[illegible] Taluq of Salem [illegible]

						9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Personal [illegible]	[illegible]	cents	Rs A P	Rs A P	For Personal benefit	Jodi 35-3-10	Hereditary	By former government. Year not known	No sanad. It appears from all the accounts that this has been an Inam for more than 50 years.	Vittiyal Chari —Lapattiyal Chari alias Son of Vittiyal Chari	In the Rayam Taid account of Fasli 1207 Vencatapattiyal Chari	In faslis 1230, 32 & 34 1 Kumara Chari 1 Srinivasa Chari 1 Rama[illegible] 4 grandsons of Vencatapattiyal Chari are entered as holders. In Fasli 1248 1 Kumara Chari, Srinivasa Chari & 3 Vencoba Chari are so entered. These are also grandsons of Vencapattial Chari	1 Vencoba Chari age 57	Kavnipalaiam	great grandson of the grantee	1 wife 4 sons 3 daughters 4 daughters-in-law
Sultt Nanja wet	7757/8	19-40	14-0-11	14-0-11									2 Thammana Chari age 40	Do	great grandson of the grantee	1 wife 3 sons 1 daughter
Thallipatti Volla Nondi thuthukkal Nanja	3799/16	9-94	56-6-10	52-2-11									3 Rama Chari 30	Do	Do	1 Mother 1 wife 1 Son
		29-34	70-7-9	66-3-10												

Register No 1
Sheet No 178

* is the father of the party to whom the remaining portion of the Inam has been confirmed. The piece under enquiry being shown to have been situated close to the Tank, it is most probable that it was submerged and this inference is strengthened by the fact that the fresh grant stated to have been made by the Muttadar in lieu of it continues to be in the enjoyment of the Inamdars in whose names the lost piece is recorded in the accounts. The lands given in exchange are stated to be puttah lands held by the Inamdars themselves & they are stated as follows.

Fields

Kolathandi Nanja	acres	1-2-0	Rs 5-12-6
Thopandi Nanja		1-10-0	11-13-11
		2-12-0	17-10-5

Out of this acres 1-32-0 assessed at Rs. 14-0-0 are entered in the accounts as the land granted in exchange the assessment of the remaining portion (Rs 3-10-5) being payable to the Muttadar. The fact of this exchange is not however clearly borne out by the accounts though the entries in the Jamabandi Chitta of Fasli 1254 and the subsequent accounts make mention of it simply without specifying the particular land for which it was given in exchange and the parties to whom it was granted.

It is also stated by the Tenant that the land supposed to have been submerged has been subsequently recovered and that it is in the enjoyment of other parties who hold it on full assessment & refuse to give it up. This is after all only a supposition and identification of the field being impossible and the holders having had the enjoyment of the land for nearly 50 years their possession cannot now be interfered with.

Under these circumstances and considering that the exchange above referred to was a private arrangement concluded between the Muttadar and the Inamdar without the sanction of a competent authority it seems doubtful whether the exchange can be treated as valid and the Inam said to have been given in exchange for the land now missing, can be confirmed as an Inam to the present holders.

An enquiry into rights of possession being foreign to the Inam settlement I have thought it proper to record ~~the facts~~ for the information of the Inam Commissioner the facts of the case as shown by ~~[illegible]~~ the accounts noting at the same time the circumstances of enjoyment.

Title Deeds to be issued in the names of

	Extent Ac. Cts	Assessment	Jodi	Quit rent
1 Pillara Vencoba Row	1-2	5-5-11	3-8-0	3-12-0
2 Thimmana Chari	0-51	2-10-11	1-12-0	1-14-0
3 Rama Chari	0-52	2-11-0	1-12-0	1-14-0
	2-5	10-11-10	7-0-0	7-8-0

All of whom agree to pay the amount of quit rent that may be fixed on their respective portions of the Inam.

Title Deed No. 1718 erroneously issued for this Inam in the names of Venkoba Row, Narain Row & Rama Row is returned for alteration with reference to the remarks made in para 2.

The parties to whom the portion of the Inam which has been identified has been confirmed having been all along paying the jodi on the whole Inam (Acres 9-94) and as far as can be ascertained Government has not until now been made aware that any portion of the land has been lost or that other lands have been given in lieu of the missing portion.

It appears to me that as far as Government is concerned the whole Inam has been and is still in the possession of the original grantee and his descendants. The alienation made or said to have been made by the Muttadar was not authorized and therefore cannot be acknowledged. That the acres 2-5-0 of land now under consideration are lost there is no doubt whatever, and as the Inamdar cannot find them it is not his fault.

The only course to adopt therefore seems to me to be to confirm the whole Inam (acres 9-94) to the descendants of the original grantee and to leave the Inamdars to recover from the present holders the land which is said to be used [illegible] the missing portion of the Inam.

This case has been already partially enquired into and settled by the Inam Commissioner. But a small portion of Nanja of the extent of acres 2-5-0 remain unsettled and it is this that forms the subject of the present enquiry.

Out of the total extent of the Nanja Inam (acres 9-94) portions have been confirmed as particularized below.

No of the Title Deed	Name of the Inamdar	Name of the field	Extent	Asst.	Jodi
1711	Bebal Chari Srinivasal Chari	Nondi thuthukkal Nanja	1-88	9-12-9	5-4-7
1710	Padmanabha Kishtnal Chari	Do	1-87	9-12-8	5-4-7
1717 & 18	1 Annayal Chari 1 Thimmal Chari 1 Kishtal Chari	Do	4-14	21-13-8	10-8-0
			7-89	41-7-1	21-1-2

The remaining portion which has to be settled and which as above shown amounts to acres 2-5-0 assessed at Rs: 10-11-10 was by a mistake entered in the names of Vencoba Row and two others instead of in the names of the parties in column 16 and a Title Deed bearing No: 1718 has been issued to them. The Inam owned by these persons is quite a different one though situated in the same village. The Title Deed now given them for this Inam has therefore to be cancelled and another issued in its stead with reference to the entries made in case No (1) Taluq No. 9 recorded separately.

The piece now under enquiry stands in the accounts in the names of the parties mentioned in Column 16. But the land is now missing and is not to be identified. It is stated that it was submerged by the water spread of an adjacent Tank and that in its stead, other lands were granted as Inam by the Muttadars. But there is nothing on record to prove that this particular land was submerged and that an equivalent grant was made to the holders of this particular Inam. There is an entry however in the accounts of 1254-55 to the effect that 600 guntas of land belonging to Chanthihalli have been annexed to the Tank bed of Thallipatti. This 600 guntas includes 100 guntas regarding which there is a remark that it forms a p[illegible] of the Inam held by Ram[illegible]

Confd as recommended by Coll. [illegible] as on 22 [illegible] 7-8-0 [illegible] 19/1/70

10-11-10
[illegible]
28-11-10

Entd.
N.A.M.
20/4/68

Salem Sub Collector's office
26th [illegible]
[illegible] 18[illegible]

Inamtapatti –
Krishnagiri Taluk.

pare Ina

General
Sheet No. 179



Fair copied

Register No [illegible]

No. 4

Register No 1
Sheet No 180

Inam Register of Nissa Shrotriam Village of Toranahalli No 149 in the Jani Mahal of [illegible]
in the Krishnagiri Taluk Salem Dist.

This is a Nissa Shrotriam Village, in a Jani Mahal
The shares are 1 to 3 between the Agrahardar and the Mattadar
The accts of the Village commence with the Fusly 1224

No 1700

Salem Krishnagiri

1705

Under [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to Mattam on present terms

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
2–6	Religious Grant	Ayakat as per accounts					For the Support of Uttaradi Mattam at Hale Narasimhapuram in the Mysore Territories	Payable to Mattadar 1366 7 2	Payana Mauli	A grant of Jagadeva Rao confirmed by Mr Graham. Sunnud almost destroyed	Produced a Sunnud in Persian & Mahratti by Tippu. It appears to be merely of Route. Acts as Inam	—	—	In F 1224 Chagala-halli Inam Village of Uttaradi Mattam Sakkias Darmakkasy Beriz 537 Pagodas Jody 369 Pagodas	Uttaradi Mattam. Priest in Charge of the Mattam for the present is Satyadhyana Tirtha 62	Hale Narasimhapuram in the Mysore Territories Vakil Swamiraya Char of Kaveripatnam		—		This is a Shrotriem Nissa village, the Inamdar's share being 1/3 of the Beriz; & the Mattadar's share 2/3 of the Beriz.	2/3rd of the Beriz being payable to the Mattadar [illegible] 15 per ct 6
		Total Ayakat		1015.41																	
		Deduct Poramboke		195.24																	
		Assessable extent		820.17		3541 8 4															
		Deduct Inam		248.40		1527 10 5	The Mattam is Mysore Brahmins														
		Net Remaining extent		571.77		2013 13 11															
		Pattas Land	Dry	270.41		214 11 5															
			Wet	229.15		1699 14 6															
			Total	499.56		1913 9 11															
		Unoccupied Waste Land	Dry	47.19		11 12 0	Charge at 2 annas per acre on the dry & 8½ per cent														
			Wet	25.02		87 8 0															
			Total	72.21		99 4 0															
		Total Dry		317.60		226 7 5															
		Total Wet		254.17		1787 6 6															
		Grand Total		571.77		2013 13 11	Estimated Ayakat Value														

The only question occurring in this case is in respect to the holding & management of the village, with which we have little to do. The village was long in the possession of the Inamdar, who was ~~in~~ collecting the Beriz of the village, & paying 2/3rd of it to the Mattadar; & since then both managed the village jointly and in amity. In 1857, a ~~[illegible]~~ complaint was preferred in the Revenue Department about the right of giving a certain land to Ryots & collecting Revenue. The Collector of the District passed an order in 1857, admitting the ~~[illegible]~~ part of the management of the village by the Inamdar, & forbidding it for the future as a proceeding opposed to the Regulations. The Inamdar then placed the ~~[illegible]~~ case before the Moonsiff Sadr Amin by an Original Suit. The Moonsiff passed his decision in favor of the Inamdar, & the case is now ~~under~~ in appeal in the Civil Court.

The Mattadar & the Inamdar have placed themselves in such position, that we cannot definitely say ~~who~~ as to who actually manages the village; for, they have, since the Moonsiff's decision was passed, & while the appeal is pending, entered into an arrangement with each other in 1862, to the effect that the management of the village should be vested in a Gumastah of the Mattam, & that the Gumastah should be furnished with an order by the Mattadar for collecting his share. In 1867, the Mattadar accordingly issued an order to the Inamdar's Gumastah, who is making collections, & paying the Inamdar & the Mattadar their respective shares.

