Inam Register of the Umbali Village of Kondapanayakanapalli or Payala Timmanahalli No 116 in the Nadamanahalli Taluk No 26 in the Baniki Pollam of the [illegible] Taluq in the Salem District

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

Umbali Register No 9
Baniki Pollam

Register No 9
Sheet No ~~770~~ 764

There is an Umbali Village of an ancient date.
The acts available commence with the [illegible]

	Ayakat	
	1599·94	
Deduct Poramboke	929·68	
Remainder	670·26	579-14-0
Deduct Inam	115·24	131-2-3
Remainder	555·02	448-11-9
Particulars		
Dry	669·67	578-0-9
Wet	0·59	1-13-3
Total	670·26	579-14-0
[illegible] Dry	554·42	446-14-6
[illegible] Wet	0·60	1-13-3
Total	555·02	448-11-9

Jodi
Originally 200-0-0 as Umbali now paid. Village; & since converted into an independent grant by the Pollam Sunnud of Captn Graham of F 1209

Ayakat Rev. in F 1208
248-1-6
Jodi 172-10-5
In a present cultivation whatever its [illegible] be the Jodi 448-11-9 I would fix the Ayakat Rev as the proper value for the extent of [illegible]

Not known

No land. It appears in F 1212 as an Umbali village subject to a Jodi of 20 Pagodas - or about 70 Rs - In F 1209 the Jodi was stated at 148-11-0. It has been since raised to Rs 200. According to the Kyfiyat of F 1209

	Past years	Dpt years	Jodi
In the Sata Rahim Rule	52		
In the Days of Hyder		11	
In Tippu's Day	1	15	
In Company's Day	19		148-11-0

In F 1212 Payatimmanahalli ~~[illegible]~~ Ancient grant Veerappa Naik ~~[illegible]~~
Jodi 20 Pagodas
of Grantee Bala Dasari Naik. Grantee's Poligar Kariappa in 1732

In F 1229 This is an ancient Jaghir Inam. It was so in the Tippu's days & in Company's rule it is a Jaghir Inam subject to Jodi of 148-11-11. Baladasari Naidu enjoyed

Name
Kondappanayakanapalli
1 Appu Naidu 55 Son -
2 Peddabali Naidu 58 Brother's son -

Wife, Daughters, Son
Wife, Sons 2, Brother 2

They enjoy the village in 2 equal shares but the land is not divided

There is an ancient grant. Under the spirit of Captn Graham's order regarding old Inam villages, the Poligar charged a Jodi of 20 Pagodas or 70 Rs which has since been raised gradually to Rs 200. The Poligar possessed no such authority of raising the Jodi as he pleased. Captn Graham directly laid down that a discretionary Jodi should never further be charged.

Proposed Rev. is Rs 579-14-0-2
Charge 1/4 on this - which will be
Rs 145 Rs

But the present Jodi far exceeds this - & the grant is a recent one [illegible] for making the grant an independent one - I would therefore confirm the village in the present tenure - but on the existing Jodi without charging any Quit rent [illegible]

In consideration of the small extent of the [illegible] the valuation of the village is reduced to Rs 500 - Confirmed on 1/2 assesst on a combined Q R of Rs 350 payable to the Poligar.
W.H.
27/2/66

Entd
T.D. No 4237

580
448
132
350
509

Inam Register of Umbali Village of Chintagunnanapalli No 115 in the Nadavanahalli Taluk No 26 in the Baniki Pollam of the [illegible] Taluq in the Salem [illegible]

Umbali Register No 10
Baniki Pollam

Register No 10

There is an Umbali Village.
The acts commence with the [illegible]

	Ayakat	
Deduct Poramboke	95·71	
Remainder	166·65	185-13-9
Deduct Inam	4·80	12-11-4
Remaining	161·85	173-2-5
Particulars		
Dry	156·31	150-5-8
Wet	5·54	22-12-9
Total	161·85	173-2-5
Cultivation in F 127[illegible] Dry	156·31	150-5-8
Wet	5·53	22-12-9
Total	161·84	173-2-5

