62 [illegible]

808

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
12	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Punji	Dry	1 33 15 62 1/8 78 15/16	1.85 Ac Es		2 12 0	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Venugopalaswamy at Venkatesapur [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	do	do	do	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] 1228 Muniya	[illegible] Bajantri [illegible]	[illegible] 1231 Venugopala swamy [illegible] 1257 Bajantry Muniya	Venkatesapur Bajantri Lakshmi 30 2 Muniya 10 3 Narasija 9	—	—	—	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 808 [illegible] 1189
	[illegible] Punji	Dry	2 11 1 76 1/2 91 1/16	2.27 Ac Es		3 6 3															
	[illegible] [illegible] Punji	Dry	0 1 8 1 1/4 1 8/16	0.02 Ac Es		0 1 4															
			4 6 8 189 14/16 166 8/16	4.16 Ac Es		6 3 7															
	[illegible] Punji	Dry	0 29 14 26 1/8 29 14/16	0.75 Ac Es		4 10 4															
	[illegible] Punji	Dry	0 10 12 9 10 12/16	0.27 Ac Es		1 5 4															
			1 0 10 36 1/8 40 10/16	1.02 Ac Es		5 15 8															
	Total [illegible]		6 7 2 174 207 2/16	5.18 Ac Es		12 3 3															

20/5/62 [illegible]

True Copied

[illegible] Register of [illegible] Village of [illegible]

Ossur Taluq Salem District

Money Assessment

Dry	1st 2-4-0	Wet	1st 7-8-0	
	2d 1-14-0		2d 6-4-0	
	3d 1-8-0		3d 5-0-0	
	4th 1-0-0		4th 3-12-0	
	5th 0-8-0		5th 2-8-0	

Athavar Register No 27

Reg No 27

Sheet No 523

This is a Sarva Inam for the support of Devadayam. It is classed as 1st class village in regard to dry and the land irrigating the [illegible] is of the 2d class. The soil is reddish of a superior quality. The accounts available are those of F 1229 & F 1231.

2

Devadayam
Arekatta No 101
in the Sulagiri
Pattayapettai
Ossur Taluk
Salem Dist

3 4 5 6

Ayakat of F 1231

Ayakat	255-76	—
Deduct Poramboke	69-95	—
	185-81	401-14-6
Deduct Inam	22-28	74-15-4
Remaining Sircar	163-53	326-15-2

Particulars

Dry	136-61	215-3-11	
wet	18-72	103-7-10	
	155-33	318-11-9	
	8-20	8-3-5	Cheyrkal 1 R per acre
	- -	- - -	
	8-20	8-3-5	
Dry	144-81	223-7-4	
wet	18-72	103-7-10	
	163-53	326-15-2	Ayakat value

Returns of Cultivation & Revenue during the last 5 years

F 1266	250-7-11	
1267	250-7-11	
1268	250-7-11	
1269	285-0-11	
1270	285-0-11	
Total	1321-9-7	
Average of 5	264-5-1	264-5-1

The difference from the ayakat value by 62 Rs. as the village is well cultivated and [illegible] the ayakat value represent the money value of the village

8 9

For the support of Varadarajaswamy at Sulagiri. The Temple is in good order.

10

Permanent

11

Not Known

12

No Sanad

A Takid dated [illegible] of [illegible] by [illegible] Polegar of Sulagiri for the performance of service to the Varadarajaswamy in the name of Manikka Varadappa

2 A Takid of Tahsildar dated 9th January 1822 in conformity with the order of Collector conferring the village for the service of Varadarajaswamy.

3d A Takid of Tahsildar dated 5th September 1822 in conformity with the order of Collector conferring the village for the service of Varadarajaswamy in the name of [illegible]

13 14 15

Varadaraja swamy

Do

In force
Not found

In name of [illegible] & [illegible] as an old Inam Do

16 17 18

Sulagiri Varadarajaswamy Pujari

1 Arekatta Naranappa 40
2 Govindaraja 35
3 Venkataraja 82

Fair Copied

19 20 21

Old Inam

[illegible]

Tax free

To be continued

to Temple

~~36/61~~

Continuance sanctioned

25 Jan 64

7

[illegible] Register [illegible] corresponds to No 102 of the [illegible] Village

1st	1	14	1st	1 - 6	2 - 0
2d	1	8 - 0	2d	5	0 - 0
3d	1	0 - 0	3d	3	12 - 0
4th	0	12 - 0	4th	2	8 - 0
5th	0	7 5	5th	1	14 - 0

[illegible] Register No 28

No Regd No 28

Lee

This is a Large Inam Village for the support of Devastanam. It is classed as 2d Class village in regard to Dry - and the character ~~but~~ inspecting the wet is of the 3d Class. The soil is reddish & mixed with sand - and it is of a inferior quality.