~~The Mattadar is [illegible] claim in trust~~

As, however, the Inam belongs to the Mattam, & as the Sunnud confers the Inam right in the village ~~[illegible]~~ on the Mattam, I would confirm the Inam right in the village in the name of the Mattam. The courts will decide the respective right of each in the village. ~~The~~ The Mattadar & the Inamdar do not wish to come to a settlement about either giving ~~[illegible]~~ up his right for a Jody, ~~or for a~~ or for some land, or for a [illegible] on the other hand. For there are certain ~~[illegible]~~ usual revenues of [illegible] enjoyed by the Ryots; which the Mattadar would wish to be included in the Beriz, & which the Inamdar wishes to be excluded from the Beriz, as the tenth had never been collected. We cannot therefore even fix a Beriz for the village to the satisfaction of either. To be confirmed therefore, [illegible] Inam right [illegible] in the name of the Mattam

Fusly	Dry	Wet	Total	Amount of Beriz	Circar share	Inamdar's share
F 1267	270.27	229.15	499.42	1868 8 3	1329 7 5	539 0 10
F 1268	270.27	229.15	499.42	1868 8 3	1329 7 5	539 0 10
F 1269	270.27	229.15	499.42	1868 8 3	1329 7 5	539 0 10
F 1270	270.27	229.15	499.42	1868 8 3	1329 7 5	539 0 10
F 1271	295.47	217.42	512.89	2115 4 2	1510 8 1	604 8 7
Total	1377.35	1134.02	2511.37	9589 15 2	6832 3 9	2757 11 5
Average of 5	275.47	226.80	502.27	1917 15 10	1366 7 2	551 8 8

This is the Beriz according to the return of the Karnam which neither the Mattadar nor the Inamdar affirms. I would therefore fix the Ayakat assessment ~~Rs~~ 2063-10-11 as the ~~[illegible]~~ Beriz of the village.

Extract granted to Appaji Setti Mutteedar of Penugonda Mattam 27-4-68.

Register No 1 Register of Inams in the village of Isoutapalli Taluq of Kristnagiri District of Salem

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

9 Personal Wet 367 6/16 9 1879-2-5 871-2-10

Sittikali yelam damarau Nanja
Do
Yiriyinkilo Nanja } 172 3/4 4- 32 32-13-0 30-3-8

	13- 50	111-15-5	101-6-6
Deduct portion of this Inam for which T.D. No 1596 has been already issued	0- 25	2-2-5	0-16-0
Remainder	13- 25	111 99-4-1	34-2-0

Bhata vritti

Jodi 35-0-0
Payable to Mutedar

Hereditary

Granted by former Government Date not known

No Sannad

Viddiya Sri Char Pymayachi
Appana Char brother of Asarappa Char
In the Hayum Tirva Account of F. 1207
Pillara Appamachar. Son of the party in Col 13 Do F 1248 as in F. 1207

The ward Pillara is the family Name of the party in F. 1203

Kaveripatnam
1 Venkobachar 57 — Great grandson
2 Tammanachar 40
3 Ramachar 30 — 2 & 3 Great Great grandsons to the party in Col 13
Kristnagiri
4 Venkobarao alias Venkatrao 48
5 Nanarao 24
6 Ramarao 21
} alienees

No 1
Wife 1
Sons 2
Daughters 3
Daughters in law 2
8

No 2
Wife 1
Sons 3
Daughter 1
5

No 3
Mother 1
Wife 1
Son 1
3

No 4
Wife 1
Son 1
Daughter in law 1
3

No 5
Wife 1
Daughter 2
3

No 6
Mother 1
Wife 1
aunts 2

No 4 has purchased at a court auction Ac 2. 50 for Rs 233-0 in 1822. The court certificate is produced

W
Do

Confirmed in 4 Deeds

	Extent	assessment	Jodi	Quit Rent	
No 1					
W	5. 39	41-9-2	13-15-0	3-8-0	at 1/8
Do	4- 32	30-3-8	10-7-0	10-0-0	at 1/2
	9- 71	71-12-10	24-6-0	13-8-0	or 13 Rs
No 2					
	0- 52	4-0-6	1-6-0	0-6-0	at 1/8
No 3					
	0- 52	4-0-6	1-6-0	0-6-0	at 1/8
Nos 4 to 6					
	2- 50	19-6-0	7-0-0	1-8-0	at 1/8

The Collector was written to on the 29 October 1863 to attach this Inam for non attendance of the Inamdars. The Inam was ordered to be fully assessed for default 24th March 1866 and included in the list of Inams forwarded to Collector with letter dated

The Inamdar however appears to have preferred his claim before the Collector who referred it to the Thasildar for enquiry

The Thasildar furnished a register for the Inam the particulars of which are entered above. From the remarks in the above register it appears that the date of the Inamdar's appearance though not within one year from the date of application for attachment is still within one year of the general warning issued by the Inam Commissioner under date 26th January 1864. The claim is therefore admitted

2 The parties Nos 4 to 6 are entitled to a share in this Inam and not in case No 43 as has been erroneously recommended by the Deputy Collector. The Inam Patta No 1718 already issued in the names of Nos 4 to 6 has been cancelled and a new one issued for Ac. 2. 05 in the names of Venkobachari &c the proper party entitled to it in Case No 43.

3. Acres 4. 32 assessed at Rs 30-3-8 appears to have been transferred to No 1 by Venamma an undivided childless widow marked A. in the annexed genealogical table & is therefore charged with half quitrent.

17/4/70

Register No 1
Sheet No 181

Fair copied

Written to Collr
to release the Inam
from attachment

3 B II 4
1/4

4202

T.D. Nos
1803
1804
1805
180

Tsandapalli Village
Jari Mittah!
Misa Shrotrium
Krishnagiri Taluk

Register No. 1
Sheet No. 182

[illegible] village of [illegible]

of Permeswara Matam Kistnagiri Taluk Salem District

This is a Sarvamanium village belonging to a Mattam in the Jari Mittah of Permeswaram — The Acct of 1804, the Dayam Sirval Acct of 1807 & the subsequent Accts of 1820/48 are for [illegible] — the Copper Acct of [illegible] [illegible] useful [illegible]
The tax is payable by the Mutwadar & the agrahadar enjoys but 2/3 share in the Lands

		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	[illegible] Rangi	Dry Ist	1 20 2	1·50		18 12 7	For the support of Muthiyaprana Swamy at Tsandapalli. The temple is in good order	Tax free	Permanent	[illegible] Inam	In Land. It appears in the survey acct of 1804, the Dayam Sirval Acct of 1807 & in all the other accts. Inam	At the survey Muthiyaprana Swamy do Pujari Mallur Srinivasa chary. In 1807 Muthiyaprana Swamy		In 1830 Pujari Mallur Srinivasa chary. In 1848 Mallur Srinivasa chary	Tsandapalli Muthiyaprana Swamy. Pujari 1 Venkatrama chary 35 2 Rama chary 40 3 Rama Chary 50 4 Gurraraja Chary 40			Lives at Kaverypatnam	Each of them does service 3 months in the year & the produce of the Inam is enjoyed in 4 equal shares. The pujaris are warned that they shd live at Tsandapalli according to the orders of the Collr.	To be Confirmed. Tax free. [illegible] 3 months since have been given for a branch of the [illegible] family [illegible] at Tsandapalli [illegible] living at Kaverypatnam. It appears that [illegible] uninterrupted [illegible] 16/3/61	T.D. No. 1626 Conft. 13 Novr.
2	[illegible] Rangi [illegible]	Dry Ist Wet 2 Wet 3	22 12 2 16 8 2 2 11 7 19 8 15 8	3·62 2·41 2·87 4·28 8·70		2 1 2 19 14 5 10 13 8 30 12 1 34 12 9	For the support of Lakshmi Narayana Swamy at Tsandapalli. The temple is in good order. & Inam in the name of Gangabay & Setu Row & Rangachary for which the [illegible] of Gangabay & [illegible] Setu Row [illegible] by partition [illegible]	do	do	do	In Land. Do	At the survey Lakshmi Narayana Swamy. Pujari Narayana Chary. In 1807 Lakshmi Narayana [illegible]		In 1830 Pujari Rama chary. In 1848 Rama Chary	Tsandapalli Lakshmi Narayana Swamy. Pujari 1 Gangabayamma 2 Setu Row [illegible] Rangachary [illegible] To be Conf. Tax free			16/3/61	To be Conf. Tax free. [illegible]	Her husband's brothers Setu Row & Rangachary file a statement for this Inam but they have not had any [illegible] Setu Row [illegible] [illegible] brother [illegible] has been [illegible] from 6 years [illegible] Gangabay. It appears that Setu Row [illegible] of the brothers allowed for [illegible] to be revised. [illegible] temporary [illegible]	T.D. No. 1627 Conf. 13 Novr.
3	[illegible]	Dry 2 Wet 2	35 0 30 0 35 0	0·88 0·97 1·85		0 15 9 5 7 11 6 7 8	For the support of Timmaraya Swamy at Tsandapalli. The temple is in good order	do		do	In Land. Do	At the survey Timmaraya Swamy. In 1807 Timmaraya Swamy		In 1830 Pujari Timmaiya. In 1848 Timmappa	Tsandapalli Timmarayaswamy. Pujari [illegible] 2 [illegible] 60			S. D. No. 16	To be Conf. Tax free [illegible]		13 Novr. Conf.
4	[illegible] Rangi [illegible]	Dry 3 Wet 5	13 20 33 8 9 8	1·22 1·84 1·26		17 0 7 11 0 6 28 7 0	For maintaining Lamp in the temple of Lakshmi Narayana Swamy at Tsandapalli. Such as heating [illegible] in the temple. The temple is in good order	Tax free	do	do	In Land. Do	At the survey Hanumantadu. In 1807 Hanumantadu		In 1830 Rajanna Venkatadri. In 1848 Venkatadri	Chandapur. Rajanna. 1 Timmiyya 35 2 Hanumantadu 22 3 Kullan 55 4 Babiyya 12 5 Timmappa 60	Heirs 4 Owners		1 — 2/4 2 & 3 — 1/4 4 — 1/4 5 — 1/4	24/1/61. To be Conf. The Inam [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 26/1/61		13 Novr.
5	[illegible] Rangi. It has nothing to do with the Inam. The [illegible] [illegible] one [illegible] of the garden of the Pandaram. [illegible] [illegible] the Inam in his [illegible] & [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible]	Wet [illegible]	30 6	0·76		6 4 8 Col 8	For [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ Lakshmi Narayana Swamy at Tsandapalli. A flower garden [illegible] supplying flowers to the temple [illegible] work after [illegible] temple	do	do	do	In Land. Do. 26/3/61	At the survey Lakshmi Narayana Swamy. In 1807 Pandaram [illegible]		In 1830 Subbrama Manniya Pandaram. In 1848 Rote	~~Lakshmi Narayana~~ [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ Lakshmi Narayana [illegible] flower garden [illegible] Pandaram [illegible]					This [illegible] in 1830 [illegible] have been given to [illegible] Subbramania Pandaram for [illegible] a charity flower garden & for supplying [illegible] flower [illegible] The Pandaram became [illegible] [illegible] Chary [illegible] the Inam [illegible]	T.D. No. 1633 Conf. [illegible] 13 Novr.
6	[illegible] Referred to [illegible]	Dry 7	[illegible] 9	2·01		22 9 7	Tsandapalli [illegible] [illegible] the Inam [illegible] at his [illegible]	do		do	In Land. Do	At the survey one [illegible] [illegible]	Adiya Appanna Chary. In 1830 Narayana Chary	In 1793 Narayana Chary [illegible]	Kaverypatnam. 1 [illegible] Chary 30 2 Tammana Chary 16 3 Venkamma 80 4 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		To be Confirmed in 4 [illegible] [illegible] the Inam [illegible] [illegible] has given [illegible] [illegible]	

58

Report No. 1

Saulahalli village
Jari Mittah
Hosur Division
Krishnagiri Taluk

[illegible] Mangi

2421 · Vala Kaali · [illegible] · Kurar · Dharmam

It appears in all the Accounts since 1807 as Sarva

Not found. Out of the Survey Register

Inf. 1904 Adiga Danna Chary Carnam

Inf. 1928 Adiga Ramachary

Inf. 1934 Adiga Danna Chary Carnam

Inf. 1928 Appana Chary

Nagia Achary

5 W. [illegible]

Kanaipatnam

Adiga Appanachari chari

Narasimha Chari 80

2 Rajachary 75

3 Rama chary 42

½ - 2·00 - 12 - 1 - 0

Kanaipatnam

4 Narasimhachary

5 Jayachary 80

6 Balachary 21

½ - 2·01 - 12 - 1 - 1 6 1 [illegible]

Son of Danna Chary

Do.

