

White
 Buckwheat
 C. J. H. W.
 20/1/02

64 Jasi Mullah Kachum

Siamee Beynberg. Refusapalli No 38 in the Uthayase Palakku the Calcutta East

There is also a college of the same kind -
The many manuscripts have in the front of 248 pages - 204 years -
The names appear first in the index and of 712.

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

In tu Sarnate 20 -
 Aqueduct 100 y Punks
 2011 -
 Sarnate - 4 1/2
 Sarnate - 1 1/2 + 1/2
 Sarnate
 Sarnate 4 1/2
 2 3/4 + 3/8

No of Hides			Acquisition Time			Season			Locality			Remarks			No. seen			Collected			Specimens		
Day	Month	Year	Day	Month	Year	Day	Month	Year	Day	Month	Year	Day	Month	Year	Day	Month	Year	Day	Month	Year	Day	Month	Year
2	2	2	2	2	1933	2	2	1933	2	2	1933	3	45	3	45	3	45	3	45	3	45	3	45
1	1	1	1	1	1933	1	1	1933	1	1	1933	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45
3	3	3	3	3	1933	3	3	1933	3	3	1933	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45
1	1	1	1	1	1933	1	1	1933	1	1	1933	9	5	9	5	9	5	9	5	9	5	9	5
3	3	3	3	3	1933	3	3	1933	3	3	1933	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45	11	45

L.H.C. Bureau - 3-44 - 38-9
Personal - 1-17 - 0-14-9 sup
Census - 3-86 - 3-8-11 = 9-
 " " " " " "

a - 2 - 9
 a - 8 - 9
 from this
 collect
 26

Ct. as a
 or 1/2 of the
 part of the
 allocation
 sufficient
 1/2
 1/2
 1/2

Approved.
 Wks
 10/15
 17/159

Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor

Sheet No 130

1. Then wherein the 5 villages were settled by Supplemental Register on 3rd May 1862, in the name of the plaintiff party as a son, and partly by alleged purchase. The produce of the 5 villages was divided equally between the plaintiff and the defendant, and the defendant pleaded that he obtained the remaining 5 villages by purchase for which he had no documents.

2. Then, one Lakshminamma wife of Jannarayana, and daughter-in-law of Dargaga, appeared on 12th March 1863, and filed statements for the 5 villages in the name of her son Biddi Narayana as the actual possessor of the Charn, and as the legal descendant of the Sany Chander Dargaga. She deposed before me that the Charn in Pudurreddy was left by her husband in charge of Kadappa Siminassai, and that she and her son were 20 years of age, and that one half of the produce was given to her husband and since his death some 5 years back, herself, and that the other half was given to a cousin under Venkateswara, who has remained under the protection of Krishna Rao. The complaint was referred to the Judge. A report has been received this day from the Tahsildar through the Collector of the Salem District for Madras. The abstract of the evidence on both sides appears to be as follows:

Plaintiff witnesses

Annamma Haffey, wife of Haffey and 11 villages

Speaks of the Charn at Kadappa, at Pudurreddy, Chittoor, and Chittoor. States that Krishna Rao Jannarayana, Subbaya, Jannarayana, Venkateswara, and Subbaya son-in-law Siminassai (father of defendant - Subbaya) were enjoying the Charn jointly, but he cannot say the proportions of enjoyment, that from 20 years Subbaya &c. were not found, some dead, and one went away to Doodla, and that he does not know who had since.

Carried on the cultivation, but that the cultivation has now managed by Siminassai, and from 5 years by his son Krishna Rao who enjoys the lands, and that Lakshminamma has been coming once a year and looking after the produce, but that he does not know if she has taken any produce.

Chittoor Haffey } Speaks regarding Chittoor, Chittoor, Chittoor, and Chittoor. Declares the enjoyment of 11 years in the family of Lakshminamma and her son, states that the Charn, at Kadappa and Pudurreddy were held jointly by Plaintiff, and one Subbaya, and states that he has heard that both Plaintiff and Subbaya &c. Venkateswara have been enjoying the Charn, that Krishna Rao had no enjoyment, and that, if any in fact, it must have been that of Annamma who is under his protection.

