Regd [illegible]

Reg 44

(4-8)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| [illegible] 17 [illegible] 8 [illegible] 53 | 10-[illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>10-2-7 | Khala<br>Wilt | Jody<br>1-13-7 | Brun Tool<br>Caut Rhuen | Wet Land | Inf 1806<br>Subba<br>Rasty | Inf 1838 |
| [illegible] 32 10 [illegible]<br>Gurikala<br>Range | 19-7-6<br>0-0-0<br>19-7-6 | | | | It appears<br>to abt to<br>Acalefun<br>to Mexico<br>As Inam | | Veerasamaya<br>Grandson |
| 32 16 2 32 21 | 29-10-1 | | | | | | |

Requires Extract 20/6/62 Forwarded to the [illegible] No 3 in Col. 16 — [illegible]

+ to fact. [illegible] letter [illegible] [illegible] to Civil orders, but I confirm the share of No 2 in his name, without prejudice to the [illegible] by No 1 as mortgagee. — [illegible] 14 [illegible] the [illegible] of No 1 & 2 — [illegible] 14-9 / 11-12-0 / 2-12-0

As regards the 2d case that of Tumpate Subbaya ~~and Annayan~~ a dispute of Shares which extends to the fields in the succeeding case — Subbaya No 3 mortgaged his lands to one Annayan of Tumpattur in [illegible] or F1239 — Annayan states [illegible] mortgage [illegible] Subbaya [illegible] in his possession, the dry lands & [illegible] that in his possession the wet fields.

& that he is enjoying dry — mortgaged the wet fields which belong to the next case in the [illegible] to [illegible] that [illegible] the wet fields of the case is [illegible] waste — the former Annayan [illegible] a wet field & dry fields [illegible] Subbaya [illegible] 2/3 of [illegible] in favour of Subbaya

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| [illegible] 5 [illegible] 20 10 2 52<br>Gurikala<br>Range | 5-13-4<br>0-0-0<br>5-13-4 | do | Jody<br>1-10-7 | do | do |

Wet Land — It appears to abt to Acalrus [illegible] Inam

Inf 1805 — Mitiyam Narayanaya

Inf 1818 — Venkata Bhat Dan —

[illegible] case complained to the Collector [illegible] that he [illegible] to Annayan [illegible] land [illegible] cultivation [illegible] & that he [illegible] the land [illegible] Annayan [illegible] complaints Annayan complained to [illegible] 1848 [illegible] the Collector [illegible] order [illegible] Civil Court [illegible] before [illegible] Civil Court Annayan [illegible] filed [illegible] by the Collector in F1258 [illegible] Annayan [illegible] 1841/48. [illegible] 10 or 12 years [illegible] Subbaya No 3 [illegible] Regarding the mortgage by Subbaya —

Bellari

Veerasamaya Grandson — Veerasamaya Grandson — Uf [illegible] 2
60
Tumpatur

2 Subbaya — Grandson — Uf [illegible]
70

Inf 1838

Veerasamaya

Grandson

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ½ 109 | 8 77 | 5-1-3 | |
| ½ 720 | 2 44 | 9-11-9 | Tody 14-9 |
| 11-21 | | 14-13-0 | |

3

Inf 1807 — Kuppan — Kempan Subbaya 59 — Daughter [illegible] — Uf Sons 2

Veerasamaya

Sudra

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ½ 109 | 8 77 | 5-1-3 | |
| ½ 7 wet | 2 43 | 9-11-9 | Tody 14-9 |
| 11-20 | | 14-13-0 | |

Inf 1832 — Venkata Bhat

24/11/62 — [illegible]

Left blank — as nothing can be made under the circumstances of the case

Inf 1828 — Venkata Bhat

Inf 1825 — Venkata Bhat

In the first case — a simple [illegible]. For long time, Veerasamaya & Subbaya (In 1821) sons of 2 brothers, were enjoying their portion of the Inam in 2 equal shares — No 2 mortgaged his share to the brother of No 1, viz Venkaya who [illegible] a Deed of mortgage on common paper dated [illegible] or F1259. [illegible] to the mortgage [illegible] & mortgagee [illegible] that whenever the mortgage amount [illegible] the land should be given into the possession of [illegible] No 2. A dispute arose about [illegible] between the mortgagor & the mortgagee, & the Collr decided [illegible] in 1853, that the mortgagee [illegible] of the land, & [illegible] as the mortgage [illegible] in contravention of [illegible] 1848. The mortgaged share [illegible] after the death of the mortgagor [illegible] & claimed that the Government [illegible] had a [illegible] executed [illegible] Inams [illegible] enjoyed by No 1 [illegible] father's share by No 1. [illegible] when attested afterwards by No 2 also — No 2 denies

Deemed a Daughter [illegible]

This field was [illegible] as that of [illegible] Cheny — 100 [illegible] Gunthas.

