

1830

1830

1830

1830

John Webb
to Mrs. J. Webb
1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

John Webb
to Mrs. J. Webb
1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

1830

Pader is a Village mostly settled on the shores of the Newnham-
 In only 2 days to Pader for bearings to Newnham and back to
 Karamah & the Newnham Arch of the mountains on the N. side of the Newnham
 Karamah was returned to the Port right in the Village was made over to the Newnham
 Newnham is a small village, apparently a bank, & the village is generally small.

[illegible][illegible]

1/2 pence to Henry
 a. to the amount of the
 application of 1711
 Plus 1/2 of the } - 23 18 -
 made }
 Total 65 4 3

Vetëri Hadi kom. i kësaj shtetshpirtërie
 dhe i kësaj shtetshpirtërie i kësaj shtetshpirtërie
 dhe i kësaj shtetshpirtërie i kësaj shtetshpirtërie

[illegible]

the proper Bergey of As 65 the
 1/2 of the within is 13 the
 Total As 71 17-

Ref. 1000. No. 1000
Nephrolepis flavo-
in the yellow as an under-sized paper
But he has no acquaintance. & 2 others
have since been since to an under-sized
between themselves about to future of the
No. 1000.

Wm. B. Smith

Rate of assessment prevailing on the village

	Maximum	Average	Minimum
Day	15-11	13-7	9-6
Nat	5-11	4-10-7	3-5

The accounts available are the survey account bearing the sign of Mr. Cockburn. The Summat Jamabandi similarly authenticated.

This is a Nisra Village settled on 5 tenure. At the formation of the mutta the right of Government to 2/3 of the Berge was transferred to the muttadar. The soil is reddish earth. The ayakat consists of wet day & garden. The soil is considered generally a good one. The assessment is simple.

Survey Ayakat

Suburb	350-22 ams	
Partaboli	29-92	
	320-10	
Particulars		4%
Day	312-61	363-3-5
Nat	7-4-9	34-2-6
	320-10	297-4-11
Of this assessed in S.1212		
Day	48-38	33-13-9
Nat	3-4-1	12-7-6
	46-8-3	46-8-3
Un assessed land, now assessed at the average rate of the village.		
Day	270-27	229-6-8
Nat	4-11	21-11
	274-74	250-5-8
Suburb Jovi Budam		
Day	7-56	4-13
Nat	1-51	3-4-4
	8-57	7-7-4
Remaining Carcar		
Day	304-95	268-18-5
Nat	4-48	30-4-2
	311-43	299-13-7

Average Cultivation

Day	152-47	129-7-9
Nat	6-47	30-14-2
	158-94	160-5-11

The waste is Day 152-47 assessed 128-7-8

The village has much advanced since S.1212 but however the average seems to be a little too high for the wood description of soil & even the assessment of the cultivated area exceeds by far the actual rental of the Shastriyamdar. There can be no hardship in the assessment of the cultivated area, for the low rental is the result of the unproductive non-working disposition. On the waste, I would make much revision & fix its value for the present at 1/4 of the assessment. This added to the cultivated Berge, the Berge comes to 192 Rs. which seems to be a fair value of the village, for the purchase of the permanent settlement.

No Record.

A Sakid of Mr. Graham dated Raktchase or S.1216-17 resulting out the village on the a Shastriyam gale gutter or rent of Shastriyam mutta halli. 18-15-0 or village. Below the name of one Sammanachari is produced by one Kemali.

Secondly a Rental of the Rammeneelli muttadar Lakshmana Bai dated Sarana or S.1233 in the name of Rammeneelli Kistna Chari resulting out the Shastriyam Nisra at Day 15-15 & making over the village entirely to Shastriyam. The rent seems to be for an unlimited period.

In the Survey of the village in the year 1819 for the Register as Ramme Nelli Gundlakhalli. Received for the with the Saptham records of the 8 villages. Daran are shown in the Taluk Register. The village as there is described as a muttadar Shastriyam gale muttadar village. without any remark.