The deed available is the Devadayam Register of Hoog.

X by [illegible] Returned herewith to the Collector of [illegible] it is [illegible] order No 1746 8/3 [illegible] 11/3/66

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

2 Name of Village No 102 [illegible]halli in the [illegible] Taluq [illegible] Zillah [illegible]

3–6 Ayakat of Fasli 1231

Ayakat	147-36	—
Deduct Poramboke	5-26	—
	142-10	225-11-2
Deduct Inam	11-13	21-13-6
Remaining Sircar	130-97	203-11-8

Particulars

Assessed Land	Dry	123-97	171-7-5
	Wet	5-49	25-2-3
		129-46	196-9-8
Not assessed	Dry	1-49	1-2-0
	Wet	-	- - -
		1-49	1-2-0
Total	Dry	125-46	178-9-5
	Wet	5-49	25-2-3
		130-97	203-11-8

One hundred & thirty & ninety seven

7 [illegible] in Inam

8 For the support of Kasi Visweswara Swamy ~~at Hoog~~. The Temple is in good order.

The value of Aradhana [illegible] duty & the [illegible] deemed to be one which has been alienated for Patharaj Deparathery

9 Tax free

10 Permanent

11 Total Inam

As per the Register of Devastanam villages prepared in Hoog this village is described to have been granted in Salivahana 1640 Vilamba or 1746 & renewed by [illegible] Goud in Siddharti or 1809

12 Title Deed

A Sunnud dated [illegible] or F 1209 by [illegible] to Kasi Visweswara Swamy confirming the village as Tax free in the name of ~~Manika~~ Nanjundaya.

2d A Letter of Tahsildar dated 9th January 18[illegible] in conformity with the order of Collector confirming the village for the service of Kasi Visweswara Swamy in the name of ~~[illegible]~~ ~~Chikka~~ Nanjundaya.

3d A Letter of Tahsildar dated 5th September 1822 in conformity with the order of Collector confirming the village for the service of Kasi Visweswara Swamy in the name of Nanjunda Dixit.

13 Of Frontier

Kasi Visweswara Swamy

The Lakes of [illegible] & [illegible] Forest are old.

15 The Registered in F 1229 Kasi Visweswara Swamy Pujari Nanjundaya

In the Register 7 F 1231/32 Nanjunda Dixit

17 Sulagiri in the Taluk

Kasi Visweswara Swamy

~~Pujari~~ Darmakarta - Sulagiri Poligar Ramnada Chokka Gounder

Pujari. Subba Dixit. He ~~[illegible]~~ does service on behalf of the daughters of Nanjundaya - viz - Parvathamma & Annapoornamma - & a daughter-in-law - ~~[illegible]~~ Seshamma. Seshamma's husband died 80 years ago - ~~[illegible]~~ his father Nanjundaya died in Nala or 1852. The daughter-in-law can therefore have no right of inheritance - the widow's claim is for subsistence, for which she should appeal to Civil Court. Parvathamma & Annapoornamma enjoy some sundry Devadayam Inams. This Inam village is now in the possession of Subba Dixit & he conducts the service & Pujah - he produces a deed of gift dated Kilaka 1848 by Nanjunda Dixit, Narana Dixit, & Siddamaya, brothers sons of Nanjundaya of Hoog. According to this document Subba Dixit was to ~~[illegible]~~ enjoy all the Inams, except a few allowed for the subsistence of Parvathamma & Annapoornamma. This document is subscribed by Nanjunda Dixit of Hoog. I would ratify the gift made by his brother's sons - I would confirm the Inam in the name of the Deity - without disturbing the present enjoyments & would refer the several parties for the redress of their claims -

The Poligar ratified the gift & directed the village be enjoyed by Subba Dixit

L 21/5/62

W. Amtill
Dy Collr

21 Old Inam

Whole

Tax free

Town Inam of the Deity & in the name of the Poligar as Darmakartha

Continue accounts as recommended J. D. 27/[illegible]

25 Jan 64

7

Wm [illegible]
Dy Collr

Inam Comr

Fair Copied

XX ~~Recommended~~ I hope there is no reason to alter the deed, but it will be [illegible] that this settlement [illegible]

Cultivation of village during the last 6 Years

F 1266	184-8-0
F 1267	184-8-0
F 1268	162-12-0
F 1269	162-12-0
F 1270	191-4-1
Total	806-4-3
Average of 5	161-4-1

Certain is a Devasthanam village, I would take the ayakat value to represent the average value of the village -

It appears that the [illegible] is attached to a Pujari, the grant [illegible] made to the Poligar [illegible]

Petn 97 of 1866, by ~~[illegible]~~ Pujari Subba Dixit - Requests that the TD may be issued in his name, & in that of the Poligar - [illegible] Poligar as the [illegible]