Inam Register of Torayeri No. 134 In the Tripattur Talook In the Salem Dt.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
No. [illegible] 12	[illegible]	Dry No. 180 D. 51	2-82-8	2.51		1-11-2	Bhata Vritti - This was a Chetty Inam given for building the village	Tax free	Heredy.	Not Known	No Sannad - The Inamdar is not able to prove 50 years enjoyment	—	—	In F 1259 Arumugam Gavudu. A Remark added, that the village for which it was given — does not exist — the village [illegible]	Torayeri Arumugam [illegible] 50 [illegible]		Wife 1 Sons 3 Daughters 3	—		Title deed [illegible] $\frac{1}{2}$ [illegible] 12 - 28/11/[illegible]	T.D. No. 892 [illegible] $\frac{1}{4}$ [illegible]
No. 2 13	Perumal	Wet No. 61 D. 196	1-5-13	0.15 / [illegible] crop		0-3-6	Punchangi Inam	Tax free	Do.	Do.	No Sannad	—	—	In F 1259 Venkata Kristnaya	Vaniyambadi Punchangi Venkata Kristnambhat	—	Wife 1 Sons 3 Daughters 2	—		Title deed [illegible] $\frac{1}{2}$ [illegible] - 28/[illegible]	T.D. No. 893 [illegible] $\frac{1}{4}$ [illegible] do.

(12-13) Regr. No. 82 Do.
Torayeri, Tirupatore Tq., Salem Dt.

Circar Village Register No. 83 — Regr. No. 83 (1-2)

Inam Register of Pannada Kuppam No. 135 In the Tripattur Talook in the Salem Dt.
Pannada Kuppam No. 135 -

This is a village transferred from the Gudiattam Taluk, a Taluk of the North [illegible] of the Salem [illegible] ... [illegible] calculated for 2 crops [illegible] XX

[illegible] regard [illegible] lands [illegible] ... [illegible] consolidated [illegible] ... [illegible] 2 crops is not [illegible] ... [illegible] calculated for one crop [illegible] ... at 1st rate of [illegible] [illegible] rate of the village - [illegible]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
No. 1 14	Devadayam	Dry No. 63 D. 106	1-9-9	1.24 / [illegible]		1-3-3	For the Support of Perumallu In the Village of Pannanda Kuppam	Tax free	Do.	Do.	No Sannad. It appears [illegible] in the [illegible] of F 1259			In F 1259 Timma dasari	Perumal swamy Devasthanam pujari Rama Dasari	Pannada Kuppam		—	—	The age of the Inam is not proved to be fifty [illegible] from the evidence of the Inamdars, the probabilities are in favor of the presumption of the right [illegible] [illegible] the Inam as [illegible] 28/10/[illegible]	[illegible] do.
No. 2	Perumal	Dry No. [illegible] D. 153	2-29-1	2.82		1-12-10	Punchangi Inam	Do.	Do.	Do.	No Sannad	—	—	In F 1259 Margaya	Agraharam Madanur Annayan [illegible] 40 / 2 Venkatramayan [illegible] 13		[illegible]	—		Title deed [illegible] $\frac{1}{4}$ [illegible] 28/[illegible]	T.D. No. 895 [illegible] do.
		Wet No. 9 D. 54	0-4-2	0.10 / 2 crop lands		0-10-6															
		2	2-33-3	2.82		2-7-4															

Sheet No. 64 [illegible]

Inam Register of Bandar palli No. 136 In the Tripattur Talook In the Salem Dt.

Circar Village Register No. 84 — Regr. No. 84

This is also a village transferred from the Gudiattam Taluk of the North Arcot Dt.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
No. 1	Perumal	Dry No. 29 D. 21	2-19-2	2.47		1-10-3	Kyrati Inam	Do.	Do.	Do.	No Sannad. This appears [illegible] in the [illegible] of F 1259. The Inamdar is not able to prove 50 years enjoyment. But it is probable from the evidence of old Gaundars [illegible]			In F 1259 Siad Husain	Udayendram [illegible] Syed Hussain 55		Wife 1 Sons 3			Title deed [illegible] $\frac{1}{4}$ [illegible] 6 - 28/10/[illegible]	T.D. No. 896 [illegible] do. [illegible]