XVII

Village of Korattapatti No 21 Mittha of Kannankurichi Taluq of Salem in the District of

Remarks.

1 This is part of the Kannankurchi Muttha belonging to S. Rungasamy Moodr
2 The Inam Accts available are quoted in Col 12.

Regr. No. 13

(1-2)

Sheet No. 242

Religious
Do
Pilludiappa & Muniappa
Kattumanam
8-30-88·86
2 - a
Devadayam granted for Pooja & [illegible] to Pilludiappa & Muniyappan at Korattapatti and Service is continued
Free of tax
Permanent
Not known
No Sanad in Inam Accts of 120 - 20 - 48 458 — 4
Not known
Muniyappan Inamdar of 1808 458
"
Korattapatti
Shrine of Pilludiappa & Muniappan Poojari Chinnappan
"
"
"
To be confirmed to the Shrine permanently so long as the Puja is continued.
17-5-[1]862 [illegible] Taler
29 June 64

Do
Saktiamman Chinnappan 12-38 5 12-96
27-15-6
Khairati granted for the personal benefit of the holder
Free of tax
Hereditary
Do
Do
Do
Nadir Mulla [illegible] Inamdar of 1808 458
"
Ammapett
1 Sayad Asan [illegible] Shah
2 Setkinsa Tagzinalies Mirza age 70
3 Kobirha age 7
4 Haidar [illegible] age 35
5 [illegible]ulla Saheb age 30
6 Sayad Kadar age 27
No 2 brother of No 1 & 3 great grandson & No 4 great grandson to the party in Col 10.
of No 1 2
of No 2 1 grandson
of No 3 1 mother
of No 4 1 wife
of No 5 4 sons
of No 6 1 wife
[illegible] as in Col 6 [illegible]
[con]firmed to [illegible] 98 on Rs
22-5-[18]62 [illegible] Taler

TnD4416
GF[illegible]

Further Remarks of Case No 10 of Rásipuram Village in Salem Taluq of Salem District

1. For this Inám 2 Statements were filed, one by Ummar Kán, and Gulam Hussein, as the original heirs of the form[illegible]
2nd by Gaus Sahib, Kadumia, & Madar Sahib. The former represent 3 alleged Survey Inamdars Viz Lála Miya Hussein Sahib,
and Mahamed Ismal, and state that No 1 is Lalamia's daughter's Son, and that the other 2 are Mahamed Ismal's Sons.
The set of Gaus Sahib represent the Survey Inamdar as Lála Ismál Sahib's Son Hussen Sahib and state that they are Hussen Sahib's Grand so[ns]
The Case was referred to the Tahsildar, and his Reports and enclosures have been duly noticed. It appears from the evidence of all people
examined that the Inam is enjoyed for an Ashar Kán Makkan at Rásipur; that Gaus Sahib &c and their father have been from a long time receiving
the produce of the land, and attending to the Service of Ashar Kána; and, it further appears from the Circar records that the evidence of the early accounts
available containing any remarks about enjoyers, shows that in Fs 1210 accounts the Inam was entered in the name of Lála Imámshá's son Hussen [illegible]
that in the Jamabandy of Fs 1232 the entry was made in the name of Hussen Sahib, with a remark that Hussen Sahib died and that one Mahamed [illegible]
was enjoying the Inam in his lieu; and that in the account of Fs 1248, & 57, the entry was made in the name of Abdulla Shá. Gausa proves by his
Genealogical tree that Hussen Sahib (noted in the accounts of Fs 1210 & 32) was his Grand father and that Abdulla Shá (noted in Fs 1248 & 57)
his father. So far it is established that Gaus Sahib is the party actually in the Enjoyment of the land and the Service incumbent of the
Ashar Kána 2. As for Ummar Kán and Gulam Hussein, they have attempted to prove by Ryots that though Gaus Sahib and the
father were receiving rents &c, the Chits of Cultivation were usually given by Ummar Kán and Gulam Hussein's father and that the rents were paid to Gaus[illegible]
under the directions of Ummar Kán. Ummar Kán and his Ryots produced in Evidence a Cultivation Patta and Muchilika for Fs 1266, a Patta for
Fs 1267, & a patta for Fs 1272. The documents seem to me to require much Caution in allowing ~~th~~ them due weight. It is opposed to long actual
enjoyment [illegible] other parties. Even if it should be a fact, the true nature of the Circumstances, under which, one like Ummar Kán
unconnected with the Inam in the accounts and without enjoyment should have to Superintend Cultivation of the Inam is not known.
Ummar Kán's alleged Survey-holdars are found in no Public Records. I would therefore Register the Inam in the names
the actual enjoyers and Service-doers, Gaus Sahib, Kadumia Sahib and Madar Sahib, whose father and Grand father are in
all the accounts as enjoyers. Ummar Kán &c will be left to establish their Claims before other authorities.
3. In the deposition before the Taluq Sheristadar as given by Gaus Sahib &c it is represented that Gaus Sahib admitted
his having had no enjoyment and his having received the rents under the orders of Ummar Kán &c and that Ummar Kán
&c gave Pattas. But in the Statements declared to by him before me he firmly stated that he enjoyed the Inam
himself as owner, and the Karnam supported the affirmation by his Signature on the Statement. The Sheristadar
did not ask Gaus Sahib, under what Circumstances the Pattas &c were given by Ummar Kán when he himself Claimed the Inam
by right of ownership and inheritance. As however this part may be well reserved for adjudication in the Courts.
I Confirm the Inam in the names of Gaus Sahib and his brothers.
4. In Fs 1238 the Inam is entered as Masjid Inam, and the Services of Ashar Kána are attended to. The Inam
is recorded in the early accounts as personal Khyrát Inam. I would therefore Confirm the Inam as personal at 5/8
Ry R or R 1

(Signed) A. Narrayana Rao
Dy Collr
Inam Commn

Inam Dy Collr's Office
Camp Tinnevelly
31st December 1856