Son

Son

Sons

Son Daughter

2-8-10

Uncle

Son

Son

Others

To be Confirmed in 2 TDL

1st in Name of Nos. 1 to 3

Tax 2-5-10

QR ⅛ 1-4

[illegible]

4th 2d in Name of Nos. 4 to 6

Tax 2-5-9

QR ⅛ 1-4

[illegible]

21/8/62

13 Nov [illegible]

[illegible] Ine. Off.

Personal [illegible] 8 ~~32~~ 3·80

[illegible] Rama Chandra Mangi

21 ·158 · D · 1770 · D · D · Dharmam

Note. One Raja Rama Chandra Chary appeared & states that he is a person included in the [illegible] of 1450 - that Kishna Chary [illegible] [illegible] Ramachary [illegible] - that he merely [illegible] to the [illegible] Rama Chary [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] had been [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Kishna Chary [illegible] when Kishna Chary said [illegible] years old - in his 15th year he says he had mortgaged it - [illegible] produces a certificate from the [illegible] of the village that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] from long time [illegible]

Reproduced & recorded [illegible]

Not found

Rama Chary

Inf. 1907 Marada Ramachary

Inf. 1931 Rama Chandra Chary mortgagee

Inf. 1934 Maradur Venkama Chary mortgagee

Inf. [illegible]

Kanaipatnam

Marada Dondachary [illegible]

2 Rajanna Chary 22

Sister of Rama Chary

Usurped

This Inam was [illegible] in 1450 when [illegible] Ramachary & Rama Chandra Chary at Kanaipatnam [illegible] mortgaged to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Represent [illegible] [illegible] of mortgage & [illegible] on [illegible] [illegible] Ramachary & Ramachandra Chary of 1450 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Tax (2) 10

QR 26/8/62

[illegible] · 400 · 1·25 · 620 · D · 0·65 · D · Dharmam

Not found

Vedagiri Achary

Rangachary

Inf. 1907 Vedagiri Rangachary

Inf. 1928 Appana [illegible]

Inf. 1934 Maradur Venkama Chary mortgagee

Inf. [illegible] Rama Chary

Kanaipatnam

Vedagiri Achary

Gururaya Chary 52

⅓ - 0·42 - 2 - 1 - 4

Ramachary 40

⅓ - 0·21 - 1 - 0 - 8

Kanaipatnam

3 Vedagiri Achary

Ramachary 50

⅓ - 0·62 - 3 - 2 - 0

Brother

Son

No. 1 [illegible] [illegible] a share [illegible] [illegible] mortgaged

Tax 0-2-2

0-3-2

To be Confirmed in 3 TDL

1st in Name of No. 1

Tax 2-2

QR ⅛ [illegible]

2d [illegible]

3d to No. 3

Tax 3-2

6/9/62

QR ⅛ 2·0

9·9·74

·2·5

1·32

2 4·07

3·5 4·08

33·28

15·9

4·12·1

121·6·2

135·7·1

Reproduced [illegible] [illegible] of the Case

Note. A Pattah of [illegible] [illegible] dated 14 Nov. 1799 [illegible] produced - [illegible] the fact that 6¾ [illegible] of wet land of Chowdahalli were taken for the [illegible] of the Talahalli tank & not [illegible] included in the [illegible] Talahalli. This shows that [illegible] the same [illegible] land in exchange might have been ordered

Dharmam

Not found. Out of the Survey Register

Inf. 1907 [illegible] Venkatapati Achary

Inf. 1928 [illegible] [illegible] Bhima Chary

Inf. 1934 Konera Chary [illegible]

Kanaipatnam

Padamandahalli Kishna Chary 70

Inf. [illegible] 11 - 1·87 - 10 - 8 - 9

Kanaipatnam

2 Babachary 38

3 Srinivasachary 34

4 [illegible] Rangachary 28

Inf. [illegible] 11 - 1·88 - 10 - 8 - 9

Kanaipatnam

5 Machepanni Venkatachary 64

6 Dondachary 50

Inf. 2014 - 4·07 - 44 - 12 - 1

Kanaipatnam

7 Levanikota Subbachary 44

Inf. [illegible] 13 - 1·32 - 7 - 15 - 2

Purchaser

Purchaser

Do

Do

Purchaser

Purchaser

Son

Son

Daughter

Tax 5-4-7

No. 1 to 4 produce 2 deeds of sale 1 on stamped paper dated 15 July 1824 & [illegible] of a Court [illegible] who conducted the sale of the land under a decree of the Court in [illegible] 1823 - in favor of [illegible] [illegible] Chary who purchased it [illegible] for 252 Rs - a decree of the Court dated 26th Sept. 1833 - [illegible] the said in favor of [illegible] No. 1 - on [illegible] of the purchase

No. 5 & 6 produce [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 1820 [illegible] [illegible] 1822

To be Confirmed in 10 TDL

1st in Name of No. 1

Tax 5-4-7

QR ⅛ 2·15·0

[illegible] Confd

2d in Name of No. 2 to 4

Tax 5-4-7

QR ⅛ 2·15·0

[illegible] Confd

Inquired into the claims of Nos. 1 & 2. No. 1 states that the 2 shares [illegible] a deficiency in area of 1·10 - & that the [illegible] 1802 executed [illegible] [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] necessary to [illegible] & [illegible] [illegible] to the extent of deficit. He produces the [illegible] [illegible] & claims that [illegible] 10 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Nos. 2 & 3 added [illegible] - but the deficit land has not yet been received & [illegible] further [illegible] the present extent is [illegible] shares & [illegible] [illegible] accordingly [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] cannot now be brought into force [illegible] [illegible] its [illegible]

3d TD in Name of Nos. 5 & 6

Tax 5-8-11

QR ⅛ 2·8·4

[illegible] parties have agreed in the fact that the original family's interest in the [illegible] was transferred to the new land, & that this right [illegible] transferred [illegible] [illegible] by the Court from the [illegible] family to Venkat Rao. I have entered Venkatarama Rao [illegible] [illegible] for the [illegible] [illegible] but which [illegible] belonged to the original family before 1807. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] as the land, there is no ground for [illegible] that the exchange was [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of Venkat Rao [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] I have [illegible] therefore introduced the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] has been allowed in lieu of old Inam, as compensation [illegible] case. The [illegible] states, that [illegible] his [illegible] [illegible] & that he cannot therefore give up his right to [illegible] this land [illegible] in his favor [illegible] [illegible] Pallehalli belongs [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the village [illegible] & the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the 2 [illegible] were [illegible] as one [illegible] [illegible] in 1807. [illegible] [illegible] all the villages of the 2 [illegible] [illegible] Indisputable that the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 80 years ago. [illegible] [illegible] of Talahalli to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] Isontapalli [illegible] 149 [illegible]

Isontapalli Village
Krishnagiri Taluk

Register No. 1
Sheet No. 183

8 [illegible] 2·31 0 2·38 20·18 0 Bala [illegible] 1 8 2 [illegible] land

[illegible] Machegani Ruypala chary [illegible] Machakanni Ruypala chary

Kaverypatnam
Machegani
Venkoba Chary 64 [illegible]
2 Donda Cherry Do 50 [illegible]

[illegible] 2 brothers [illegible]
Both are brothers. They are divided in family. The land is not divided. The produce is enjoyed in 2 equal shares [illegible]

[illegible] 1–6–2
[illegible] 1/8 2–8
Donda Chary [illegible] a separate [illegible] for his 1/2 share in the land, as he is divided in every other respect from his brother. Venkoba Chary states that [illegible]

1594
13 [illegible] 63 [illegible]

The land is now mortgaged to Donda Chary's brother-in-law for [illegible] Chary's marriage; [illegible] a karanamah between the 2 brothers was passed to the effect that after the present mortgaged claim shall be over at the prescribed period, Venkoba Chary [illegible] exclusively [illegible] number of years. He pleads [illegible] the [illegible] cannot be separated. But as his statements are [illegible] the separate [illegible] cannot be [illegible] to Donda Chary under the present circumstances.

[illegible] appears in all the [illegible] as [illegible]

The absentee brother was entered in the attachment list dated 29th October 1863 [illegible] since one [illegible]

[illegible] 24/5/66

[illegible] 2·12·10 2·32 30·3·8 D [illegible]
[illegible] 3·6 9·18 71·2·10 25·9·2
[illegible] 22·12 3·57 29·7·7

Total 17·2·14 17·07 130·13·7

[illegible] dated 25th [illegible] 1864 No. 23 from [illegible] claiming the absentee [illegible]

A [illegible] No. 2325 of 1863 from [illegible] claiming [illegible] for the share of her father Narasimha [illegible] chary. Endorsed [illegible] and [illegible] the Court 26 Sept. 65

Settled in supplementary Register 17/2/70
14/3/67

Extract granted to the 1st party in Cal: 16 – 10–8–68

[illegible] Pillar Appana Chary [illegible] Pillar Appana Chary

[illegible] the land was mortgaged [illegible]

Whole [illegible] in the Bangalore [illegible]
Sumati Gunda Cherry 70 [illegible]
[illegible] 957 29·7·1
[illegible] ago [illegible] 10–7–2
2 Deva [illegible] Venkobacherry 50
3 Dumacherry 22
[illegible] 17 – 0·25 – 2–2–8 – [illegible] 1/4

[illegible] Subbamma [illegible] adopted [illegible] Purnachary [illegible] adopted boy [illegible] Gunda chary [illegible] adoption took place [illegible] years ago under the orders of Gunda chary [illegible]

A deed of sale [illegible] dated 1835 by Appana chary for 56 Rs. [illegible] the purchaser [illegible] dated 27th Septr 1826 [illegible]

[illegible] 1st in [illegible] of [illegible]
[illegible] 10–9–2
[illegible] 1/8 2–2–8
91 [illegible]
2 [illegible] of [illegible]
[illegible] 16
[illegible] 1/8 2 [illegible] 4
1595 1596
[illegible] 16/62

9 [illegible] 1·32 0 1·80 8·8·10 D [illegible] D D [illegible] land

[illegible] not found apart of [illegible]

Kaverypatnam
Gouda Kistna Cherry 28
Brother [illegible] of Venkanna Chary of [illegible] who was [illegible] of the [illegible]
[illegible] whose [illegible] his [illegible] for [illegible] the [illegible] settled a [illegible] allowance [illegible] give [illegible]

[illegible] 1/8 2 1 [illegible]
[illegible] 21/8/62
1597

11 [illegible] 1·22 12 1·82 8·10·3 D D D D [illegible] land

[illegible] not found [illegible]

Kaverypatnam
Both [illegible] Achari 50 [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] widow [illegible]

[illegible] 1/8 2 1 [illegible]
6/9/62
1598

~~[illegible]~~ But the land [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] They have taken [illegible] They have [illegible] appeared [illegible] 2 karanamahs executed [illegible] each other [illegible] in 2 equal shares [illegible] The karanamahs are accepted [illegible] 2·37 – 11–4–7