The Kadappa Haffey states that about 10 Kadappa Haffey.

He states that he has heard many years ago accompanied Lakshminamma to Kadappa &c. and brought the produce of the lands given to him by Krishna Rao and his son and his son Krishna Rao also. Ready money was paid also some years.

Chittoor, states that a 1/2 field of Kadappa was rented to him by one Subbaya in 1867, and since then he has been paying the rent to him and his wife and not known, and that Krishna Rao would usually accompany him, that the Plaintiff or his husband never came, and took the produce from him, but that he has heard that Lakshminamma had some right in the lands.

He has heard of the tenant and his signature in it.

that the defendant's father, James, conveyed to him the six-acre land of Milledale some 4 years ago and he in fact the owner to him; and afterwards, from 2 or 3 years, to discharge his sons, it does not have anything of relevance.

Mimigan of Pederse d'igair

Journal of Subash Chandra
Barananda of Panchabali Subashya gave him the land off Panchabali 2 years ago. Subashya had 2 years ago, that afternoon, Subashya
ordered him to give the land to Panchabali and to Lakshmanmuni, but he paid the rent according to Laksh-
manmuni. He started the statement 2 days after, and said he paid the rent to Panchabali, and not to Lakshmanmuni.
and Subashya stated to give otherwise.

Defendant's witness } Charles Diggs, K. & S. 11/11/11

Documents filed before the Pittsfielder by Defendant Shucknugator.

The Karmiam Anwaraj and Khatam Pasamaj, denied the enjoyment of Subbarammal, their evidence being
contradicted by the statements of the subscribing ryots. I therefore, infer the claim in the name of Kishnayanzai as
correct in favor of whom possession a preponderating evidence was produced and whose enjoyment was admitted
by the wife of Subbaraj in Panchangam Mirasdar of the Village.

...in his depositions before me on 27 June 1844 that he had ...

the alleged right of purchase. In the inquiry before the Judge, he failed in addition to answer the question whether the alleged right of purchase was a right of purchase in which the gift of Sub pag was devoted to. It is clear then from the confession in the evidence that the party who has forged the deed of sale, and the examination before me, to give an answer to the right to the lands. I cannot agree with the Subordinate that this forgery would entitle the deed of gift or the right of purchase or generally established. I leave the nature of the documents to be settled by the Civil Tribunal, where Lakshminarayana or others might sue Krishnagangai.

The Subordinate believed that both Krishnagangai and Lakshminarayana have joint enjoyment in the lands which is contradicted by the own remarks which will be stated to below, but in what proportions, and under what title he cannot conclude. As for the forged document, the Subordinate says he is not able to perceive that Krishnagangai committed the forgery himself. As regards the joint or several enjoyment of the lands, the Subordinate's remarks show that the defendant Krishnagangai is found to have had only a joint enjoyment of the lands. But as to the nature of the right in which he holds, no satisfactory evidence is shown. It is probable that while the lands for Krishnagangai. There is no doubt to the forgery and concludes the statement showing that both parties seem to have enjoyment.

As the facts of evidence is more in favor of Krishnagangai's possession, and enjoyment, and as Lakshminarayana has failed to make out her case, I adhere to the decision already passed and would inform Lakshminarayana to seek redress in the Court.

The several claims of Krishnagangai have been already duly charged with their fitting Land Proofs.

It appears that the same list of Chakras showed the same of Dindal Karambha as the enjoying Pradhan.

It is found in Karambha now only for Jagtengraha on the 11th January 1821 for Kallatur on the 16th January

for Kallatur	Do Do
for Kallatur	Do Do
for Kallatur	Do Do
for Kallatur	Do Do

Sheet No 131

The Chakras are set down among Documents to be attached.

When Krishnagangai appeared in May 1822 and deposed to his right. Lakshminarayana appeared on the 14th March 1822. The case was referred to the Subordinate on the 21st March 1822. The Subordinate's report dated 28th January 1823 has been received this day through the Salem Collector.

(Signed) J. Narayana Rao
Dy. Collector

Impd 24/1/23
Salem District

Sheet No 131
Salem District