[illegible] the Inam was [illegible] Narayanaya [illegible] Venkatabhattu [illegible]

One Tumpattur Annaya states that the field was [illegible] father by [illegible] Narayanaya [illegible] a deed of gift on common paper dated [illegible] F1228 executed by Veda Narayanaya [illegible] father. Venkatabhattar [illegible] Sudarsanambhattar [illegible] Inam as his father. Vedar [illegible] No 115 [illegible]

The survey [illegible]

| | |
|---|---|
| [illegible] Kalahasti Subbaya [illegible] | 66½ [illegible] Gunthas |
| [illegible] Kanyadi [illegible] | 128 Gunthas<br>2 [illegible] |
| | 194½ [illegible] |

[illegible] in which 66½ Gunthas [illegible] Veda [illegible] — 100 [illegible] Gunthas [illegible] 20 Gunthas [illegible]

1 of 1910 — 1019 — 1024

[illegible]

14 Apl 65

JR copied 20/6/68

Settled vide the extract of this case in another sheet.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| [illegible] 13 | 1[illegible] 8 | 1 36 | 5-7-8<br>0-0-0<br>5-7-8 | Ramsing | [illegible] | do | do | Wet Land |
| [illegible] | | 6 69 | 2-6-6<br>0-0-0<br>2-6-6 | | | | | It appears to abt to Acts As Inam |
| | 11 | 0 5 | 7-15-9 | | | | | |

Inf 1806 — Lanka Ramaya — Brahmin

Inf 1832 — Subbaya — Son Subban — Chengalbaya — Dixit Sudra

Inf 1859 — [illegible] — Sudra

Tumpattur

Remarks of the [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] actually enjoyed by Annaya [illegible] 48 the Inam in the Case, that the [illegible] mortgage for Subbaya in the preceding case — If so, does [illegible] Subbaya enjoy the [illegible] [illegible]? Cannot it be [illegible] ascertained? Does Subbaya [illegible]

XX

Wet [illegible]

[illegible] 6/68

Nallamuthalla — 45

Inam Register — [illegible] — Inam Kalambakkam No 896 in the Tumpattur [illegible] in the [illegible]

Reg No 45 — Sheet No. 102 C — (1—2)

Narasaraopet — Tari Suttah Of Kattam —

| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| [illegible] 1 | 12 [illegible] | 12 35 | 3-10-0<br>0-0-0<br>3-10-0 | Fort Duffaut | [illegible] | [illegible] | Ant | Wet Land | Inf 1806 | Inf 1832 | | | | | | | | 1 of 1910 |
| [illegible]<br>Range | | | | P. Honkarappa | | | | | It appears | Honkarappa | Thaya | | | | | | | |
| Ariki | 6 2 | 0 16 | 0-13-2<br>0-0-8 | at Aralhasi [illegible] | | | | | to abt to | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 0-12-6 | The [illegible] in good condition | | | | | Acts | | | | | | | | | |
| [illegible] | | 12 51 | 2-6-6 | | | | | | As Inam | | Inf 1857 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Rava | | | | | | | |

Avaluayalaunbutta

A Honkarappa — Deed — Paper — Purvam

XX (It is the land enjoyed by Annaya ?) [illegible]

A Statement should be taken from Annaya [illegible] the effect of it being [illegible] that he enjoys the Inam as [illegible]

[illegible] 30/5/86

[illegible] 2/5/86

JR copied 20/6/68

Punja—
[illegible] 2-8-11
[illegible]
Punja

4-8-8
4-8-8
4-10-9
4-9-10
4-9-11
4-15-7

Tank Supplied by [illegible] Vadigamma at [illegible]
The temple is in good condition

Inamdar
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Sa [illegible]
Muthu
Vadigamma

