






Case 4 – Appeal Nos 2383 of 1864 –
Judgt delivered 3rd October 1865 –

Badrinarayakampalle
Village

Report 82
Sheet No 95

Case 4



From the Record of the Enquiry instituted through the Tahsildar into the claims of N[os] 1 to 3 to the inam after it has been fully afforded, it appears that Venkata krishnayya & Rappaya the registered holders enjoyed 1/2 share in the main and is stated Venkata krishnia sold his share to Nagarayan – There is no deed forthcoming in support of this sale and it is stated to have been lost – The Evidence of the Village officers & elders in the taluq shews that this 1/2 share was enjoyed by the purchaser Venkatarayan and afterwards by Chokkalingam the sister of the latter at whose death it reverted to her daughter Meenakshi ammal – Meenakshi ammal died during the lifetime of her mother Chokkamma – A Deed of gift on simple Paper, was produced before the Tahsildar from whom the attested copy of which was sent for, shews that the gift was made on 18th October 1839 – The Donor also has recognized the gift before the Tahsildar –

The other 1/2 share is stated to have been mortgaged by Rappayya to Venkatarayan father of N[o] 1 – There is no deed in support of this transaction produced – N[os] 1 to 3 say they have lost it –

There are [illegible] receipts for payment of the whole Sudi on the inam for 25 years from Vilambi to Nandana Sudi 7126 [illegible] They are signed by names, & do not seem to be genuine – They appear to have been newly got up – The [illegible] are not old enough & Pattah even to be true, they do not substantiate any thing in favr – of N[os] 1 to 3 right on enjoyt. They merely record the payt of money for "Rappayani Sudi" – made for 25 years upto Parthiba by the same man Dalinjanadi Ramadas Pattanayan of the land, & for 10 years from Ananda by [illegible] Ramadas –

[illegible] evidence in the case establishes the long enjoyt of N[os] 1 to 3 – Their title is evidently of more than 40 years standing to it – I do not feel sure that the alleged sale to Chinnayan are true and not fraudulent get up as an after thought –

[illegible] Rappaya has left any [illegible] – On the whole I would recommend that in consideration of the [illegible] of Title and long enjoyt of the Appellants' family, that the inam may be confirmed to N[os] 1 to 3, without prejudice to the rights of the other family

Rent 1/2 & R[s] [illegible] per annum – Sudi – [illegible]
& Rat 1/2 – [illegible] – 14-7 payable to Mittadar
6-[illegible] to Sunka

Approved
12/3/66

[illegible] from 7/6 to 7/6 as recommended and adopted

Z. No. 899

Letter D. Allotted
5/3/67