Apt [illegible] only

Jodi 36-0-0
Granted as specified in the Sunnud produced for the due performance of valuable services rendered

Not known the date of the grant

Produces a Sunnud of Poligar Immudi Kempe Gowda dated [illegible] issued to Machegavada which runs as follows: "As you have worked upon us & [illegible] us, the village is granted to you; you shall have the [illegible] & enjoy the village hereditarily."
This sufficiently proves that the grant was not clogged with any requirement of Service.

In time Machegavada Umbali Village Ancient Jari Inam Jodi 3 Pagodas

In F 1229 An ancient Jari Inam. It was under [illegible] in Tippu's days & in Company's rule it was Jari Inam subject to Jodi 24-0-0. Kavali enjoys

Chintagunpalli
1 Munegavada 50 grandson
2 Chinnamunegavada 45 Do
3 Machegavada 40 Do

Wife 1
Wife, Sons 3
Wife, Sons 5

They enjoy the produce in 3 equal share

According to the Kyfiyat of 1209 the date of origin & duration of the Inam are as follows

Rule	No of years	Dp years	Jodi
Sata Rahim Rule	52		
In Hyder's days		11	
In Tippu's days	1	15	
In Company's days	19		24

This shows that the grant was a very old one & that it was [illegible] in F 1209 & that the Poligar charged on it a Jodi of 24 Rs which it has been since raised to the present sum of 36 Rs. The Sunnud ~~produced~~ does not contain any condition of ~~[illegible]~~ The Inamdar states the Jodi was raised some 20 years ago. As it is an old grant I would confirm as [illegible] Inam.
Proposed Rev. [illegible] to the Ayakat assest 173-2-5
Add the 243 Rs [illegible]
Under the history of the Jodi of the village, I recommend that the Jodi should merge in the Quit rent.

The Sunnad produced does not appear to be either the first or last. The case must therefore be decided according to the entries in the accounts.
Confirmed accordingly in one T.D. on a combined Q R of Rs 104 payable to the Poligar.
13/4/66 W.H.

Entd
T.D. No 4250

18
104

Inam Register of Honnappanayankotta No 123 an Umbli Village of Peranapalli [illegible] in the Beriki Palaiyapat of the Oosoor Taluq Salem District

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

Umbli Register No 14

Register No 11

This is an Umbali Village of a very ancient date
The soil is good ~~[illegible]~~ the accts commence with the time of Tippu

Umbali Village —

	Ayakat	
	1082.17	
Deduct Poramboke	832.75	
Remainder	249.42	286-13-10
Deduct Inam	31.76	38-2-0
Remainder	217.66	248-11-10
Particulars		
Dry	209.62	223-1-8
Wet	8.04	25-10-2
Total	217.66	248-11-10
Cultivation in Fs 1271 dry	177.01	187-9-6
	7.93	25-5-10
Total	184.94	212-15-4
Uncultivated dry	15.11	14-9-5
wet	17.65	21-3-1
Total	32.76	35-12-6

I propose the asst of the actual cultivation & [illegible] be taken as the average Beriz of the village viz 227-8-9

Originally granted for Umbali service

Jodi ~~10-5-11~~ 10-15-0

Accounts to appear of being granted in AD 1732 by Poligar Kanappa Gowd

No Sanad
It appears in the Accts from Fusly as Inam

~~In [illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~
This an old Umbli granted by Vira [illegible] Jodi 5 Pagodas

In Fs 1229. An ancient Jaridnam it was under Jodi in Tippu's days & in Company's rule it is a Jaridnam subject to Jodi 10-5-11. Betraya enjoys the village known as Honna Betraya Palli