Iruan
Sa [illegible]
Iruan

Ammanandambatti
Muthu
Vadigamma deity
Pujari
Parasuraman Pujari
& Chennappen

To continue
tax free
during the existence
of the deity
[illegible] 14 April 65

---

# Nallampatti — Regr No. 46 — Inam Register — Narasandaram Pitti No 297 in the [illegible] Taluk in the Salem Dist.

Naravandambatti

(1-3)

This is also a village in the [illegible] Mittah of [illegible]

| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| [illegible] Punja | [illegible] | [illegible] | | 2-15-5<br>2-15-5<br>1-5-0<br>1-5-0<br>4-2-6 | Tank Supplied of Pache Perumalla at Naravandambatti<br>The temple is in good condition | | | | Inamdar<br>[illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>[illegible] | Sa [illegible]<br>Perumalla<br>[illegible] | | Sa [illegible]<br>Punja<br>Sa [illegible]<br>Punja | | Naravandambatti<br>Pache Perumalla deity<br>Pujaris.<br>Vella [illegible] 1<br>[illegible] 2<br>Latchuman 3<br>[illegible] 4 | | — | — | To continue tax free during the existence of the deity<br>[illegible] |
| [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | | 0-10-8<br>0-13-7<br>0-12-7<br>1-7-0 | Supplied of [illegible] at Naravandambatti<br>The temple is in good condition | | | | [illegible] | Sa [illegible]<br>Pattalamma | | Sa [illegible]<br>[illegible] | | Naravandambatti<br>[illegible] deity<br>Pujari<br>[illegible] Pujari 1<br>[illegible] Pujari 2 | | — | | To continue tax free during the existence of the deity<br>[illegible] |
| [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | | 25-8-0<br>0-11-2<br>22-10-0<br>12-13-4<br>12-13-4<br>37-8-2 | [illegible] | do | do | do | Inamdar | Sa [illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>[illegible] | [illegible] | Sa [illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>Sa [illegible]<br>[illegible]<br>[illegible] | | Timpatter<br>Sellaman<br>[illegible] 60<br>alias [illegible] | Daughter [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | To [illegible]<br>[illegible] $\frac{1}{8}$ 24-12-0 |

26-12-7 21-31

[illegible] No 56 of 1865 from the [illegible] asking for [illegible]
Endorsed [illegible]
10 Oct 65
[illegible]

[illegible] 1015

[illegible] a [illegible]
[illegible] other side
Be this as of [illegible] old po[illegible]
is clearly [illegible]
~~[illegible]~~
[illegible]

Inda[illegible]
26-5-62
Trifpattur
Tahsildar's a[illegible]
to collect[illegible]
14-7-51
enclosure[illegible]

The [illegible]
[illegible] will be [illegible]
[illegible] in the [illegible] described
[illegible] in both cases
Now as to the proper
party in whose name the T[illegible]
in No 5 is to be issued - I am
clear that it must be made
out in Annaiyas name - He
claims under deed of gift
and mortgage is supported
(some of the papers - ~~[illegible]~~
~~[illegible]~~
not supported by [illegible]

-, Perma-nent

Not known.

No sannad
It appears in all the accounts as Ináûm —

In F1208 Vidiyam Náráya-naiya

Col 15
In F1232
Venkatabhat
In F1248
Venkata bhat
—
In F1257
Venkata bhat,

5-13-4
-10-1
5-3
W 5-5-1
T 1-10
1-15

Left blank, as no registry can be made under the circumstances of the Case.



The survey entries are,

| | |
|---|---|
| Inám list Kalahasti Subbaiya pangadi Inám | 66½ + ⅛ Guntas |
| In another list Kangadi Chenna Narasappa 10 years waste | 128 Guntas<br>2<br>194½ + ⅛ |

In the same list in which 66½ guntas are given
Vada chárayár Inám 100 10/10 Guntas
Joti Inám

