Register No 36

Tanahalli (Sulagiri Palayapet) Hosur Taluk

Regr No 36

Sheet No. 490

[illegible] Kotyi 32-3-8

[illegible] Fasli 1230 [illegible] Fasli 1232 [illegible] a detailed [illegible]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
	Varadarajan D. No 84 Manula Punji		3·19 117 139 3/16	3·48 Wet Dry		3-2-9	For the support of Timmaraja Swamy at Lallanahalli. The temple is in good order	Do	Brahmadeyam	Not known. An old Inam of [illegible]	Inland [illegible] [illegible]	At the Swamy of Chinnaraja Swamy	[illegible]	Fasli 1232 Timmaraja Swamy Pujari Palani Raja Fasli 1257 Rangadu		Lallanahalli Timmaraja Swamy Pujari Rangaya 60				[illegible]	T.D. No 1389 1886
	Varadarajan D. No 71 Yelle Malla Punji		4·30 160 190 6/16	4·76 Wet Dry		3-11	For the support of Banadamma at Lallanahalli. The temple is [illegible] under a tree	Do	Do	Do Fasli 30 [illegible]	Inland [illegible] appear [illegible]	At the Swamy Banadamma	[illegible]	Fasli 1232 Banadamma Pujari Dadadu Fasli 1257 [illegible]		Lallanahalli Banadamma Pujari Chinnadu				[illegible]	T.D. No 1390
	[illegible] 37 Punji		4·12 [illegible] 172 8/16	4·31 Wet Dry		8-3-9	[illegible]	Do	Do	Do Fasli 30 Gaji Varadachari	[illegible] appears [illegible]	At the Swamy Gaji Varadachary	[illegible]	Fasli 1232 Gaji Varada Chary Fasli 1257 Varada Chary		Kattupalli Kandrakota Narasimha Chary 40	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] 15/5/62	T.D. No 1391
	[illegible] No 89 [illegible] Punji		5·32 195 282	5·80 Wet Dry		4-6-3	Do	Do	Do	Do Fasli [illegible] Dodda Rama Chary	Inland [illegible]	At the Swamy Pedda Ramachary	[illegible]	Fasli 1232 Doda Ramachary Fasli 1257 Ramachary		[illegible] [illegible] Ayyangar 50 2 Rama chary 60 3 Narasimha chary 56 4 Venkata chary 5 [illegible] 40	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	T.D. No 1392
	[illegible] 23		4·23 152 3/4 183 6/16	4·59 Wet Dry		3-1-2	Do	Do	Do	Do Fasli [illegible] Mehalli [illegible]	Inland [illegible]	At the Swamy Neelachary	[illegible]	Fasli 1232 Neela Chary Fasli 1257 [illegible] Chary		[illegible] [illegible] Chary 60 2 [illegible] Chary 18 3 Venkata Chary 45	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	T.D. No 1393

Register No 36

6

479 – 387 2·89
97 Wf
116 7/16 Df

Dry 98 2 18 14 2·39
80 5/8 Wf
95 14/16 Df

5 11 5 5·28
177 5/8 Wf
211 6/16 Df

5 13 7 · Pattanapalle · Jodi · Serma · Inam

Lankat Pattanapalle

157 8 · Devasiproduction (?) · An old Inam of 1809

Reports are made by the Dasasamatmadars (?) · Circar Azahut

21 4 9

No Sanad · This appears in the Inam list of 1808 as Inam 288 Cuntahs. In the Karanam's list of 1230, distinguishing the old from new Inams, this was entered as a [illegible] Inam. See the Inam Agakat (?) of 1812 with the Karanam. · At the Survey Chennam Reddy's Inam · Do · Inam Timme Gaud

It is entered as confirmed Inam 1115 cuntahs · 1809 · Do

It appears in 1809 as Inam; therefore the old Inam [illegible]

In Fasli 1283 · Timme Gauda

In Fasli 1283 · Timmalamma

Pattanapalli · Timmalakka Daughter 70 · Widow in the name of Gopadi · On the usual conditions of service · 26/4/62 [illegible]

Husband's 1st wife's daughter Gopadi

Needs an old deed; appears in 1809. One Chenne Gaud appears by petition. He describes himself as grandson's son of one Chenne Gaud, alleged brother of the father of Nadi Gaud, father of Timme Gaud of 1809. He claims registry in his name as Timmalakka daughter of Timme Gaud can have no claim when he [illegible] a Cousin. He alleges that the Timme Gaud noted in F 1231/1232 is Timmalakka's father, while Timmalakka states that her father Timme Gaud had no male issue, & that he gave all his property to her & to her husband Timme Gaud, & that the registry in F 1231 & 1232 was made in her husband's name, & that she has been enjoying the Inam all along from nearly 50 years. Chenne Gaud has presented a petition to the Commissioner No 2811; the petition is pinned in the margin. On this subject Chenne Gaud's uncle Nadi Gaud & his mother presented petitions to the Collector as early as 1849. An inquiry was made & final endorsement given on 4th January 1857. The decision in the endorsement runs thus: "It appears that the Inam was enjoyed by Timme Gaud, the [illegible] & [illegible] Timmalakka's father, & that he having died without male issue his son-in-law Timme Gaud enjoyed the Inam, & now his daughter Timmalakka has enjoyed the Inam; that in 1836 when the subject came under [illegible] in [illegible] Timmalakka was acknowledged as proper heir by Razinamah; that in F 1257 a complaint was made against Timmalakka, & it was withdrawn with the representation that Timmalakka should enjoy the Inam for life, & that on the registration of Fasli [illegible], Timmalakka wished to make the registry in the name of her husband's 1st wife's (otherwise her own step-)daughter Gopadi. The claim of the petitioners was therefore dismissed." The endorsement further states that [illegible] when Timmalakka dies, the necessary orders will be passed.

