[illegible] Supplemental

Inam Register of [illegible] in [illegible] Village
Krishnagiri Taluk Salem Dist.
[illegible]

5 8 8

Register No 8
Sheet No 169

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

1 Devadayam [illegible] D No 113 · 1820·89 · 1·13·5 · [illegible] of Ramanathaswamy at [illegible] The temple is in [illegible] · [illegible] · [illegible] · Inam Appears in the [illegible] accounts [illegible] 400 years [illegible] · [illegible] Ramanatha Rajaswamy [illegible] Ramanatha Rajaswamy · [illegible] Pujari [illegible] · Ramanathapuram Ramanatharaja swamy Pujari ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] 400 [illegible] · To be confirmed Tax free [illegible] in the name of the Deity 12/10/62 · T.D. No 1612 Confirmed 25/10/63

2 Devadayam [illegible] D No 17 · 5·90 · 5·22 · 1·8·9 · [illegible] of Chennaraya swamy at Fellamahatti The temple is in good order · D · D · Inam · D · [illegible] Perumal [illegible] Perumal · [illegible] Pujari Ramanuja [illegible] · Fellamahatti Chennaraya swamy or Perumal Pujari Chennaya 35 · To be confirmed [illegible] 9 6 Tax free T.D. in the name of the Deity 12/9/62 · T.D. No 1613 Conf 25/10/63

5-12 · 5-61

3 [illegible] · 23·3·2 · 8·10·2 · 3·21·4 · [illegible] Fellamahatti [illegible] at Fellamahatti It is [illegible] · D · D · Inam · D · [illegible] · [illegible] · Entered in the attachment list dated 28th October 1863 since one year expired. ~~Fully~~ accepted for default · Supl Register received for this case & further enqr. Rep. — 14/11/66 · 24/3/66

4 [illegible] · 1·22 · 6·5·5 · [illegible] · D · D · Inam · [illegible] · [illegible] · There are no heirs to this Inam. The [illegible] of the village enjoys this without any [illegible]. Collr. asked for further information in Supplemental Register 21.1.67 [illegible] · To be resumed for the reasons stated in the column of remarks · [illegible] 25/10/66

G No 9 Supplemental [illegible] Village

Inam Register of Vadamangalam No 383 Tax free Village in the Krishnagiri Taluk Salem Dist.

This is a [illegible] Inam village

[illegible] · 1838 · 19·09 · [illegible] 4·5·0·11 · 12·3·4 · 19·20 · [illegible] 9·8·0·92 · 12·35 · 19·92 · 16·10 · 3·10 · 16·13·10 · 6·4·7 · 23·2·5 · [illegible] of Perumal at Vadamangalam The temple is in good order · [illegible] · [illegible] · Inam It appears in the accounts from [illegible] as Inam · [illegible] Perumal [illegible] Pujari Perumal [illegible] · [illegible] Ramani [illegible] · Vadamangalam Perumal Pujari Ramani ~~[illegible]~~ Deseri 30 · To be confirmed Rs 6-9-0 T.D. in the name of the Deity 31/10/62 · T.D. No 1614 Confirmed 25/11/62

6 Devadayam [illegible] · 8·37 · 8·92 · 7·9·3 · [illegible] of Ranga at Vadamangalam The temple [illegible] · D · D · Inam · D · [illegible] Ranga Pujari Chinna · [illegible] Ranga Pujari [illegible] · Vadamangalam Ranga Pujari [illegible] · Settled in Supplement · [illegible] · Resumed

Case Nos 2 & 3
a [illegible] No 74 of 1865 from Pujaris
[illegible] and [illegible] regarding [illegible] Deeds.
[illegible] as the [illegible] resumed [illegible]

In the Register of Vadamangalam [illegible] village [illegible]

323

3 Pallalamma [illegible] Nanja — 8 0 — 8 4 6 — Temple supported by Pallalamma at Vadamangalam ~~[illegible]~~ — [illegible] — Inam — It appears in all the Accounts from Fusli [illegible] — Do. — Pallalamma Pujari Peddamma — Do. Pallalamma Pujari Palla [illegible] Cull — Vadamangalam Pallalamma Pujari [illegible] — [illegible] it is recorded that the Inadar [illegible] village has [illegible] left the Inam to the Agraharam the Agraharam enjoys the Inam [illegible] — Inam also an [illegible] property enjoyed without any right to Agraharam [illegible] performed — [illegible] — Resume — 25/10/[illegible]

Written to Collr 10/2/70

Settled in supplement.