[illegible] 30·2 [illegible] 22·9·3 D [illegible] 1 8 2 D D [illegible] land

[illegible] Ramachandra Chary [illegible] 35 [illegible] a year. [illegible] The deed of sale [illegible] The 2 [illegible] of the document are [illegible] the [illegible] Ramachandra Chary who [illegible] North Arcot. He also produced a [illegible]

Whole [illegible] in the [illegible]
[illegible] Srinivasa Chary 35
2 Ananta Chary 50

Produced a deed of sale [illegible] dated [illegible] 1846 [illegible]

In this case, one [illegible] Chary, who is now [illegible] Ramachandra Chary [illegible] in the land [illegible]

1599
1600

[illegible] Cheetoor [illegible] No 149 [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] 2-30 8-70 | 26-4-10 | Bala [illegible] | 5-14-9 | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | Appa Rao | Manur Krishna chary | [illegible] Manur Appana chary | [illegible] Rukka chary Ammaa chary | Kaveripatnam Manhali Sreenivasachary 50 Purchaser son | [illegible] 5 Daughter | [illegible] sale on stamp paper dated [illegible] by Ruppachary [illegible] | [illegible] in 3 [illegible]

D [illegible] 2-79 13 2-49 | 18-0-0

6-10 3 6-25 | 44-4-10

[illegible] 3 Pinaka Sreenivasachary 20 6 | and Daughter's son | Yemmaka [illegible] | [illegible] from 1204 At [illegible]

Net No 23 — 2-49 — 18-0-0
[illegible] No 22 — 0-38 — 2-10-1
287 20-10-1 √ 2-12-9

Kenchahalli
2 Minindra Kuppachari 30 | [illegible] | [illegible] +

[illegible] No 22 — 2-73 — 11-14-5 | [illegible] 2-2-0

[illegible] No 22 — 1-25 — 8-12-4 | 1-0-0 √ 21/8/62

[illegible] 2-2-0
[illegible] 1-8-0
[illegible]

Ist [illegible] 2-12-9
[illegible] 22-4-0
21/8/62
2d [illegible] No 2
[illegible] 1-0-0
[illegible] 28-0-0

1601
1602
1603

13 [illegible]

[illegible] 2-38 2-79 | 18-1-1 | D | 1-2-8 | D | D | [illegible] | Appa Rao Manur Krishna chary | [illegible] Manur Krishna chary son | [illegible] Rukka chary son | Kaveripatnam Mannur Ramachandra Chary 48 | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] original No 260 [illegible] No 275 [illegible] Bhimachary [illegible] | [illegible] 80 [illegible]

D°

Kaveripatnam
5 Panduranga Narasimmachary 22 | Grandson [illegible] Panduranga Ramachary | Mother [illegible]
Net 1-75 — 11-5-9 | 0-11-8

Pana 2 Minimanachary 30
3 Ramachandra 14
4 Laxmanachary 12
[illegible] No 22 — 0-52 — 3-5-8 | [illegible] 0-3-6

Yemmaka [illegible]

[illegible] 3-6
[illegible] 2-6-0
21/9/61
2d [illegible] No 2 [illegible]
[illegible] 3-6
[illegible] 2-6-0
3d [illegible] No 5
[illegible]
10/[illegible]

1604
1605
1606

[illegible] 10-0 1-20 | 8-0-0 | 10 | [illegible] | D | D | [illegible] | Appa Rao [illegible] | [illegible] Rukka chary [illegible] | [illegible] | Mudsala Rajalendra Rao 48 | Purchaser son | [illegible] Brother Daughter son | Produced a [illegible] dated [illegible] | [illegible]

D°

[illegible] Rajalendra chary [illegible] son [illegible] chary

[illegible]

21/[illegible]

1607

[illegible] 2-40 | 14-0-0 | D | 0-15-5 | D | D | [illegible] | Appa Rao [illegible] | [illegible] Krishna chary son | [illegible] | Krishnachary [illegible] | [illegible] 30 [illegible] 70 [illegible] 10 | [illegible] who performed [illegible]

D°

[illegible]

1608

[illegible] 8-19-0 8-29 | 66-12-1 | D | 8-12 | D | D | [illegible] | Appa Rao Padmanabha [illegible] chary | [illegible] Krishna chary | Kaveripatnam Padmanabha Krishna Chary 70 | [illegible] | [illegible] 3 [illegible] | [illegible] in 1700

D°

[illegible] Padmanabha [illegible] chary | [illegible] Padmanabha Krishna chary

½ — 4-25 — 32-14-0 | 4-5-1

2 Bala chary 38
3 Sreenivasachary 34
4 [illegible] Rangachary 25
½ — 4-24 — 32-14-1 | 4-5-1

Ist [illegible]
[illegible] 4-5-1
[illegible] 23-0-0
2d [illegible] No 2 [illegible]
[illegible]

1609
1610

[illegible] 20-2 1-64 | 9-3-3 | D | 2-2-9 | D | D | [illegible] | Appa Rao [illegible] | [illegible] | Tembhalli Muniamsami Kuppa Chary 25 | Grandson | [illegible] | [illegible]

[illegible] 1-25 1-68

18

[illegible] | 20-13-11

[illegible] field which he has been [illegible] from [illegible] years [illegible]

[illegible] Kuppachari 12-12-67

1611

[illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible]

Krishnagiri Taluk [illegible] Ditto

Jaunsapalli Village
Krishnagiri Taluk, Salem Dist.

Register No 1
Sheet No 184

19
21
II

[illegible] 2 1 2 2.20 11 15 1 [illegible] Punja 1 1 8 [illegible] [illegible] Re Lands
Alla Durey
Ku 1863
Krishna Chary
Lidzu
Vaupali
1 Hanumanta Chary 60
2 Rajachary 60
3 Ramachary 60
4 Laxmanachary 60
5 Ananta Chary 40
Lidu
Do
Do
Do
—
1/3 share
Whole Case
Tirst 1-8
Quit 1/8 22-0-0
I.D.N. 1674
Confd.
13 Nov 63

20

[illegible] 2 2 2 4.71 32 15 1 D Punja 2.38 D D Re Lands
Alla Durey
Venkata Narasachary
Rama Chary
Krishna Chary
5.0.15.6
Padmanabha Sreenivasachary
Kaveripatnam
Padmanabhi Babachary 38
~~Srinivasachary~~
1/2 - 2.35 - 16-7-6
2 Krishna Chary 70
1/2 - 2.36 - 16-7-7
Purchased
Purchased Lidzu
1-1-10
1-1-10
Whole Case
1st [illegible]
Tirst 1-1-10
Quit 1/8 22-0-0
2d [illegible] Case
Tirst 1-1-10
21/8/62
I.D.N. 1675
1676
Confd.
Do

Case No. 21.
R.Ps Nos 2473 of 1862 and 112 of 1865 from Vedagarba Guru Rayachari claiming exp. for the lapsed share of deceased Subbammal. Rejected as he is not legal heir 26 Sept. [illegible]

21

[illegible] 5 5 6 2.14 28 15 1 D Punja 1 18 6 D D Re Lands
Alla Durey
Adasar Appaga Chary
Adasar Appagachary all except 1 acre for 91 Rupees
Krishna Chary
Ponnali Subbamma
Ramachary
Mathur Venkama Chary
Kaveripatnam
Mathur Ramachary 50
2 [illegible]
3 Ramachary 40
4 Venkannachary 40
[illegible] 22 - 3.11 - 22-11-6 - 1-7-8
5 Ponnali Subbamma died 12 years ago
[illegible] 22 - 103 - 6-3-9 - 1-7-10
Purchased
Purchased
Whole Case [illegible]
1st [illegible] 4
Tirst 1-7-8
Quit 1/8 22-11-0
21/8/62
Confd.
1782

Vedagarba ... mortgaged in 1864 by Subbamma for 60 Rs, the [illegible] ... no other evidence. [illegible] Vedagarba [illegible] ... a [illegible] ... by Subbamma [illegible] 1864 ... mortgage. The mortgage cannot be admitted as a right ... the claim of [illegible] ... [illegible] therefore resume this land.
25/7/62
XX
No 2525 of 1866
Vedagarba Krishna Chary claiming [illegible] the deceased
XX

22

[illegible] 8 22 10 8.57 62 0 11 D Punja 8 8 6 D D Re Lands
Alla Durey
Bala Chary
Venkata Chary
Srinivasa Chary
Varadi Srinivasa Chary
Kumbakonam
1 Varada Vasudevachary 45
2 Krishnachary 35
3 Ramachary 32
4 Bhimachary 35
5 Lakshmanachary
6 Annachary 36
7 [illegible]
Whole Case
Tirst 8-6-6
Quit 1/8 26-8-0
Confd.
do
1678

XX
[illegible] mortgaged ... of a mortgage [illegible] ... 1/2 acre ... 3-14 [illegible]

23

[illegible] 1 9 14 6.50 38 15 8 D Punja 6 3 3 D D Re Lands
Alla Durey
Narain Chary
Venkama Chary
Tirupati
Palli Venkama Chary 40
2 Krishnachary 35
3 Rama Chary 30
Lidzu
Do
Do
Endorsed
Whole Case
Tirst 10-3-3
Quit 1/8 23-8-0
21/8/62
Confd.

24

[illegible] 1 35 1 7.86 13 2 0 D Punja 6 18 6 D D Re Lands
Alla Durey
Ramachary
Kaveripatnam
Dirgha Venkata Chary 58
1/2 - 0.94 - 6-9-0 - 7-7
2 Ramachary 90
Lidzu
Whole Case 2 [illegible]
1st [illegible]
1681

[illegible] 149 [illegible]