No direction can be traced but the place is given

This field was measured in the Survey as that of Vira Chuiraja Charry 100 1/4 Guntas. In the Khayam Tirva account, the Inám was registered in the name of Vidia Nárayanaiya. His son Venkata bhattar is said to be living in the Bangalore Division. One Tirupattur Annaiya states that this field was given to his father by Vidia Nárayana of the survey in gift and produces a deed of gift on common paper dated Srimukha or F1222, as executed by Vida Nárayanaiyan to his father. Venkata bhattar grand son of Sudarsana bhattar, claimed the Inám as his fathers in Civil Suit No 115 of 1849. At the same time Kempati Subbaiya No 3 in the preceding case complained to the Collector, that the wet land under cultivation was his, and that he mortgaged it to Annaiyan and that Annaiyan attempts to defraud him of the land by saying that he got the land in gift from the other party. Previous to all these suits and complaints, Annaiyan complained to the Collector in the enquiry of 1848, that the Taluq authorities would not register his gift of Vidia Narayanaiyah's lands in the accounts. On enquiry, the Collector passed an order that as the matter was pending in the Civil Court, he could pass no orders, but directed that Annaiya should as usual enjoy the land and before he should be dispossessed of the land a fuller enquiry must be made. In the Civil Court Annaiyan &c filed an answer against Venkata bhattar denying the facts of the complaint and affirming the gift - On the plaintiff's failing to prosecute for six weeks the suit was thrown off. We cannot register the Inám now as directed by the Collector in F1258 in the old fictitious names. As for the gift alleged by Annaiyan though the Deed of gift is dated F1222, it is not found registered in any account of F1232/34/48 - It appears from evidence of old Ryots and a Mazar given by Karnams &c, as well as from the present enquiry that the Inám enjoyed by Annaiyan was Vydian Narayana's, but that it had been enjoyed by Subbaiya No 3 in the preceding case, and that from 10 or 12 years Annaiyan was enjoying it. Regarding the mortgage by Subbaiya, Annaiyan states Subbaiyan shewed him the Dry land and for the Wet shewed the land under dispute which belonged to him by gift. It appears also that from long time an Inám to the North of the land is waste from long time. It is therefore clear that the Wet land now under cultivation and in the enjoyment of Annaiyan is the land mortgaged by Subbaiya. Annaiyan produces 3 Lakids of Tahasildar's 1 of 1836, 1 of 1847, 1 of 1849 regarding arrears of rent due by Ryots to Annaiya - but none of these prove Annaiya's enjoyment prior to the date of the mortgage or 1830 - As regards Jodi on Wet land in this case, it has never been paid - The Muttadar says, he did not know the Inamdar. Annaiya says the former Muttadars remitted to him the Jodi. It further appears that up to the date of mortgage of the land in the [illegible] place Kempati

[illegible] Jodi receipt of 1826 A.D [illegible] by Subbaiya. It cannot be admitted [illegible] if according to the mortgage no land was [illegible] by gift had been shewn him - I cannot [illegible] now in the enjoyment of Annaiya could be [illegible] at the time of mortgage, the mortgager might have [illegible] by mistake. Under such suspicious circumstances of the deed of gift for the land in this case and under the above evidence which shows that the land under cultivation was the one transferred by mortgage and when the Inámdár of the original family is absent I cannot recommend registry of the Inám in this case in any-body's name. I would place it under attachment. The land to be attached is necessarily a waste field —

(Signed) A. Nárayana Row
Deputy Collector
Inám Commission
24-1-62,

Sheet No. 10 B

Lets Azur by 10/2/70 to G
with statement for Annaiyan
showing that he has two sons &
two daughters.
8/3/70 VM

V

[illegible]

From the remarks of the Deputy Collr. I gather, that the land actually enjoyed by Annaiya is not the Inám in this case, but is that which he obtained by mortgage from Subbaiya in the preceding case. If so does not Subbaiya enjoy his Wet field No 4? Cannot the exact position of No 5 ascertained. Does Subbaiya claim the land enjoyed by Annaiya is his — A statement should also be taken from Annaiya and sent to this office, if it is proved that the land he enjoys is the Inám in this case —
(Sd) V. Chentsal Row
Asstt Asst
31-5-66

Written to Tahsildar
2-6-66

Dy Collr's yadast 26/5/62.
Tripattur Tahasildar's arzi dated 14/7/51 and its enclosures.

I am satisfied that in both cases the land as described in the Register is rightly described. Substitution has been attempted but cannot be supported.

The Title Deed will be prepared as shewn in the Coln descriptive of the land in case No 5.

Now as to the proper party in whose name the Title Deed in case No 5 is to be issued, I am clear that it must be made out in Annaiyan's name. He claims under a deed of gift and mortgage is suggested by some of the papers but is not supported by the production of any deed or documentary evidence on the other side.

Be this as it may, old possession is clearly made out and adverse claims by the original grantee's family would in all probability be barred by Act of limitation.