4 [illegible] Nanja — 6 30 — 6 75 — 2 16 — [illegible] — [illegible] — Inam — Do. — Not found — of [illegible] — Do. [illegible] Ammal [illegible] Agraharam [illegible] — Inam an [illegible] property. [illegible] it is recorded that [illegible] family became extinct & that [illegible] Agraharam [illegible] Inam [illegible] — Inam an [illegible] property as shown in the column of enjoyment [illegible] — Resume — 25/10/[illegible]

[illegible] from 30 years without any title [illegible]

[illegible] Supp. [illegible] 3/2/70 [illegible]

Reject No 10 ~~12~~ 10

In the Register of [illegible] village of Devasamudram [illegible] No 14 in the [illegible] Taluk

[illegible] village

1 [illegible] Nanja — 18 — 0 47 — 1 1 10 — For the support of Pamamma at ~~Devasamudram~~ [illegible] No temple exists [illegible] for [illegible] years — [illegible] — Inam — It appears in all the accounts from Fusli [illegible] — Do. Vedamangalam [illegible] — Do. Pujari Mala [illegible] Do. Pujari Chella — [illegible] Pamamma Pujari ~~Pujari~~ Chella of Devasamudram [illegible] — Tolu Conferred Taxfree [illegible] the Goddess — [illegible] — Con[illegible] [illegible]

16/5

2 [illegible] 85 — 1 9 4 2 — For the support of Devasamudram [illegible] at Devasamudram [illegible] 186 136 — Do. — Do. — Do. — Inam — Do. — Do. Ramaswami[?] — Do. Rama Rao — Do. Ragunatha Rao — C. Ramaswamy Nayakan Purchasr 45 — [illegible] Brothers — [illegible] 25th [illegible] 1858 [illegible] 1859 [illegible] Ramaswamy [illegible] C. Ramaswamy Naiker for 200 Rs — Vakil [illegible] of [illegible] — 29/11/62 — Tolu Conf. Taxfree [illegible] — 29/11/62 — [illegible] — 25/

3 [illegible] Nanja — 5 18 — 1 20 — 2 18 4 — [illegible] — Do. — Do. — Do. — Inam — Do. — Do. [illegible] Eimma — Do. [illegible] Eimma — Do. [illegible] Eimma — Entered in the attachment list dated 28th October 1865. Time one year expired. Fully assessed for default. T. R. 24/3/66

4 [illegible] Nanja [illegible] — 3 70 — 3 70 — 1 1 6 — [illegible] — Do. — Do. — Do. — Inam — Do. — [illegible] — Do. [illegible] — Do. Chella — Do. Fully assessed for default — T. R. 24/3/66

[illegible] — 1 40 — 05 — 2 8

3 99 — 3 75 — 1 4 2

Register No 9

Vadamangalam Continued
Kristnagiri Taluk
Salem Dist.

Shrotreeina

Register No 9
Sheet No. 170

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personal | Wet Ac. 6-30.<br>51<br>Hayatnanja | 6.75 | — | 21-1-6 | Bhata vritti | Tax free | Here Not ditary known | No Sunnud | . | In F. 1207<br>Hedagarhalli Sama chari | In F. 1248 Narasimhachari Agraharamdar. He enjoys as if the widow of Samachari gave it in gift to him | Cavaripatam<br>Rangammal<br>40<br>½<br><br>Kristnagiri<br>Giriyammal<br>alias<br>Bogiratamal<br>50<br>½ | Daughter in law of the party in F. 1248<br><br>Do. | son 1<br>daughters 4<br>grandsons 2<br>7<br><br>2 daughters<br>2 grandsons<br>3 grand daughters<br>7 | The original grantee died issueless. His wife Subbammal before her death appears to have given this Inam ~~for~~ in gift to Canchy Venkanna-chary the grandfather of the husbands of the present holders about 60 years ago. The gift is noted in the Acct of F 1248 & 59 | This Inam was resumed upon the remark of the Dy Collector in the Original Regr that it was one usurped by the Agrahards upon the extinction Original Family. ~~And the~~ From the Tasildar's Urge Of 31-12-69 No. 36. It appears that the Inam was given in gift by the original grantee's wife to the grand-father of the husbands of the present holders and that they are in enjoyment since a long time. I would confirm the Inam with a compulsory Q. R. of Rs 23/4 at 1/8 of the Asst.<br><br>5 February 1870<br>W. Wasim |

Confirmed
Quit. 2-12-0
3/2/70 M

75-

~~[illegible]~~
Dolor Inam

Wo
T. D. No
1802.