This is not found among the number (S.12) of Sarayamallan S.1212.

Rammeneelli Radamli A Nisra 1 purchase from S.1241 by one Annamichel aya son of one Vankata Ramaya & grand son of a Riga aya to Annaya alias Subramanya S.1241, selling to the latter person the Shastriyam right of one Annaya, son of Narasimha Chari with Annaya's consent & as his constituted agent for disposing of the property of Annaya & protecting him. The amount of sale was 50 Rupees.

A deed of sale on common paper dated Pictur or S.1234 to Narasimha Chari son Annaya by one Vankata Kistna Chari son of Subba Chari of Rammeneelli in an auction, held by the Auction Commissioner in 1825 of the property of Kistna Chari who has stood security for a defaulting Sagar Datta of Oler, viz. Vankata Ramaya. The amount of sale was 15 Rs.

Produced a deed of sale on common paper dated Pictur or S.1241 by one Annamichel aya son of one Vankata Ramaya & grand son of a Riga aya to Annaya alias Subramanya S.1241, selling to the latter person the Shastriyam right of one Annaya, son of Narasimha Chari with Annaya's consent & as his constituted agent for disposing of the property of Annaya & protecting him. The amount of sale was 50 Rupees.

In the Survey account with the Rammeneelli bearing the signature of Mr. Cockburn the heading is written as follows - 'Muhulabagula Gramma' Shastriyam village. & then survey entries are made. The Sakid of the Muhulabagula muttadar says that it belonged to the muttadar, that the muttadar priest entrusted it to a Jumnasti; that the Civil Court unlawfully sold it for the Jumnasti's debts & that in consequence, the muttadar had lost possession of the village. He has no documents to produce, to show that the village was granted to the muttadar. But he produces a letter dated S.1212 Narasimha Chari who described himself as a purchaser of the village in an auction, held by the Auction Commissioner in 1825 of the property of Kistna Chari who has stood security for a defaulting Sagar Datta of Oler, viz. Vankata Ramaya. The amount of sale was 15 Rs.

Conformed to the present holder on 2/3 assessment. S.1212 by one Annamichel aya son of one Vankata Ramaya & grand son of a Riga aya to Annaya alias Subramanya S.1241, selling to the latter person the Shastriyam right of one Annaya, son of Narasimha Chari with Annaya's consent & as his constituted agent for disposing of the property of Annaya & protecting him. The amount of sale was 50 Rupees.

of sale ~~was~~ concluded with the acquisition of the village; that Venkatarayan and his wife died leaving 2 sons Sundaramarayan & Sishajeni Aiyar; that Venkatarayan's brother & sons lived undivided and enjoyed the village on his behalf; & that they have since fraudulently included this property of his, in the partition of their own property and that he was not aware of the partition and that the Jodi receipts for the village from the Mutladas Kacheri are up to the day in the name of Annaiya Sishab. He therefore requests that the village should be registered in Annaiya Sishab's name.

The 3rd claim is that of Sundaramarayan who says that when he was but a boy his uncle defrauded him and entered the village which was allowed by Annaiya Sishab to his sister for her use & subsistence among the common ancestral property and allotted it to the share of his uncle Arunachellaiya. He requests that as a gift or allowance to his mother, the village should be registered in his name.

The 4th is that of the present enjoyer Arunachellaiya who states that the purchase was made by his father; that at the time the purchase was made the father and uncle having been in dispute with their cousins, the deed of sale was executed in the name of his brother's brother-in-law Annaiya muly, for names sake, that he & his brothers enjoyed the village uninterrupted ever since the date of sale; & that in Virudhikrit, the property having been divided, this village and some property was allotted to his share; that the Karmikam Vinai of Navali & Peddur Sarafi & some property was allotted to the share of Sundaramarayan his brother's son and to Sishajeni Aiyar (brother of Sundaramarayan) adopted by his elder brother Navali Subhayan now living, that the property has been since enjoyed according to the partition and that Sundaramarayan and his maternal uncle have only to defraud him, thus conspired to prejudice against his right to the Shrotriyan.