25	[illegible] Naattu Nanje	3 84 13 5 8 7	28 15 3	[illegible]	9 4 7	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] Lt Appleer [illegible] [illegible] 7 do 4 as [illegible]	Arthe Ruraiy Athura Athanna chary do 1807 Athura Bima- chary	[illegible] Athura Bima chary do 1828 Saamaliyan Dukha chary Purchaser [illegible]	Hole Darumhyan Sambogue Streenivasa Chary 35 2 Ananta Chary 50	Purchased son Purchased brother	Hither-Avres 2 sue 1 [illegible] sue 2	[illegible] [illegible] attained [illegible] in [illegible] 201 of 1858 — [illegible] chary	Title Confirmed Tax 2-6-7 Q.R. 1/8 23-12-0 [illegible] 21/8/62 Confirmed	13 Nov 63
26	[illegible] Ayyamarum Nanje	4 16 2 4 40	55 0 8	Do	7 18 3	Do	Do	[illegible]	Arthe Ruraiy Ayeri Ananta chary do 1807 [illegible] Ragunada chary	do 1828 Do Dada chary Purchaser from [illegible]	do 1834 Mahali Dada chary do 1828 [illegible] chary	Kaveripakam Manbali Streenivasa Chary 52	Purchased son	Hither Ayes sue 1	2 deeds [illegible] produced [illegible] paper [illegible] in 18 July 1812 in favour of [illegible] 28 — [illegible] 1814	Title Confirmed Tax 7-13-3 Q.R. 1/8 26 [illegible] 21/8/62 Confirmed	[illegible] 168
26	[illegible] Nanje	2 15 2 2 37 1 83 1 96 21 11 0 17 5 8 5 00	18 4 3 11 4 5 [illegible] 0 2 18 5 4	Do	9 7 7	Do	Do	Devadayam Do	Arthe Ruraiy Manbali Ramachary do 1807 Manbali Ramachary	do 1828 Bimana chary son	do 1834 Bimana chary [illegible] chary Ladu	Kaveripakam Manbali Kistnachary 28 1/2 [illegible] 2 50 2 Streenivasa Chary 70 [illegible] 2 50	[illegible] adopted son or otherwise his [illegible] 16-2-11 Ladu	Bho [illegible] [illegible] 6-11-10 [illegible] 11 6-11-12		Title Confirmed to 2 3rd 1st [illegible] Tax 6-11-1 Q.R. 1/8 21-4 2nd [illegible] Tax 6-11-9 Q.R. 1/8 21-4 21/8/62	
	[illegible] Nanje	6 87 5 11	28 9 3		9 71		Do	Devadayam Do 1 [illegible] of [illegible] is produced	Arthe Ruraiy Athura Sohala chary do 1807 Athura Sohala chary	do 1828 Nara simma chary son	do 1834 Narasimma chary do 1828 Sohala chary Ladu	Kaveripakam Akrara Vasudeva Chary 28	Ladu	Hither [illegible] 1		Title Confirmed Tax 9-2-11 Q.R. 1/8 24-9 [illegible] 21/8/62	
	[illegible] Nanje [illegible] Nanje [illegible] Nanje [illegible]	5 11 7 6 29 1 18 7 6 46 5 31 12 5 86 [illegible] 2 5 4 06 16 12 9 16 32 21 24 0 21 91	5 16 2 50 7 2 26 3 6 28 5 5 110 10 3 118 9 5	[illegible] 5th [illegible] 16 [illegible] 15/11/71 In his case, [illegible] 3.50 became submerged under the [illegible] of [illegible], as [illegible] the field — the submerged [illegible] [illegible] in the [illegible] of [illegible] by the [illegible] in 1799. The land now [illegible] [illegible] chary [illegible] 3.50 — 26 - 13 - 10 — in the [illegible] but [illegible] there are no remarks to that effect found in the Accounts	38 4 11	Do	Do	Devadayam Do	Arthe Ruraiy Pillar Ramachary do 1807 Pillar Ramachary	do 1828 Achanta chary [illegible]	do 1834 Swami Nayachary do 1828 Surraya Chary	Hole Darumhyan 1 [illegible] [illegible] Vasudeva Chary 56 1/2 [illegible] 1 32 1-7-9 1/2 [illegible] 4 08 27-10-7 5 40 29-2-4 2 Venkatachary 33 3 Ramachary 30 [illegible] 5 40 29-2-6 Kaveripakam 4 Swami Nayachary 5 [illegible] 58-4-9	[illegible] son [illegible] Concurrence [illegible]	[illegible] Tax 7-13-3 [illegible] 7-13-3 [illegible] 15-10-5		Title Confirmed [illegible] 3 [illegible] 1st [illegible] Tax 7-13-3 Q.R. 1/8 10-12-0 11 [illegible] 2nd [illegible] Tax 7-13-3 Q.R. 1/8 11 [illegible] [illegible] Tax 15-10-5 Q.R. 1/8 5-8 22 [illegible] [illegible] 3.50 [illegible] submerged [illegible] an equal extent of [illegible] chary [illegible] field [illegible]	21/8/62
	[illegible]	[illegible] 1 90 0 1 50	9 6 0	Do	0 10 0	Do	Do	Devadayam Do	Arthe Ruraiy Do do 1807 Mallar Bimana chary	do 1828 Ahilua chary son	do 1834 Mallar Ahilua chary do 1828 Bimana chary	Kaveripakam Mallar Venkanna Charry 40	[illegible] son	Hither 44 sue	His brothers have no share in this — they have their divided share in other villages	Title Confirmed Tax 0 10 Q.R. 1/8 [illegible]	[illegible] 169

Reg. No. 1
Sheet No. 185

31	[illegible] 3·29 a 3·73	26·9 a	[illegible]	[illegible] 6911	[illegible] 2	[illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] Vacant [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Latin Do [illegible]	Chelagmaham Dalavoi Rajachari 30 2 Vedavyasachari 25 3 Narasimhachari 20 4 Venkatachari ½ share 1·86 – 23-4-6 5 Kuppachari 6 Srinivasachari 25 25 ½ – 187 – 28-4-6	[illegible] mortgage	[illegible]	Whole Cess [illegible] 1st [illegible] [illegible] 3-5 [illegible] ⅛ 2-8 [illegible] 6 [illegible] 3-6-11 [illegible] ⅛ 2-8	1643 1644 Conf. A.S. 13 [illegible]
32	[illegible] 1·31 6·76	12·0 8	Do	[illegible] 1211	Do	Do	[illegible] Do	[illegible]	[illegible] Narana chary Daughter	[illegible] Adiya Narana chary Daughter [illegible] Narana chary Daughter's son	Kanipakam Adia [illegible] 60 2 Her adopted son Tammana Chary 16	Daughter widow Her adopted son	adopted son adopted [illegible]	The adoption is proved [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Whole Cess [illegible] 12-4 [illegible] 2-12-0 25/[illegible]	1645 Conf. [illegible] do
33	[illegible] 1·47	10·5 a	Do	[illegible] 109	Do	Do	[illegible] Do	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] chary mortgagee	[illegible] [illegible] chary [illegible] chary son				Vide supplemental sheet appended hereto — [illegible] 166	
34	[illegible] 11·6 0·36	2 2 6	Do [illegible]	[illegible]	Do	Do	[illegible] Do	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Kanipakam Tolapalli [illegible] 28 2 [illegible] 28	[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Landed [illegible]	Whole Cess [illegible] ⅛ 4 [illegible]	1646 Conf. [illegible] do
35	[illegible] 0·24 8 0·86	5 2 11	[illegible]	Do	Do	Do	[illegible] Do	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Mallavarapalli [illegible] 40 2 [illegible] 35	[illegible]	[illegible] 1 [illegible] 2 [illegible] 1		Whole Cess [illegible] ⅛ 10 0 [illegible]	1647 Conf. do
36	[illegible] 15·20 8 13·57 [illegible] 2·75 2 2·23 3·71 3·94	12 12 5 30 8 44 2	[illegible]	[illegible] 4·7 1	Do	Do	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	Chennapalli [illegible] 60 2 [illegible] 60	[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] 1 [illegible] 1 [illegible] 1		Whole Cess [illegible] 7-1 [illegible] ⅛ 5	1648 Conf. [illegible]

[illegible]

Paramat Nattam 52 [illegible] Punji 1-93 1-23 | 7-6-8 | Pagoda Inam | Tax free | Do | Religious Service | No Sunnud Mentioned in the accounts of F 1212 as Dev Inam 2 | [illegible] Chinnathambi Pillaiandan In F 1227 Chinnathambi Pillaiandan | In F 1224 Pati Jamedar In F 1248 Malli Jamedar | Paladandar alias Pillaiswaram | Chinnathambi Pillaiandan 30 | Grandson | Gent 1 Remove 2 | — | To be Confd Tax 1/8 = 14-0 | 28/3/63 | Inam 1649

Supplement to the above village

Paramat Nattam No 58 [illegible] 62 1/2 Gunties 1-22-2155 | 9-10-2 1-7-1 9-5-1 | For the subsistence of the Mutt as Charity 6 | Tax free 1-18-3 | Hereditary 6 | Not known | No Sunnud This field is entered in the Circle Survey This appears to have arisen from mistake The Inamdar produces a copy extract of Sunnud in which this [illegible] is included In F 1230 ~~[illegible]~~ it is entered as a Manual Inam & appears as such in all the subsequent accts The enjoyment has been maintained from the beginning | Not the same not found | In the Nazar Zemah of F 1227 not found | In F 1230 Vedagiri Narasimha Chary [illegible] Narasimha Madhavaya Chary Kristnachary Narasimha Chary | Kottanapati Vedagarbha Nagaendra Chary 50 Leader | 2 Srinivasa Chary 44 Do | 3 Rangachary 40 Do | 4 Sagarachary 32 Do | 5 Krishnachary 65 Son | Not with [illegible] descent Gent 1 | [illegible] Gent 2 | [illegible] | To be Confd Tax 1-13-3 Tax 1/8 = [illegible] | 21/8/62 | Inam 165

[illegible] 1-53 1-13 | 1-1-4 1-03 | 2-6-6 2-16 | 2-4-1 | 6-3-0 | 8-7-1 | Nanjai Inam or an Inam originally granted for collecting Revenue as a Revenue peon The services of the peon are not required by the [illegible] & the service has been ever performed by the Inamdar [illegible] | Tax 7-7-9 | D | D | No Sunnud | Do | In F 1227 [illegible] Sadagopa Chary | [illegible] Kannunallai Ammanakkamma 30 | Grandson widow | Mother in law | To be Confd Tax 1-7-9 Tax 1/2 = 3-8-0 [illegible] | 2/12/62 | Inam 1779

[illegible] 2-30 0-2-75 | 19-15-0 | Bala [illegible] | Tax free | D | D | No Sunnud This is not found in the Nazar Zemah of F 1227 But it appears in F 1230 as an Inam continued by Captn Graham & as Inam in all the subsequent accts In the Survey a larger Inam appears in the name of Acharappa [illegible] | This Inam does not appear in the Nazar Zemah of F 1227 The Dewan [illegible] [illegible] | In F 1231 Mallam Acharappa Chary at Cheulahalli [illegible] Mr Graham ordered the continued Inam [illegible] | In F 1234 Mallam Acharappa Chary at [illegible] In F 1248 Vandara Chary Son | Kolar Narasimha [illegible] Pidda [illegible] Ramachary 30 | Brother's Grandson | Gent 1 | 2 Venkatara Chary 28 | Grandson | Gent 1 | Each enjoys 1/2 of the land | To be Confd Tax 1/8 = 2-0-0 | 27/9/62 | Inam 1651

40

Krishnagiri [illegible]

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

41 [illegible] Devoo [illegible] Kavi. 4-0-9 6·01 | 24-21 for Subsistence of Charity | Tody 6-4-11 | Very 6 | Not Known

No Sannad. This excluded appear in the Survey. Out of the Survey lists is not forthcoming. In all the accounts from F1107 this appears as Inam.

As to Survey This is not found. One of the survey lists is not forthcoming.

In F1107 [illegible]

Adia Appanna Charry

In F1130/34 Narana charry Cousin

In F1148 Naramacharry Cousin

Kāvēripatam

1 Adia Narasimha Charry 30	a Cousin's [illegible]	Not 1 dispt	
2 Tammana Charry 16-6	a Cousin's Grandson's adopted son	Adoption not set aside -1-	
3 Venkamma 60	Cousin's Daughter-in-law	husband's [illegible] wife's Daughter's son Ramachandra Charry	
1/5 share - 0·80 - 4-13-3 -			Tody 1-4-2

No 163 have obtained by inheritance & by partition 1/5 of the Inam - No 1 enjoys 1/2 of the share, No 2 - 1/4 Do, No 3 - 1/4 Do. No 3 has given away her share in gift to her husband's [illegible] Daughter's son Ramachandra Charry, under whose protection she has placed herself from long since. A deed of gift dated [illegible] & deed of partition in the family are produced.

To be Confirmed in 4 T.Ds.

1st in the name of No 1·6·3.