Kotta

1 Betappa Naidu 50	Brothers grandson	Wife 1 Uncles 1	No 1 enjoys 1/2 & No 2	
2 Venkatamma wife of Betappanaidu 20	grandson's grandson	brothers sons 2 Wife 1	1/4 & Nos 3 to 5	
3 Peddappa Naidu 50	grandson	Wife 1 Sons 3	enjoy the share of the land jointly	
4 Chinnappa Naidu 40	Do	Sons 4	divided	
5 Devappa 35	Do	Son 1		

~~[illegible]~~ The account of Jodi gives the following particulars

Rule	Jodi	Jodi	Tax
Native Rule	52	..	..
In Tippu's Rule	11	..	..
In Tippu's days	1 15	..	..
In Company's days	19	..	5 11

It thus shows that it is an old grant & that after the [illegible] the Jodi [illegible] & the present Jodi was changed under the orders of Captn Graham & [illegible]

~~Total~~ Beriz proposed is Rs 227-8-9

Difference 57 Rs [illegible]

The present Jodi is Rs 10-15
As per the orders of Captn Graham's order, it appears that the Jodi was changed almost on the present principle, I recommend the Jodi may be allowed to merge in the Tax.

12/11/62

Confirmed as permanent Q R Rs 11 payable to Poligar

I. D. [illegible]

A Pts 311 of 1866 from No 1 regarding bad Poramboke in the settlement
Endorsed that the right to Poramboke is upheld by the settlement
31/7/66

I D No 112

Inam Register of the Umbali Village of Chinnakanapalli No 131 in the Punnapalli [illegible] in the Beriki Palaiyapat of the Oosoor Taluq [illegible]

This is an Umbli Village of an ancient date
The soil is of an average ~~[illegible]~~ quality
The accts commence with the time of Tippu

Register No 12

	179.89		
Deduct Poramboke	603.54		
Remainder	176.35	120-9-0	
Deduct Inam	5.26	4-9-10	
Remainder	171.09	115-15-2	
Particulars			
Dry	136.39	90-6-0	
Unirrigated wet	34.70	25-9-2	
Total	171.09	115-15-2	Ayakat Value
Cultivation in Fs 1271	112.41	75-2-11	Cultivation
Waste	58.67	40-12-3	Waste

The Beriz in Tippu's time Rs 47-4-9
Do in Honble Company's 43-3-

The present cultivation has risen to 75 Rs adding 1/4 of the waste or 10 Rs I would determine the total viz 85 Rs to represent the average value of the village

Originally granted for Umbali service

Jodi 30-0-0

Orig by Poligar Kanappa Gowd in 1732

No Sanad
It appears in the Accts from Fusli as an Umbli Inam Village

In Fs 1212 Chinnakanapalli Palakondappa Naika Jodi 10 Pagodas Long enjoyment.

Inam
An ancient Jaridnam it was Jodi during Tippu's time & it was ~~[illegible]~~ an Jaridnam according to the Company's rule subject to Jodi 29-14-10 Bala Naidu enjoys

Chinnakanapalli

Sake Laxmakka 30	Brothers grandson's wife	Mother 1 Daughter 1 Son 1	One Palakonda filed a Statement that he has no right to enjoyment of the village. He was enjoying ~~[illegible]~~ same until he neglected it from 50 years. Laxami & her father in law and [illegible] were enjoying the village

Palkonda's claim is rejected
~~I recommended to confirm the village in the name of Laxami~~

The account of Jodi [illegible] as follows

Rule	Jodi	Jodi	Tax
Native Rule	52	..	..
In Tippu's Rule	..	11	..
In Tippu's Rule	1	15	..
In Company's Rule	19	..	29-14-10

As it appears from the evidence of all the accts it is an old grant, I would confirm it as a [illegible] Inam subject to Q R. The proposed Beriz is Rs 85 Rs
Difference 29½ Rs
This falls short of the present Jodi I therefore recommend that the village may be confirmed on the present Jodi only

Confirmed on 1/2 as permanent Q R Rs 57 payable to the Poligar

27/2/66

I. D. No 4239

85
57