This however is a matter for the Court. The Title Deed will be prepared in Annaiyan's name and all other parties referred to Civil Court.

Confirmed as 1/4 assessment
~~(Sd) W. Robinson~~ W Robinson
as 1st Member
in Charge of Inam Depart
7/1/78

[illegible] in full

1091.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Personal | Wet No 5 Yerikila Nanji - | 2-20-10 | 2.52 | 5-13-4 | Bhatavritti | Jodi 0-10-1 | Permanent | Not known. | No sannad It appears in all the accounts as Inam — | In F 1208 Vidiyam Narayanaiya | Col 15<br>In F 1232 Venkatabhat<br>In F 1248 Venkata bhat<br>In F 1257 Venkata bhat. |

5-13-4
-10-1
-3
W 5-13
1-5-1
1-10
-15

Left blank, as no registry can be made under the circumstances of the case.

Place of the land



The survey entries are,

Inam list
Kalahasti Subbaiya pangudi Inam } 66½ ⅛ Guntas

In another list
Kangadi Chinna Narasappa 10 years waste } 128 Guntas
2
194½ + ⅛

In the same list in which 66½ guntas are given
Vedachirayar Inam 100 10/10 guntas
Tote Inam

No direction can be traced but the place is given

This field was measured in the Survey as that of Vira Chenraja Charry 100 9/14 Guntas. In the Khayam Tirva account, the Inam was registered in the name of Vidia Narayanaiya. His son Venkata bhattar is said to be living in the Bangalore Division. One Tirupattur Annaiya states that this field was given to his father by Vidia Narayana of the survey in gift and produces a deed of gift on common paper dated Srimukha or F 1222, as executed by Vida Narayanaiyan to his father. Venkata bhattar grandson of Sudarsana bhattar, claimed the Inam as his fathers in Civil Suit No 115 of 1849. At the same time Kempati Subbaiya No 3 in the preceding case complained to the Collector, that the wet land under cultivation was his, and that he mortgaged it to Annaiyan and that Annaiyan attempts to defraud him of the land by saying that he got the land in gift from the other party. Previous to all these suits and complaints, Annaiyan complained to the Collector in the enquiry of 1848, that the Taluq authorities would not register his gift of Vidia Narayanaiyah's lands in the accounts. On enquiry, the Collector passed an order that as the matter was pending in the Civil Court, he could pass no orders, but directed that Annaiya should as usual enjoy the land and before he should be dispossessed of the land a fuller enquiry must be made. In the Civil Court Annaiyan &c filed an answer against Venkata bhatter denying the facts of the complaint and affirming the gift. On the plaintiff's failing to prosecute for six weeks the suit was thrown off. We cannot register the Inam now as directed by the Collector in F 1258 in the old fictitious names. As for the gift alleged by Annaiyan though the Deed of gift is dated F 1222, it is not found registered in any account of F 1232/34/48. It appears from evidence of old Ryots and a Mazar given by Karnams &c, as well as from the present enquiry that the Inam enjoyed by Annaiyan was Vidiya Narayana's, but that it had been enjoyed by Subbaiya No 3 in the preceding case, and that from 10 or 12 years Annaiyan was enjoying it. Regarding the mortgage by Subbaiya, Annaiyan states Subbaiyan shewed him the dry land and for the wet shewed the land under dispute which belonged to him by gift. It appears also that from long time an Inam to the north of the land is waste from long time. It is therefore clear that the wet land now under cultivation and in the enjoyment of Annaiyan is the land mortgaged by Subbaiya. Annaiyan produces 3 Lakids of Tahsildar's 1 of 1836, 1 of 1847, 1 of 1849 regarding arrears of rent due by Ryots to Annaiya but none of these prove Annaiya's enjoyment prior to the date of the mortgage or 1830. As regards Jodi on wet land in this case, it has never been paid. The Muttadar says, he did not know the Inamdar. Annaiya says the former Muttadars remitted to him the jodi. It further appears that up to the date of mortgage of the land in the [illegible] place Kempati

xxxx Subbaiyan was paying the Jodi. A Jodi receipt of 1826 A.D for 12 annas by the Muttadar is produced by Subbaiya. It cannot be admitted that Annaiyan would have remained satisfied if according to the mortgage no land was shewn him or a land already in his possession by gift had been shewn him. I cannot therefore suppose for a moment that the land now in the enjoyment of Annaiya could be any other than the land mortgaged, that at the time of mortgage, the mortgagor might have been himself in the possession of this land by mistake. Under such suspicious circumstances of the deed of gift for the land in this case and under the above evidence which shows that the land under cultivation was the one transferred by mortgage and when the Inamdar of the original family is absent I cannot recommend registry of the Inam in this case in any-body's name. I would place it under attachment. The land to be attached is necessarily a waste field —