Tody 1-4-2

Ready Inam - 3-9-1

Qt R 1/8 } 1-8-0

[illegible] Dy Colr

2d T.D in the name of No 4

Tody 1-4-2

Qt R [illegible]

Ready Inam - 3-9-0

Qt R 1/2 } 1-12-0

Her cousins are all divided -

3d T.D in the name of No 5 -

Tody 2-8-4

Ready Inam - 7-2-0

Qt R 1/8 } 0-14-0

The 4th is a case of [illegible]. Godavary Bai was enjoying the 5th share & died. Her share had been mortgaged by her in Srimukha, or F1223, & on the alleged right of mortgage, one Adia Rama charry has been actually in possession of the Inam. One Bagavat Hanumanta charry - alleged to be her husband's brother's son & said ~~to be living at Kombaconam~~ - he never [illegible] the Inam - Notice served - but he has not [illegible] has not [illegible]. Rama charry has been enjoying the Inam as a mortgagee - I wd therefore place the Inam at once under attachment -

A [illegible] made.

Anantachary
Dy Colr
Inam Cr

6/9/62

T.D. No 1659
1660
1661

Cnfd [illegible]

Blanks

T.D. No 3

The unsettled share of No 6 should be attached for a [illegible] at once

[illegible]
24/3/66

This share has been settled in Supplementary Register No 2275

21-1-0 [illegible]

[illegible]

Ārni

4 Tulasi Bai 45	A Cousin's Daughter-in-law	None.	She has rented it to her cousin for 5 Rs.
1/5 share - 0·80 - 4-13-2 -		Tody 1-4-2	

Daranferi

5 Adia Appanna Charry 80	Cousin	41 adopted son Raghavendra Charry	
2/5 share - 1·60 - 9-10-4 -		Tody 2-8-4 -	
6 Gōdāvari Bai Died 25 years ago.	A Cousin's Daughter-in-law	None - Her husband's Brother's son Bagavat Hanumanta Charry said to be living at Kumbakonam.	
1/5 - 0·8·1 - 4-13-4		Tody 1-4-3	

No [illegible] This case was settled for the [illegible] Case No 6 on a [illegible] sheet - but for the sake of greater clearness the case have been copied same here in [illegible] writing - with such revisions as have occurred to my mind in the copying of it -

Anantachary
Dy Colr
Inam Cr

22/5/63

Register No.
Sheet No 186.

[illegible] of Case No 42.

[Rec]ord-keeper reports that such [illegible] were not forthcoming for [illegible] a mere list of Samudayam for F1152/3 - in which the Inam is [illegible] as the Inam of Puranika [illegible]. This in F1132 ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] as a descendant of the original Inamdar Puranika Ramacharry [illegible] and reasonable grounds for presuming that the family of Puranika [illegible] Marudur Kesavacharry were different ones; that the Puranika family [illegible] received it in mortgage. The year F1130 was the year [illegible] Cutcheri was held, & so it appears that the remark in the [illegible] for reliability. The Plaintiff's claim is then supported [illegible] witnesses, but he does not produce any early documents to [illegible] over the case, in consequence of the contradictory character of [illegible] witnesses. The Pltff further attempts to gain [illegible] tree filed by the Pltff & his witnesses accordingly say [illegible] that no persons by the name of Kistna Charry or Rama charry [illegible] the Deft's [illegible] Ramacharry [illegible] Kesavacharry.

The Defendant was then called on to prove his genealogy. His main support is the names of [illegible] attested by Pltff Marudur Kistna Charry. This was not produced at the time of the enquiry [illegible] names alleged to have been written [illegible] & the [illegible] statement as to proof of this alleged genealogical trees are [illegible] this list does not appear genuine. 1st no such genealogical [illegible] generally existing in Hindu families as appears from the Pltff's witnesses & 2d [illegible] the names of Rama Charry & his son Ramachandra Charry, while as appears from the witnesses [illegible] of age since 70 years ago & his son passed [illegible] about that time & who therefore could not have [illegible] years ago. The remark may be evaded in regard to Rama Charry by [illegible] in consequence of the failure of memories, it will apply with all force to Ramachandra Charry [illegible] Rama Chandracharry beyond 30 or 40 years. [illegible] of the witnesses. A witness deposes that Kistnacharry [illegible] & that Kesavacharry [illegible] funerals & yet he wd say he never heard of the death of [illegible] alleged widow Sitamma is stated by witnesses to be about [illegible] the funerals of Sitamma, Kistnacharry [illegible] quite [illegible]

xxx 3 deaths had occurred within the short time of 10 years, the fact must have been a remarkable one, & attracted the notice, or excited the surprise of the witnesses, who are all men very old and far advanced in age. Thus the whole story takes an appearance of improbability. Add to this, the evidence of the Plaintiff's witnesses, the effect that Kistnacharry had no brother within their memory or hearing, & the evidence of the acct of F1130/34 - I am inclined to believe that Dondachary has not made out his right [illegible] in the present enquiry in which he [illegible] on the [illegible] dated 1793 produced by the Pltff [illegible] Charry Puranika Kistna Charry was entered as Inamdar, while in the list of Inams of the same date [illegible] Kesavacharry does [illegible] styled in any account as Puranik [illegible] of the Deft seems to be genuine from the nature & style of its writing & character. The document [illegible] requires to be proved but [illegible] which no witnesses could be had. The object of the 2d document is to establish that [illegible] charry was the [illegible] of the Puranam at [illegible]. The other documents of the Deft go to prove his [illegible] which is amply admitted. The Pltff's claim [illegible] complete. He has produced 25 documents & he has gone to search for documents xxx

[illegible] Puranika Charry 3-32-3 3·80 | 21-15-6 | Do | Tody 1-7-10 | Do | Do | No Sannad -

As to Survey Kesavacharry Kistnacharry

As to Inam lists of F1102/3/4 sent for from the Huzur - [illegible] Kesavacharry

In F1107 Marudur Kesava Charry

In F1130 Rajah Rama Chendracharry of Seringapatam grandson of Puranika Ramacharry mortgaged in Durmati in F1211 to Marudur Kesavacharry

In F1132 Puranika Ramacharry's son Marudur Kesavacharry

In F1134 Marudur Venkanna Charry Mortgagee

In F1148 - Survey [illegible] Kesavacharry [illegible] Acharry

F Sm
1709

Kāvēripatam

Marudur Dondacharry alias Kesava Charry 28	Grandson of Kesavachary	41 son 1
2 Ragavendra Charry 22	Do	41

Undivided. This Inam was described in F1230 to have belonged to Puranika Ramacharry's son Rajah Ramachendra Charry at Seringapatam & to have been mortgaged in F1211 to Marudur Kesava Charry. The present enjoyer denies the fact of the mortgage, and asserts claim on his own right. He describes Rama Charry & Ramachendra Charry of F1230 to be his grandfather's Brother's son [illegible] which relationship is proved by the attesting witnesses of his statement.

To be Confirmed Tody 1-7-10

Qt R 1/8 2-8-0

Ramachandra is alleged to have left no heirs.

[illegible] Dy Colr

xxxx He has not as yet returned. Under these circumstances, I wd place the Inam under attachment, till the Pltff establish his claim fully. If any right could attach to Dondacharry from the fact of long uninterrupted enjoyment than 50 years the only course left is to confirm the Inam in his name & refer the Pltff to the Courts for redress.

Anantachary

25/5/63

26/8/62

The above was the proceeding of the case held on the 26th August 1862. Afterwards One Rajah Rama Chendracharry has since appeared, & states that he is the person noted in the account of F1130 - that Kistnacharry was his father, & Rama Charry was his uncle - & that he himself had mortgaged the Inam to Marudur Kesava Charry for 70 Rs., & that previous to that, the Inam had been rented to the same individual. He brings a certificate from the people of Bangalore that he is the son of Puranika Kistna Charry, who afterwards became a Sanniasi. Dondacharry [illegible] to [illegible]

On the other hand [illegible] that the Inam belongs [illegible]

The parties were [illegible] enquiry was held. [illegible]

[illegible] Charry - a person no way connected with the family of Kesavacharry & that Ramacharry held the Inam by mortgage or on rent; that Rajah Ramachendra Charry was the proper owner.

The Defendant's witnesses confirm the statement of the Defendant in regard to the genealogical tree. One of the witnesses produces an [illegible] of an old book in which the list of descent is alleged to have been [illegible]

The enjoyment of the Inam by Dondacharry from his grandfather's days is [illegible] established beyond all doubt, by the accounts commencing from the Survey, by the witnesses of the Deft, and by the admission of the Plaintiff himself. But the question is whether the party possessed of legal title to the Inam by right of descent from the original family; & which is the original family. The evidence of the accounts & the statements of the witnesses require therefore careful consideration for a [illegible] in these points. The evidence of the accounts seems to me to distinguish the two families of Puranik Ramacharry & Marudur Kesavacharry as distinct ones. In the Survey the [illegible] is mentioned in 2 lots, by 2 different persons, & recorded separately in 2 different lists. One of the lists marks down Kesavacharry & Kistnacharry as the Inamdars, the other list contains only the name of Puranika Kistnacharry. The account of F1107 recorded the name of Marudur Kesavacharry for the Inam. In the account of F1130/34, Puranika Ramacharry was recorded as the Inamdar, the former of the 2 accounts describing that Rama Charry's grandson Raja Rama Chendracharry at Seringapatam was enjoying the Inam & that the Inam was mortgaged in Durmati (F1211) to Marudur Kesava Charry. The latter not describing that the Inam of Puranika Rama Charry was mortgaged in F1211, to Marudur Venkatacharry. In other instances the account of F1132, stated that the Inamdar was Marudur Kesavacharry son of Puranika Ramacharry [illegible] Acharry [illegible] Inam

Confirmed to [illegible] present holder [illegible] claim - whose title and acknowledged possession cannot be set aside on the strength of a casual entry in one account in favor of a claimant who has by no means established his title & the mortgage [illegible] the account [illegible] place [illegible]

Register of the [illegible] in the [illegible] the Taluk of Kistnagiri [illegible] Salem District

Krishnagiri Taluk
Salem Dist.

4		7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
43 Teramal	Dry No 4 19-15-4 19·40	14-11	[illegible]	Tax 73-9-8	[illegible]	Not known	No Sannad at the Survey		Survey Pillar Venkatasetti Achari	[illegible] Kumarachary Srinivasa Chary & Bhimachary ½ share Crown appanachary ½ share
	Not No 11 9-37-9 9·94	52-2-11	Submitted hence as Charity	Note – The case was first settled as Case No 10 – & wonder [illegible] the case [illegible] it has been brought here –			Disappears Not found Wallto Nelopree Diegas	One of the Survey Lent not go pertinency		
	Do No 2 2-30-0 2·75	16-8-								
	Do No 3 1-13-0 1·32	7-15-2								
	Do No 14 4-2-12 4·07	44-12-1								
	Total Dry 4 18-3-5 18·08	121-6-2								
	Total wet & Dry 5 Fields 37-17-3 37·48	135-7-1								

Reg. [illegible]

No 14 sold to Machigani Subbanachary and Venkoba Chary

No 71246 Kumarachary Srinivasa Venkobachary

Note – The field No 11 is at the Survey entered as Talsatti Ullari [illegible] Dulukkan Nangi – 397 Gunts which is equal to 9·94 – The field now belongs to the individuals No 1 – 2 – 3 & 4, & to No 7 – 13 & 14 & to No [illegible] 17 in several shares as noted in col 16 –

In the field roll, 100 Guntas or 2·50 Acres [illegible] deducted as Poramboke included in the bed of the Tallehalli Tank in the neighbouring village of Tallehalli, as appears from a record in the Kayam Survey Account of Fusly 1207 for the village of Tallehalli. No deduction seems to have been made in the Ayakat of the Irunthahalli village. At the Survey & in Fusly the village of Pedda Tallehalli was an Inam village & the village of Irunthahalli an Inam village. In 71212, a cluster of villages including Irunthahalli & [illegible] Tallehalli were made over [illegible] as one Jari Mutta. Subsequently the Mutta was divided about 30 years ago, into the Muttas of Penneswaram, to which Irunthahalli belongs, & of Tallehalli Mutta, to which Tallehalli belongs. It appears from the evidence of the Karnam & his accounts of Jamabandi, that the [illegible] of the 100 Guntas taken up for the bed of the Tallehalli Tank has been deducted each year [illegible] under the Inam – this deduction from the Jamabandi in favor [illegible] Inam is in the Pattah fields:

	Tippan [illegible]	53-5-[illegible]
	Kolattandi Nangi –	1·25 – 11-13-11
	Total	2·78 – 17-10-5
Deducting from this, the Inam		1·80 – 14 – " – 0
The remainder		0·98 – 3-10-5

charged in the Pattah in the name of Pillar Kumarachary one of the Survey Inamdars.