Ayakat [illegible] No ~~8~~ ~~9~~ 8 9

~~[illegible]~~

Regr No 9
Sheet No 171

# Inam Register of Taxfree village of Vadamangalam No 32 in the Amani Portion of the Kistnagiri Taluk Salem District

This is a Dumbala village — The soil is good — The wet is supplied by a single Tank, which is supplied by the Channels of the Ponnayar — The aspect is healthy — The [illegible] commence work the [illegible] of [illegible] —

Xan
1559

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

No 1}

Personal Sarva Inam Village of Vadamangalam No 32 in the [illegible]

| | Ayakat | |
|---|---|---|
| Ayakat | 578-39 | |
| Deduct Poramboke | 90-96 | |
| arable Extent | 487-43 | |
| Deduct Inam | 73-45 | 162-12-7 |
| Remaining Sircar | 413-98 | |
| add Portion Poramboke Subsequently cultivated | 3-25 | 11-6- |
| Total | 417-23 | |

| | Particulars | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assessed land | Dry | 234-82 | 257-12-5 | |
| | Wet | 114-14 | 535-6-7 | |
| | | 348-96 | 793-3- | |
| Unassessed | Dry | [illegible] | 17-15- | Charged at 8 Annas per acre |
| | Wet | 28-79 | [illegible]-12- | Charged 2 Rs per acre |
| | | 58-27 | 17-11- | |
| Total | Dry | 274-30 | 277-11-5 | |
| | Wet | 142-93 | 613-2-7 | |
| | | 417-23 | 890-14- | Estimated Ayakat value |

[illegible] and Beriz during the last 5 years

| Fasly | Dry | | Wet | | Total | | Ded. of Jama land Beriz | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1267 | 201 | 84 | 68 | 5 | 269 | 89 | 625 | 7 | 7 |
| 1268 | 201 | 84 | 68 | 5 | 269 | 89 | 625 | 7 | 7 |
| 1269 | 201 | 84 | 68 | 5 | 269 | 89 | 625 | 7 | 7 |
| 1270 | 201 | 84 | 68 | 5 | 269 | 89 | 625 | 7 | 7 |
| 1271 | 201 | 84 | 68 | 5 | 269 | 89 | 625 | 7 | 7 |
| | 1007 | 20 | 340 | 25 | 1349 | 45 | 3127 | 5 | 11 |
| | 201 | 84 | 68 | 5 | 269 | 89 | 625 | 7 | 7 |

The Ayakat Beriz is 890 Rs — The returns of the Sharadars shews a Beriz of Rs 625 Rs on the average — In the partition deeds of the land, [illegible] between the 2 brothers [illegible] [illegible] to yield 300 Rs [illegible] [illegible] from their lands [illegible] & fix the average Beriz of the village at 800 Rs making allowance for the [illegible] land shown under the head of [illegible] land —

For Subsistence as Charity

Taxfree

Granted in the Mohammedan year 1216 by Hyder Ali

The original Sanad of Hyder Ali free [illegible] dated [illegible] 1216 — granting the village of Vadamangalam [illegible] to Venkanna Chary [illegible] of an allowance of 15 Pagodas [illegible] as Sarva Inam tenure.

2nd — 2 [illegible] dated [illegible] on the subject of granting the Inam.

3rd — ~~Capt~~ Graham's Taliq dated 11th February 1793 — directing the village to be left in the possession of the Inamdars, & [illegible] at the same time that the [illegible] of the village be made.

4th Mohammedan [illegible] copy of Mr Graham's order dated [illegible] June 1803 directing the Inam village under [illegible] to be released from attachment.

5th Authenticated copy of [illegible] of Mr Graham dated 19th June 1803 — directing the Collectors [illegible] attachment [illegible] the [illegible] Narasimha Chary.

6th A Taliq of Mr [illegible] Cockburn dated 11th December 1821 releasing the village from a [illegible] which he had made & directing that [illegible] Should be Collected from the Inamdar.