(Signed) A. Narayana Row
Deputy Collector
Inam Commission
24-1-62,

Sheet No. 10 B

From the remarks of the Deputy Collr. I gather, that the land actually enjoyed by Annaiya is not the Inam in this case, but is that which he obtained by mortgage from Subbaiya in the preceding case. If so does not Subbaiya enjoy his Wet field No 4? Cannot the exact position of No 5 ascertained. Does Subbaiya claim the land enjoyed by Annaiya is his — A statement should also be taken from Annaiya and sent to this office, if it is proved that the land he enjoys is the Inam in this case —

Sd/ P. Chentsal Rao
Actg Asst
31-5-66

Written to Tahsildar
2-6-66

Lds Aqu of 16/2/70 to 4 with statement from Annaiyan shewing that he has two sons & two daughters
8/3/70

Dy Collr's yadast 26/5/62. Tripattur Tahsildar's arzi dated 14/7/51 and its enclosures.

I am satisfied that in both cases the land as described in the Register is rightly described. Substitution has been attempted but cannot be supported.

The Title Deed will be prepared as shown in the Col. description of the land in case No 5.

Now as to the proper party in whose name the Title deed in case No 5 is to be issued, I am clear that it must be made out in Annaiyan's name. He claims under a deed of gift and mortgage is suggested by some of the papers but is not supported by the production of any deed or documentary evidence on the other side.

Be this as it may, old possession is clearly made out and adverse claims by the original grantee's family would in all probability be barred by Act of limitation. This however is a matter for the Court. The Title deed will be prepared in Annaiyan's name and all other parties referred to Civil Court.

Confirmed on ¼ assessment
~~Sd W Robinson~~ W Robinson
as 1st Member
in charge of Inam [illegible]
27/1/78

1091

Regr. No. 43

Inam is a village in the ~~Taré Huttah of Hattam~~

~~Assessed Mustah~~

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

1 [illegible] 8·52

4 10 8 / 4 10 8 — Khalsa Aviti — 45 — Devastanam — It appears in all the accounts from the Dewan as Inam — Inam Naranaya — 1832 Venkata Bhat

Kottaravanapully, Banglore

1 Sarwanya Bhattar — 40 — Absent / wife

1848 Venkata Bhat — 2 Prakasa Bhattar — 35 — wife

1867 Venkata Bhat — 3 Alangiri Bhattar 20 — wife

T.D. 1079

No. 1079 — Approved

Walker

The Inamdar appeared relinquished 26 Jany /65 which is one year & 2½ months after attachment of the Inam in Novr 1863 & not one year since the date of Dakhar in the Dt Gazette under date 26 Jany /65 … Mr Boswell recommends the confirmation of Inam …

Letter to Collr Decr 1865 … from attachment 20 Novr 1865 … 1/1/65 — 20/6/68 — As

Approved 7/12/65

Approved 17/65

Sheet No. 102 A

44 Nallam Mullah

(1–3)

Inam Village Sundarambalti No. 295 in the Taluk of Salem …

Inam is a village in the Taré Huttah of Hattam

— Assessed Mustah …

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

[illegible] 17·32 — 9 15 8 / 9 15 8 — Fort. Support of Karuperumal at Sundarambalti The Temple is in good condition — Dev. — Revenue — Devastanam — It appears in all the accounts from 1806 as Inam — 1806 Perumal … — 1832 Pujari Ranga — Sundarambalti Karuperumal Deity — Pujari Vella Tada 45, 2 Kari Raman 35, 3 Lachuman 60, 4 Raman 25 — 1867 ~~Ranga~~ Ranga — No. 80 Rev … by terms & copy … — To be continued … — T.D. 889

[illegible] 0·35 — 1 11 8 / 1 11 8 — Fort Support of Pattalamma at Sundarambalti The Temple is in good order — Do — Do — Do — Devastanam — Do — 1806 Pattalamma — 1832 Arunachelam — Sundarambalti Patalamma Goddess — Pujari Vella Tada, 2 Kari Raman, 3 Lachuman, 4 Raman — 1867 Honi — Inam belonged to … who died some years ago – she had got the … transferred … her … present enjoyer — To be continued … named the Goddess … — T.D. 891