In the Inam Accts of Irunthahalli this exchange of fields has not been noticed anywhere – but the extent of each field is given as it was recorded in the Survey. The fields now [illegible] representing the original Inam extent for field No 11 are thus –

In No 11 –	7·44 – 39 – " – 11 –	This is the extent taken up for [illegible] shown in the Inam [illegible]
& the new field shown in the Jamabandi Acct as Inam Deduction	1·80 – 14 – " – "	This was never brought to the Inam [illegible]
	9·24 – 53 – " – 11	Total

The enjoyments of the fields are as follows –

Nos 1 to 4 – originally enjoyed 150 Guntas or 3·75 – which was adjudged in their possession by a Decree of the Sudr Amin in 1833 – But they are represented by the Karnam & the Kartam(?), who have measured the fields to enjoy only [illegible] or 2·87 in the field No [illegible]

No 12 to 14 – ought to have according to the Sale bond 165½ Guntas or 4·14 – they are represented to the Karnam as enjoying 162½ Guntas in this field, or nearly 4·14 –

The new only Guntas 140 are represented now to be enjoyed on Pattah by in the village of Tallehalli by one Narana Chetty – the bed of the Tank having been given away for cultivation.

Enjoyers No 15 & 17 are represented to enjoy the portion of the Circar field [illegible] entered in the Jamabandi Accts of the Muttadar as Inam – According to the Agreement, that portion is said to measure 2·95 – But according to the Decree of the Zillah Court, 100 Guntas of Inam bearing an assessment of 22 Vir [illegible], subject to a tax of Rs [illegible] in Cuttikatti Nangi were put into possession of No 15 to 17. These now claim that they purchased only the Inam lands of the Survey [illegible], & that the fields that they now enjoy under the Courts order are the original fields of the Survey.

[illegible] to adjust the differences in the extent of enjoyments in the fields – [illegible] 100 Guntas of the original Inam were taken up for the tank [illegible] in the Survey Pattah fields. The [illegible] to be [illegible] Guntas or [illegible] [illegible]

The Purchaser states [illegible] for his [illegible] which had been [illegible] to the Jamabandi [illegible] taken up for the Tallehalli Tank, the compensation was [illegible] & that [illegible] therefore [illegible] of [illegible] the land [illegible] The Inam [illegible] land [illegible] from Pattah [illegible] the land to satisfy [illegible] by giving them the full extent of Inam deducted at the time of the annual settlement from the Pattah of the Muttah & which is to be [illegible] his own Pattahs show the deduction [illegible] to Inam [illegible] of the Inam fields [illegible] [illegible]

A P No 1358 of 1864 from Nos 15 to 17 – complaining that the Inam which is included in Case 9 was entered in this case and referred to Tahsildar for report.
14 Nov 1865
W.W.S.

16	17	18	19	20
1	Kaveripatam Padmanabhi Kistna Chary 70	a Purchaser	Sons 2 Daughter 2	No 1 to 4 produce 2 Deeds of Sale – 1st on stamped paper dated 15th July 1824 being a receipt of a Court peon who conducted the sale of the land under a Decree of the Court in No 38 of 1823, in favor of one Jampena Kistna Chary who purchased it at the auction for 28 [illegible] 25 – a Decree of the Salem Sadr Amin's Court dated 26th Septr 1833 decreeing the land in favor of [illegible] on right of purchase.
	In wet No 11 – 1·87 – 9-12-8 ~~10-8-9~~	Tax 5-4-7		
2	Kaveripatam Baba Chary 36	Purchasers	His sons Brother's son	
3	Srinivasa Chary 34	Do	His daughter	
4	Pandu Ranga Chary 25	Do	Wife 1	
	In wet No 11 – 1·88 – 9-12-9 ~~10-8-9~~	Tax 5-4-7		
5	Kaveripatam Machigani Venkoba Chary	Purchaser	His sons	
6	Dondo Chary 64 50	His brother	Wife 1	
	In wet No 14 – 4·07 – 44-12-1	Tax 25-8-1		
	No 5 & 6 produce a Deed of Sale on stamped paper dated 7th November 1829 & duly registered in Court & a Decree of the Register Court as noted in Suit No 81 of 1832 & the case noted in the Account of 71030 –			
7	Kaveripatam Tempasikotta Subba Chary 46	Purchaser	Wife 1	No 7 produces a Deed of Sale on stamped paper dated 8 December 1836 by Kumarachary the [illegible] survey Inamdar, then [illegible] 52½ [illegible] Copy of Colr [illegible] in the name of Subba Chary vide Colrs [illegible] dated 25 June 1866
	Wet No 13 – 1·32 – 7-15-2	Tax 4-2-8		
8	Irunthahalli Pillar Sarapatea Swami Raya Chary 55	Purchaser	Wife	No 8 & 9 – produce a Deed of Sale on stamped paper dated 1830 by Srinivasa Chary [illegible] of the Survey Inamdar [illegible] for 192½ – Copy & Registered Colr on 25 June 1836
	½ part No 12 – 1·37 – 8-4-0	a [illegible] widow	Tax 4-5-1	
9	Sotted Vizayachary 27	His Brother's son	Wife	
	½ part No 12 – 1·38 – 8-6-0	Tax 4-5-2		
10	Kaveripatam Pillara Ramachary 28	a Curved [illegible]	Wife Mother	Enjoys it within himself
	½ Dry No 4 – 9·70 – 7-0-6	Tax 3-9-4		
11	Kaveripatam Srinivasa Bhimachary 60	a Donee	Wife Uncle	Produced a Deed of gift on [illegible] paper dated Subbakrit by Pillar Appana Chary to Bhimachary
	½ Dry No 4 – 9·70 – 7-0-5	Tax 3-9-4		
12	Kaveripatam Pillari Annayachary 40	a Purchaser	His sons 3	Produce a Deed of Sale on stamped paper dated Subhakrit in 1823 by Pillar Appanachary to Kumarachary, selling 165½ Guntas to [illegible] Nangi for 250 [illegible]
13	Jammanachary 85	Do	His sons	
14	Kistnama Chary 30	Do	His sons	
	In wet No 4·14 – 21-13-8	Tax 10-8-		
15	Kaveripatam Kistnagiri Venkoba Rao 46	Purchaser	His sons 2	Produces a Decree of the Zillah Court dated 13th August 1822 certifying to the purchase by Court auction by [illegible] 100 Gunts of Cuttikatti Nangi Inam [illegible] belonging [illegible] Chary
16	Rama Rao 22	His brother	Sons 1	
		10-8-10		

21
To be Confirmed in 10 T.D.s –
1st in the name of No 1 – Tax 5-4-7 / Quit rent – 5-4-2 / D.C. ⅛ 2 · [illegible] – 10 T.D. Confirmed
2d in the name of No 2 to 4 – Tax 5-4-7 / D.C. ⅛ = [illegible] – Confirmed
With regard to the above Share of No 2, No 1 states that the 2 shares included contain a deficiency in area of 1·10, & that the father of No 2 executed to him a karar namah in Subhakrit (71253) leaving to him the power of recovering the deficit & vested it [illegible] right to the extent of the deficit. He produced a kararnamah & claims that that 1·10 ch. be deducted from the T.D. of No 2, & added to him; but we do not find proof of the whether there actually any deficiency, & 2 of them was defeated [illegible] not yet recovered – & both parties enjoy the lands in 2 equal shares, & pay the tax accordingly. The [illegible] [illegible] have brought into force. No 2 [illegible] disputes it.
3d T.D. in the name of [illegible] – Tax 2[illegible] / D.C. ⅛ [illegible]
4th T.D. [illegible] – Tax 4-2-6 / D.C. ⅛ · 8 – – Confirmed
5th T.D. in the name of No 8 – Tax 4-5-1 / D.C. ⅛ · 8 – Confirmed
6th T.D. in the name of No 9 – Tax 4-5-[illegible] / D.C. ⅛ 2 · 8 – Confirmed
7th T.D. in the name of No 10 – Tax 3-9-4 / Quit rent – 3-7-[illegible] / D.C. ⅛ 2 · 8 [illegible] – Confirmed
8th T.D. in the name of No 11 – Tax 3-9-4 / D.C. ⅛ 2 · 8 – Confirmed
9th in the name of No 12 to 14 – Tax 10-8- / Quit rent – 11-5-4 / D.C. ⅛ 1-8 – Confirmed
The 10th T.D. in the name of No 15 to 17 – Tax 6-15- / Quit rent 3-12-3 / D.C. ⅛ 2 · 8 –

	S. Cirs
1710	[illegible]
1711	2-31
1712	
1713	
1714	
171[illegible]	

14/3/[illegible]

Krishnagiri Taluk | Isoundapalli, Krishnagiri Taluk

[illegible] Village No. 144 Isoundapalli, a Zemindari village in the Taluk of [illegible] in the Krishnagiri Taluk

[illegible] 478 | 172 | 10 5 0 | Brahma [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | Devadayam

At the [illegible] Mahalakshmi Ranga = chary

[illegible] Krishna chary Mandapam

[illegible] Mallum Krishna chary [illegible] Ranga chary [illegible] Rama [illegible] chary [illegible]

Nazaranam in the [illegible] [illegible]

Mahalakshmi -
1 Vada [illegible] chary 45 | Brahmin | Son 1 | No. 102 acres 7/8 share
2 [illegible] chary 40 | Do | Wife 1 | No. 8 1/4 1/8 share
3 [illegible] chary 25 | Brahmin [illegible] | Wife 1 | No. 5 1/8 share
4 Rama chary 16 | Do | Wife 1
5 Ranga chary 29 - | Brahmin | Wife 1 - | Vakil [illegible] [illegible] chary of [illegible] 28/11/63

This included in the Krishnagiri attachment list No. 2 dated 28th October 1863 and the Zemindar's Vakil has appeared & is [illegible] the [illegible] he has been informed that the case will be [illegible] as attachment [illegible] [illegible] Inam

Tole Cash
Total 10 9
[illegible] 7/8 1 6 0
[illegible]

This Inam is under attachment by having become recommended to the Collector of the Dt for attachment on the 28th October 1863 -

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

It is not clear whether the present holders are descendants of the original Zemindar or of the mortgagee - The inam is confirmed however as recommended without prejudice (in the event of the latter being the case) to the [illegible] right of the orig[ina]l Zemindar.