Extract granted to Rangamma Mother of Narasimhamurti Achari the party No 1 in Col. 16 thro' her Vakil Ramachariyar 18-5-68

[illegible] Venkanna Chary ×

~~[illegible]~~
In Mr Graham's Taliq of 1793 — Venkanna Chy
In the Taliq of 1803 — Narasimha Chy
In the Taliq of Mr [illegible] Cockburn in 1822 Narasimha Chy [illegible]
In the Register of 1804 — Narasimha Chary [illegible] Beriz of [illegible] was [illegible] Pas [illegible] 199-41-75 or 409 Rs
[illegible]

1. Narasimha murti Achari age 6 yrs

2. Giriammal alias Bagerti Ammal

1 Srinivasa Chary died 6 years ago & his brother (2) Venkanna Chary died 4 years ago —

Grandson

Grandson

Heir No 1 wife Rangamma 35 — son Narasimha murti Achari Daughter 4 [illegible]
Born 4 months after father's death

(2) Heir No 2 wife Giriammal alias Bagerti Ammal 45 — Daughters Narsamma [illegible] & Kamamma [illegible] who have [illegible] Adopted son Venkanna from 3 years ago [illegible]

This is a Sarva Inam grant of Hyder Ali 1797. It was confirmed by Tippu, & at the assumption of the Country Mr Graham confirmed it in 1799 — Subsequently Mr [illegible] Cockburn [illegible] the village [illegible] the [illegible] It was again [illegible] as Inam in 1803 — Again about 1820 Mr [illegible] Cockburn placed the village under attachment on a complaint [illegible] that the village was a village subject to a [illegible] which the Sharadars [illegible] — On due enquiry Mr [illegible] Cockburn restored the village to its Sarva Inam tenure — 1822

2 The village is now enjoyed as ~~[illegible]~~ a Sarva Inam ~~[illegible]~~

3 This is a case of [illegible] The original grantee's grandsons [illegible] The deceased left behind them the heirs specified in Col 19 — Srinivasa Chary left a [illegible] & 4 daughters & a posthumous son [illegible] brother No 2 [illegible] another heir was born & 2 daughters — A year after his death [illegible] the case being ~~[illegible]~~ the ~~[illegible]~~ 2 daughters [illegible] Case was referred to [illegible] and laid over for the [illegible] of the Collector's office — The two individuals appear by proxy [illegible] Inam Commission. The widow of the deceased [illegible] widow of Srinivasa Chary [illegible] pleaded that [illegible] On behalf of Rangammal widow of [illegible] that the [illegible] for avoiding [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] that both the brothers were divided [illegible] that the land was [illegible] [illegible] for any permanent purpose [illegible] [illegible] the whole [illegible] between the brothers [illegible] [illegible] Rangammal [illegible] [illegible] had a male offspring — Rangammal [illegible] [illegible] be registered in name of her son [illegible] widow of Venkanna Chary [illegible] [illegible] both the brothers — On behalf of Bagerti Ammal widow [illegible] [illegible] divided families — [illegible] [illegible] & that the half [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] Srinivasa Chary may be registered in the name of his widow or his son; & that the half share of Venkanna Chary may be registered in the name of her daughter [illegible] [illegible] that in Sarva Inam [illegible]

The evidence & statements of both the parties the facts elicited are, that in Sarva Inam [illegible] village for the 2 brothers, with the consent of their father divided the whole estate reserving the division of their village for [illegible] [illegible] The partition deeds of Sarva are recognized by both the parties. In the partition deeds or [illegible] [illegible] "I shall have right to the family inheritance [illegible] [illegible] exchanged between the 2 brothers in the year [illegible] [illegible] I shall have no power or right to sell any portion to which [illegible] of [illegible] in the line of our grandson [illegible] [illegible] I [illegible] any gift [illegible] be made, ~~[illegible]~~ cannot do so without the orders of our father. & after his death [illegible] [illegible] I cannot do so without your consent." In the para [illegible] both [illegible] the documents [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] all the [illegible] that [illegible] be [illegible] of the body ~~[illegible]~~ in the line of our grandson & succession. & [illegible] [illegible] & no [illegible] between me & you in respect to any property except [illegible] [illegible] which are left in common."

These circumstances clearly shew that the 2 brothers were divided in all respects, in interest & [illegible] so far as [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] inheritance & succession — but [illegible] in that neither could [illegible] sell or give away any [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] without each other's consent — This [illegible] was [illegible] [illegible] favorable against any alienation of the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] in force for a long time — [illegible]

Approved [illegible]

Appeal [illegible] dated [illegible] No 2401 [illegible]

App. [illegible] dated 20 Oct 1871 No 2457 —

Both parties appear [illegible] the decision of the Deputy Collector who rejected [illegible] the claim of the [illegible] to exclusive Register in his name & that [illegible] to the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] & the course [illegible] the Deputy [illegible] be disturbed [illegible] Contending parties [illegible]