Timmalakka says her father was the only son of her grandfather. The [illegible] filed by the petitioner is in many respects wrong. Timmalakka's claim is strongly borne out by an old [illegible] Darvandan (?) deed of F 1231, found in the Taluk records, [illegible] which mentions that the Inam was served by Nadi Gaud for a time; that Nadi Gaud died without completing the service; that his son Timme Gaud completed the service, enjoyed the Inam; that this Timme Gaud and the [illegible] had no male issue [illegible].

Reg No 36 · Confirmed to Timmalakka. The registration in the name of Gopadi will not now be made, as there is no occasion for it while the present holder is alive.

30 May 62

3 [illegible] 62

7 · Kotakatta Inam · Dry 1090 3 19 12 3·32 · 20 Wf · 182 12/16 Df · 6 9 7 · Kota Katta · Do · Do · Do · No Sanad · An old Inam of 1809 · This appears in the Inam list of 1808 as 516 Cuntahs

Timme Nangi (?) · Dry 1091 2 28 13 2·72 · 91 1/2 Wf · 108 13/16 Df · 10 2 8 · Do · [illegible] in 1231 (?)

Ramu Nangi (?) · Dry 1092 · 17 8 0·24 · 14 3/4 Wf · 17 8/16 Df · 2 2 10

Ramu Nangi (?) · Dry 1093 · 11 4 0·28 · 9 1/2 Wf · 11 4/16 Df · 1 12 5

Nangi · Dry 1094 · 10 2 0·25 · 8 9/16 Wf · 10 2/16 Df · 1 9 2

9 15 0

1·37 · 25 10 1

8 9·65 · Wf · 387 8/16 Df · 32 3 8

& Timme Gaud, & [illegible] Nadi Gaud also; & that in consequence of this Timme Gaud had been enjoying from Bhoudri or 1800. It is therefore clear that the Timme Gaud entered in the [illegible] of F 1231/32 was Timmalakka's husband. The Petitioners' claim is therefore rejected. Timmalakka's wish to make the registry in Gopadi's name can be accepted, giving the petitioners full liberty to make out their claims in the Civil Courts.

In the Karanam's list of 1230, distinguishing the old & new Inams, this was entered amongst the old Inams. In F 1231 it was [illegible]. In the restoration list of F 1231, signed by the Collector, Fort Inams, to the value of 32-3-8, is specified as Inams restored to the village. The heading of the list sets forth that these Inams entered in the list were proper Inams up to A.D. 1800, or Kalayukti, the year next to Siddharthi. By reference to other [illegible] it appears that an old Inam entered in the list of 1809.

At the Survey · Timme Gauda · In 1809 Fort Inam Timme Gaud · This was [illegible] in 1830 & restored in F 1231 as an old Inam

In Fasli 1230 Inam [illegible] · In Fasli 1231 Inam Gaud · In Fasli 1282 Timme Gauda · In Fasli 1283 Timmalamma

Pattanapalli · Timmalakka Daughter 70 · husband's 1st wife's daughter Gopadi · Widow in the name of Gopadi as desired by Timmalakka

Rs 1/8 24 Rs
[illegible]
26/4/62

30 May 62

3 May 62

Case No 647

A Pn 369 of 1865 from Kistnappa claiming as the adopted son of Timmalakka since deceased. Endorsed that the settlement made will not be altered. 9/1/66 [illegible]

Abstract

Reg Rules				Description of Inams	Extent					Jodi	Inam		Proposed D.R.	Approved D.R.	Revised	Comp
Dy	Wt	Gar	Total		Reg Nos	Dry	Wet	Gar	Total							
2	0	.	2	Devadayam	2	8·24	0	.	8·24	0 . .	6	59				
1	1	.	2	Darmadayam	1	2·87	2·39	0	5·26	. .	27	49				
4	5	0	9	Personal	4	18·02	6·37	0	24·39	. .	43	30				
7	6	.	13	Total	7	20·91	8·76	0	37·91	. . .	71	85				

Pet. of Chenne Gaud (alluded to in the Dy. Collr's remarks) dated 28 May 62 praying for the registration of the Inam in his name.

The Inams have been registered in the name of Timmalakka, the present undisputed holder. She is alive; the claims of the pet. or any others will not be recognized or entertained.

[illegible] 8/8/62

30 Ma

Register No 37

Inam Register of Pursum (?) No 117 in the Talook of Pattapalli (?) Ocean (?) Taluk [illegible] District

The village does not appear in the Restoration List

Account of 1809 contains Vulpasuzzgre (?) Inam & Fort Inam. Book of tenure not in existence now. The [illegible] for [illegible] the Inam – [illegible] to [illegible] grant, but it [illegible] Shrotriem or [illegible]

2	3	4	5	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Personal Patta (?)	Dry 1092 Nangi	1 2 2 35 7/16 42 2/16	1·06 Wf Df		1 8 4	Bhala [illegible]	Tax free	Personal	Jodi · Inam	No Sanad · This does not appear in the Acct of 1809	At the Survey Narasimma Chary	Do 1209	In Fasli 1282 Narasimma Chary	[illegible]	Pattanapalle Tirumalacharya (?)	Daughter	[illegible]	To be [illegible] as [illegible]

Note in margin: 4 Items · not [illegible] as [illegible]

The [illegible] not [illegible] in 1809 nor in F 1231 [illegible]

S. Can