T. K.
24/3/66

2 - 4 | 780

[illegible] [illegible] 1780

Supplemental Register No. 1
Sheet No. 187
Isoundapalli Village

entered in the regr
Regr & issued

Sheet 6

Collr written to, to release
14-6-67

Supplemental

Register No 118
Sheet No 208

Velavalli village
Krishnagiri Tk
Salem Dt

Fair Copied

Krishnagiri Taluq

Batavarti subsistence Inam — No 140 Oradi punji — Guntas 255 7/16 — 6·38 — 2-7-5 — 2-7-5 — Granted by a former Government — Reg No 118 — Jodi 4-10 — Hereditary — Not known

Vélávalli —

No Sanad but Jodi pattas are produced. By the Kayam Tirva account of Fusly 1207 and other subsequent accounts the Inam is proved to be 50 years old —

Rámápandithan — Son of Thirumalapandithan

The name of Rámápandithan is entered in the Kayam Tirva account of Fusly 1207. In the accounts of Fusly 1230 the name of Venkatrámápandithan is entered as the son of Séshapandithan deceased. The same name appears in the accounts of Fusly 1232 & 34. The name of Séshachelapandithan appears in the account of Fusly 1248 as the great grandson of the original grantee —

Séshapandithan the Son of the original grantee Venkatrámápandithan grandson whose name appears in the accounts of Fusly 1232 & 34 Séshachelapandithan great grandson whose name is entered in the accounts of Fusly 1248.

Séshayan alias Séshachelapandithan or Séshagiri aiyan age 52

Vániambadi

Great Grandson of the original grantee

Wife — 1
Son — 1
daughter 1
Brother — 1
Brother's wife 1
Brother's son 1
6

The Inam is of an older date than 50 years and has been in the enjoyment of the family of the original grantee. It is therefore recommended to be confirmed to the party in the 16th column at 1/8th Quit rent which has been agreed to — Quit-rent at 1/8th „ 4-4
Former Jodi — „ 4-10
„ 9-2

The Inám was laid under attachment in consequence of the nonappearance of the Inámdár before the Inám Deputy Collector, but as he has since appeared within the time required by notice before the Tasildar, the Inám is recommended to be released from attachment

13-7-66 — W. Thomas, Sub Collector

Confirmed on a Combined Quit-Rent of 10 Annas & released from attachment

16-3-67

2-4

I.D. No. 1791
89

2-7-5
4-10
2-2-7
4-4
9-2 10 Annas

5

Batavarti or Subsistence Inam — No 277 Pallam Nanji — Guntas 45 1/16 — 1·13 — 6-10-8 — 6-3-2 — Not Known — Reg No 52 — Jodi 13-4 — Hereditary — Granted by a former Government

As per Reg

Collr written to, to release
14-6-67

Registered

Supplemental

Fair Copied

Malayándahalli

Krishnagiri Taluq, Salem Dt

No Sanad but Jodi Pattahs are in existence —

By Paimash account of Fusly 1304 and the Kayam Tirva account of Fusly 1207, the Inám is proved to be of longer standing than 50 years

Thiramalapanditan

In the Pymash and Kayam Thirva accounts, the name of Vaniambady Thirumala panditan appears. In the accounts of Fusly 1230-32 & 34, the name of Séshachalaya is entered as the son of Rámapanditan. In Fusly 1248, the name Venkatrama panditthan is entered

Tirumala panditan entered in Pymash & Kayam accounts one and the same. Séshachalayan entered in the account of Fusly 1230-32 & 34 is the grandson and Venkatrámá pandithan entered in Fusly 1248 the great grandson of the original grantee

Séshayan alias Sethagiri ayaner or Séshachalapanditan — age 52

Vániambady

Great grandson of the original grantee

Wife — 1
Son — 1
Daughter — 1
Brother — 1
Brother's wife — 1
Brother's son — 1
6

The Inám is of an older date than 50 years. It is therefore recommended to be confirmed to the party in the 16th Column at 1/8th Quit-rent which has been agreed to —
1/8th Quit Rent „ 10-9
Former Jodi „ 13-4
1 8 1

This Inám was laid under attachment in consequence of the non-appearance of the Inámdár before the Inám Deputy Collector, but as he has since appeared within the required time before the Tasildar, the Inám is recommended to be released from attachment.

13-7-66 — W. Thomas, Sub Collector

Confirmed at recommended or a Combined Q R of R 1„8„ & be released from attachment.

21-1-67

2-4

I.D. No. 1790
87

Batavarti or Subsistence — No 35 Mittur Nanji — Guntas 57 — 1·42 — 4-3-5 — 4-3-5 — Minandian — Reg No 5 — Granted by former Government for Panchangi Service — Sarva Inam — Hereditary — Not Known

As per Reg

Reg No 8

Shrotriem

Supplemental

Fair Copied

Thellanahalli (Shrotriem)

Krishnagiri Taluq, Salem Dt

No Sanad or other documents

The Inám is proved by the accounts to be more than 50 years old —

Buchibattan —

The Inám is entered as Panchangi Inám in the Pymash account of 1795 and in the Kaiyam Tirva account of Fusly 1207. But no name is mentioned. In the account of Fusly 1230-32 & 34 the name of Buchibattan is entered. In Fusly 1248 the name of Pápayan appears as the son of Buchibattan

Pápayan entered in the account of Fusly 1248 is the son of the party in Column 13.

Elangalipatti in Dharmapury Táluq

Venkatrámayan alias Venkatrama battan age 28

Grandson to the original grantee

Wife — 1
Daughter — 1
Father — 1

The Inám is of an older date than 50 years. It is therefore recommended to be confirmed to the party in the 16th column at 1/8th Quit Rent Rs „ 8 „ which has been agreed to

13-7-66 — W. Thomas, Sub Collector

Report whether the Inam is really enjoyed by the Kissa Shrotriemdar or by the parties in Col 16 as it can only be confirmed in the latter case

~~Confirmed as recommended~~

It is reported that there is no such Inam & that it is enjoyed by the Kissa Shrotriemdar of the village without any right. The Inam therefore fully

Regr. Bandanapalli Village

Krishnagiri Taluk Salem Dt.

...st No:
ber orig[illegible]
Regr.

Kódi-Punji No 72
Ulléri Nanji

Guntas 690

25

15¾ 1° 64 4-14-1 4-14-1
755¾ 18°89 16-3-1 16-3-1

Not Known

Tóde 3-0-8

Hereditary

Not Known

No Sanad or other documents
The Inám is proved to be more than 50 years old by the accounts—

Kristnam battan

In the Pymaish account of 1798 the name of Kichibattan is entered as the Inámdár. In the Káyamtirva account of Fusly 1207 the Inám is entered without the name of the holder. In Fusly 1230 Kuppábattan's name appears. The same individual's name is entered in the accounts of Fuslies 1232, 34. In the account of 1248 the name of Venkat Kistnambattan is entered as the grandson of the original grantee—

Kichibattan whose name is entered in the Pymash account and Kuppábattan entered in the accounts of Fuslies 1230-32 & 34, are the sons, and Venkatakrishnambattan whose name is entered in the account of Fusly 1248, the grandson of the original Grantee

Krishnambhotla age 20

Kammayanalliir in the attengari Taluq

Great grandson to the original grantee

Mother 1
Sisters 2
3

The Inám being of an older date than 50 years is recommended to be confirmed to the party in the 16th Column at 1/8th Quit Rent which has been agreed to—

1/8th Quit Rent 1-10-0
Former Jodi 3-0-8
4-10-8

13-7-66

M. Thomas
Sub-Collector

Confirmed
recommended
at a Q. R. of
Rs 4-11-12
W.M.
21-1-67

8th

Regr. No 82

Fair Copied

Menar Inam Regr. No 13 - Chennekavundanpalli

Batavarti or Subsistence grant

Dry

Guntas 360 6/16

9·4

16-4-2

14-12-1

Granted by a former Government

Sarva Inám

Hereditary

Granted by a former Government
Time unknown

No Sanad - a deed of gift executed by Buchammál in the year Parídhava—
By Pymaish and Káyamtirva accounts, this Inám is proved to be 50 years old—

Rámábhotlu

In the account of 1796 the Inám is entered in the name of Rámábhotla as Panchangi Inám. In Fusly 1208, the Inám is entered in the name of Rámábhotlu. In Fusly 1230 the name of Buchammál is entered as the daughter in law of the Inámdár. The same entry appears in the accounts of Fuslies 1232. 34 & 48—

Krishnagiri Taluq Salem Dt.—

The party in the 10th column is the same individual whose name appears in the Pymaish and Káyamtirva accounts. Buchammal whose name appears in the subsequent accounts is the daughter in law of the original grantee—

I Sishabattan age 45
II Sundara Sástre age 40

Dharmapuri
Rayakóta

aliences through remotely related to the party entered in the accounts of Fusly 1230 and subsequent accounts—

I
Daughter 1
Sons 4
Wife 1
6

II
Daughters 2
Son 1
Wife 1
4

acquired the Inám by alienation 20 years ago

The Inám is of an older date than 50 years, but the parties in present possession having acquired the Inám through gift only 20 years ago, the Inám is recommended to be confirmed to them subject to 1/4th Quit Rent Rs 3-6

13-7-66

M. Thomas
Sub Collector

The same information [illegible] called for in Case of the village of Khande Koundenhalli Regr. No 8 of this Taluq is required in this case
W.M.
31-5-67

Register No 13
(Shrotriem Jari Mittah)

Fair Copied

Menar Inam Regr. ~~No~~ 10 Khandekoundenhalli

Batavirti or Subsistence Inam

Dry class Maram punji

Guntas 201

5°02

2-5-11

2-5-11

Granted by a former Government

do

Hereditary

Granted by a former Government
Time unknown

No Sanad a deed of gift executed by Buchammal in the year Parábava

Rámábhotlu

In the Káyamtirva account of Fusly 1207 the Inám is entered in the name of Rámábhotlu. In Fusly 1230 the name of Buchammal appears as the daughter in law of Rámábhotlu deceased. The same entry appear in the accounts of 1232 [illegible]

Rámabhotlu is the party in the 13th column is the same person whose name appears in the Káyamtirva account of 1207. Buchammál whose name appears in the subsequent accounts is the daughter in law of the [illegible]

Krishnagiri Taluq Salem Dt.

I Sesha battan age 45
II Sundara Sastre age 40

Dharmapuri
Ráyakótai

aliences through remotely related to the party entered in the accounts of Fusly 1230

I
Daughter 1
Sons 4
Wife 1
6

II
Daughters 2
Son 1
Wife 1
4

acquired the Inám by alienation 20 years ago.

The Inám is of an older date than 50 years but the parties in the 16th column having acquired it by a recent alienation (20 years ago) the Inám is recommended to be confirmed subject to 1/4th Quit Rent Rs 0-8-0 annas eight

13-7-66

M. Thomas
Sub Collector

The Inam has already been fully assessed because the party now in the 16th col [illegible] before the [illegible] to state how the Inam was acquired by the parties in Col 16, whether the sellers are alive, & if so, what they have [illegible] regarding the alienation
16.5.67 W.M.

per Regr.

Regr. No 10
(Shrotriem Jari Mittah)