[illegible] in the village [illegible]

so that each [illegible] enjoys one half of each field with a few exceptions. Bagu Lawa produced a [illegible] of partition of [illegible] in the village [illegible] one common paper dated Sadharana or 1261. The partition deed refers to the deed of Olava & the division of the plots was made because the 2 brothers could not [illegible] without dividing the [illegible] of the village in equal shares. In fact the division was also [illegible] by the [illegible] of Ramyama's Vakil in 1856 before the Kulkarni [illegible] Olava & Sadharana both the brothers [illegible] each other & executing [illegible] or mutual Razinamas [illegible] of the [illegible] of the village. Ramyama's Vakil denies that any partition deed of the kind (dated Sadhara) produced by Bagu to the party ~~[illegible]~~ was ever executed. He says that the [illegible] produced by the other party was dated "Sravanaya" the year prior to Sadharana ~~[illegible]~~ which ~~[illegible]~~ was never executed. Bapurama's Vakil states in reply that the division of the fields was commenced in Sravanaya & after it was finished the partition deed was [illegible] & dated [illegible] the partition came into effect in the succeeding year Sadharana. Whatever may be the pros & cons on the partition deed [illegible] is clear from the present enjoyment that ~~each field~~ a moiety of each plot is enjoyed by the parties & so there is no question that the lands were [illegible] divided.

The only question to be examined for the settlement of the dispute is whether the terms of the Olava document which are [illegible] at no subsequent date cancelled between the parties, in any of their several [illegible] Razinamas [illegible], allow of inheritance of either of the shares by a daughter's son. Bapurama's Vakil states that the Sadharana Partition deed & the present divided enjoyment amount to a tacit cancelment of the terms of Olava. Ramyama's Vakil produces on the contrary copy of a Razinama alleged to have been filed by both the brothers on the 21st Jul 1855, before the Kulkarni. It [illegible] given in a case of [illegible] complained of by one brother against the other. It runs to the effect that the property should go only to the male heirs of either & that each should have liberty of leaving his share as he pleased [illegible] [illegible] of this Razinama is found in the Kulkarni's office. It appears to belong to no case. No [illegible] of the case in which it is alleged to have been filed appears in the Calendar of [illegible] for the month of Jul 1855. ~~[illegible]~~ nor does the complaint or examination appear to accompany it. One of the ~~documents~~ witnesses to the document by supporting statement he alleges having put in his signature ~~[illegible]~~ in [illegible]. He cannot undertake to say anything more ~~[illegible]~~ on the merits of the documents which falls within the province of the Civil Courts. [illegible] because the 2 brothers did both come [illegible] in the [illegible] of that year ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~

From the fact that the ~~[illegible]~~ division of Sadharana [illegible] alleged [illegible] of any remarks in [illegible] of the subsequent documents in respect of future succession it must be inferred that as regards future understanding the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] or [illegible] new [illegible] in [illegible] in respect of future [illegible] annulling the terms of the Olava document or [illegible] [illegible] were understood [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] [illegible] in the wording of it in [illegible] [illegible] the terms of the Olava document [illegible] the terms of future succession [illegible] mentioned in the Olava document [illegible]

It is also a question whether the terms of future succession include an inheritance by a daughter's son.

For the purpose of the present inquiry, it is enough to take their divided state as each share in the enjoyment, & whether the [illegible] [illegible] Sona? Dinuvapa Chay & Bapurama or Shrirama, widow of Sadharana Chay [illegible] son of Jamku? [illegible] [illegible] Shinde Bahari son of Dinuvapa Chay [illegible] as well as to ~~[illegible]~~ claim [illegible] in respect of the latter for the [illegible] of [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ the ~~respect~~ claim of the former [illegible] for the [illegible] of the whole [illegible] in his name [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the ½ share in [illegible] in [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] Sadharana Chay was [illegible], & he [illegible] this [illegible] to have the village [illegible] [illegible] Ramyama [illegible]

Soon after Dinuvapa Chay's death in 1856, Ramyama's Vakil also applied to the same effect in his name & in ~~her~~ the name of his brother's widow.