[illegible] 0·82 — 2 2 9 / 2 2 9 — Fort Support of Chelliyamma at Sundarambalti The Temple is in good condition — Do — Do — Do — Devastanam — Do — 1806 Chelliyamma — 1832 Sunkalini — Sundarambalti Chelli Amman Goddess — Pujari Arunagiri — 1867 Sunkalini — — — To be continued … the Goddess … — T.D. 890

9

Regr. No. 40

Nattam

[illegible] Dry [illegible] 12 · 27 11 7 · 5 12 3 / 5 12 3

[illegible] Rangi

For the support of the [illegible] Jaganathaswamy at Nattam such as burning lamps, flowers &c. in the temple. Varahaswamy [illegible] Rajah is [illegible] performed

[illegible] Permanent · Not known

No sunnud. It appears to have been [illegible] from [illegible] as Inam

13820 Mallikadu Pandaram

13822 Pallakki [illegible]

13823 Chinna Lakshmi [illegible] [illegible]

Nattam Pandaram Subbarayan 32 [illegible] son

[illegible]

Enquired [illegible] of the present [illegible] by Collr. in his [illegible] No. 468 dated 15th Octr./58

Confirmed on annual [illegible] 7 [illegible]

28/1/60 [illegible]

TD 886

T.D. No. 886

12 March 60

7

Closed

[illegible]

Regr. 41

Nattam Mutta

Muttah Register No. 5

Inam Register Chokkanambatti No. 391 in the Tenkallur Taluk in the Salem Dist.

Chokkanambatti

[illegible] a village of the [illegible] Nattam

[illegible] temple

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

[illegible] Dry [illegible] 4·22 · 2 3 4 / 2 3 4

For the support of Palakshamma at Chokkanambatti. ~~[illegible]~~ The temple was [illegible] & [illegible] the temple [illegible] from 10 years.

Religious Service · Permanent · Not known

No sunnud. It appears to have been [illegible] from [illegible] as Inam

13806 Perumal Swami

13832 Venkataraya Pujari

Chokkanambatti

No temple. The temple has gone to ruins.

— · — · To be resumed

13853 Narayana

A. P. No. 144 of 1866 from Lakayya stating that he repaired the temple as directed by the Depy. Collr. & requesting [illegible] Received 12/8/66

[illegible]

do

[illegible] Dry [illegible] 21 2 8 21·05 · 18 3 8 / 18 3 8

[illegible] · do · do · do

No sunnud

13806 [illegible] Phakir

Do.

[illegible] Dry [illegible] 25 30 4 26·76 · 29 4 2 / 28 15 7

Palaganavadi Rangi

40 33 11 26·82 · 47 3 3

[illegible] 9 17 8 9·23 · 51 15 10 / 2 7 9 / 49 8 1

55 9 15 56·25 · 96 11 4

13832 Amir [illegible] Phakir [illegible] 2

J. R. [illegible] 20/6/66

[illegible]

1 [illegible] 90

2 [illegible] 50

80

13848 3 [illegible] 45

4 [illegible] 40

13853 5 [illegible] 35

6 Ameer Bibi Saheba 30

7 [illegible] Saheba 28

Daughter · Daughter 3 · Daughter · Daughter · Son · [illegible] 1 son · Daughter

[illegible] divided [illegible] lots

[illegible] 9 each lot [illegible]

No 1 [illegible] 1 lot · No 2 [illegible] one lot · No 3 & 4 one lot

[illegible] in favour of all [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~

28/1/61

T. D. No. 887

TD. 887

Regr. 42

Nattam Mutta

Muttah Register No. 5

Inam Register Padupatti No. 298 in the Tenkallur Taluk in the Salem Dist.

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

[illegible] Dry [illegible] 0 6 3 0·15

For the support of Vedigappa at Padupatti. The [illegible] temple [illegible] Vedigappan [illegible]

Religious Service · Permanent · Unknown

No sunnud. It appears to have been [illegible] as Inam

13806 Perumal [illegible] Vedigappa

13822 [illegible]

Nattam Padupatti

Vedigappan temple

TD888

T. D. No. 888