Tola Cecil [illegible]

In the [illegible] to the [illegible] 7

Jui Ajahat [illegible] is 890

In [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Shinde Bahari son of Dinuvapa Chay

[illegible] widow of Sadharana Chay

Bagu Lawa

Rs ⅛ 100 Rs

Vakils
Ramaswamy [illegible]
Rama Chay

23/8/62

# Register of Inams in the Village of Vadamangalam in the Krishnaghery Talook, Salem District.

| 1. | 2. | 3. | 4 | 5 | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. | 13. | 14. | 15. | 16. | 17. | 18. | 19. | 20. | 21. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. 1. | Dévadayam or Religious Service Inam. | Dry lr: 71. Attatta vai Panja | Cuntas 357. | A C 8.92 | 7.9.3. | 7.9.3. | Granted for Ramagatha, Ithévatha pooja. The service is stated to be regularly performed. | Jodi 2.8.0. | granted for religious service to be enjoyed so long as the service continues to be performed. | Not Known | —"— | Goddess. Selliammas | In the accounts of Fusly of 1234 the name of Chinnan is entered, as "Karaga poojari" with a remark that he was performing the Jatrai or Annual service regularly.<br>In the accounts of Fusly 1248 the name of Péruma appears as "Selliamma Karaga poojari" with a note that the poojari, being unable to pay the jodi, had left the Inam under the management of one Narasimha Chari and that the Inam had been in this individual's possession for about 40 years. | In the accounts of Fusly 1234, the name of Karaga poojari Chinnan is entered. In those of 1248, the name of Péruma is entered with a remark that Narasimha Charri was in possession of the Inam and that he was unconnected with the family of the Inamdar | Moonean Rodgeer | Son of Péruma whose name appears in the accounts of Fusly 1248. | Not Known. | —"— | | This Register is, after the necessary enquiries, prepared in accordance with the instructions contained in the Inam Commissioner's Official Memo (dated 12th February 1870) received with the Collector's letter No. 966 dated 15th April 1871.<br>This is a Dévadayam or Religious service Inam and is of an older date than 50 years.<br>The service for which it was originally granted has been shewn to be regularly performed. |

The Inam was placed under attachment in consequence of the non-attendance of the Inamdar before the Inam Deputy Collector, but as the holder filed this application within the prescribed time of one year, it is recommended that the Inam be released from attachment and restored to the present holder free of tax, but subject to the payment of the former jodi viz.— Rupees. 2. 8.

Ag. Sub Collector

Salem Sub Collector's Office.
Oossoor 10th November 1871.

Enfranchised (71) Service

Register No. 9
Sheet No. 212

Confirmed for the service.
24/1/72

T D No. 181

Compd. lt H. D. C.

# Register of Inams in the village of Vadamangalam in the Talook of Kristnagherry Salem District.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Devadayam or Religious Service Inam. | Wet 96 Puttalaman Nanji. | Gentah 15. | A.C. — 38 | 3.13.0<br>Deduct Maramkammi — 8.6<br>Balance 3.4.6 | 3.4.6 | Granted for religious services in the Puttalamman Pagoda. | Jodi — 10 — | To be enjoyed so long as the service continues to be performed. | Not known | Not known. | Goddess Puttalamman. | In the accounts of Fusly 1234 the name of Poojari Pethannah is entered. In the accounts of Fusly 1248, the name of Cullah Poojari is entered with a remark that he was the grandson of the party whose name appears in the accounts of Fusly 1234, but that he being unable to pay the Jodi, had left the Inam under the management of one Narasimha Chari, who had had possession of it for about 40 years. | Cullah Pujári whose name appears in the accounts of Fusly 1248 is stated to be the grand son of Pújári Pethannah entered in the accounts of Fusly 1234. | Cumbum Pujári. | Culliputti | Nothing can be ascertained. | Not known |  | This Register is, after the necessary enquiries, prepared in accordance with the instructions contained in the Inam Commissioner's official Memo (dated 12th February 1870) received with the Collector's letter No 966 dated 15th April 1871.<br>This is a Devadayam or Religious Service Inam and is of an older date than 50 years.<br>The service for which it was originally granted continues to be regularly performed.<br>The Inam was placed under attachment in consequence of the non attendance of the Inamdar before the Inam Deputy Collector, but as it appears that the holder filed his application within the prescribed time of one year, it is recommended that the Inam be released from attachment & restored the Pagoda, free of tax, but subject to the payment of former Jodi, viz: Annas (10) Ten.<br>Fred Nicholson<br>Ag Sub Collector. | Confirmed [illegible]<br>24/1/72<br>I. D. No 1815 |

Registered No 9
Sheet No 213

Enclosure (14) forms.

Salem Sub Collector's Office
Hosoor 13th November 1871

Compd. & Exd.

Exd. 11/12/71

Fair Copd.