He produces 5 Shrotriyan Jodi receipts of the Mutladas viz

- 1 for G 1240 by Mutladas Lakshmana Rao in the name of Annaiya Chani
- 1 for G 1242 by _____ in the name of Gundahalli Shrotriyan Annaiyan &
- 1 for G 1243 by _____ in the name of Annaiya purchaser from Venkata Kistna Sastri who had purchased the village in an auction
- 1 for G 1244 by _____ in the name of Annaiya Gundahalli Shrotriyan Jagirdar
- 1 for G 1245 by his sons Sishajeni Aiyar & Balaji Aiyar in the name of Annaiya Chani brother-in-law of Kistna Chari & who had purchased the same from Venkata Kistna Chari a purchaser of it in auction

8-72. A Power of Attorney on Common paper dated

8-2 November 1825

alleged to have been given by Sath Commissioner Singanabasi to Venkata Kistnayan stating that in the auction held of the property (Shrotriyan village of Gundahalli) of Tistina Chani who stood security for a defaulting sugar renter Venkata Kistnayan purchased the village at the highest bid of 13½ Rupees.

8-72. A Power of Attorney on Common paper dated Partur or G 1234 alleged to have been executed by Kistnachari widow Venkamma and Shrotriyan Annaiya to Arunachellaiya putting themselves under his protection and making over to him all their property & debts with a right & full liberty to dispose of any of their property as he liked.

8-72. A deed of partition on Common paper dated Virudhikrit or G 1259 according to which this village was allotted to the share of the present enjoyer Arunachellaiya.

And some matters

were sent by Swarapilola Kistnachari. Beyond this and the entry in the accounts of G 1212 with the Karmam there is no other proof to show that the village was an Inam village of the Brattam. He claims that the village may be registered in the name of the Mulabagule Brattam for the support of which the grant was made.

The 5th claim is that of one Venkataramanaya of Sriprathur, brother and constituted agent of Annaiya Sishabhar alias Annaiyan alleged to be the person mentioned as purchaser in the sale document of Khara or G 1241 (Doc. ment No. 1 in Col 20). He says that his brother Annaiya Sishabhar purchased the village as per the deed of sale dated Khara produced by Radambli Arunachellaiyan, that his sister was given in marriage to Venkatarayan brother of Arunachellaiyan, that Venkatarayan and his brother were entrusted for the use of their sister with the management of the village and with the documents.

He says the subsequent receipts were all in the name of Annaiyan without remark & that this Annaiyan was the person who purchased the village as per Sub of sale of Partin or S.1234 & that no change in the Registry has ever taken place. He has had no deed of transfer from Annaiya Dikshit the nominal party entered in the deed of sale of S.1241.

Thus there are 4 claims set forth for Registry.

From the entry in the Survey account & in the Gram List of S.1219 it is clear that this is an old grant; Mrs. Graham's Sakid of S.1204 does not agree with the entry made in the Survey account. The Survey describes the village to belong to the Mattam & Mrs. Graham's Sakid is in the name of Sammanachari. The omission of the village from the Registry of S.1234, & in the list given in it of the villages of the Mulabazula Mattam is not accounted for, by the accounts now before me. If it had ever belonged to the Mattam as indicated in the Survey, the Mattam lost the village 40 or 45 years ago & no claim has been ever made during this long period on behalf of the Mattam.

Assuming Sammanachari the person named in Mrs. Graham's Sakid as the real owner of the property, it is seen that the Gram passed through several hands. It passed from Sammanachari's family by sale in auction to one Venkatasubramanyam & from him it passed by sale to Narayanaachari's son Annaiyan in S.1235. At this stage one Annachellaiya, a person quite unconnected with any of the above families, but who appeared as an agent of the purchaser Annaiya, is alleged to have sold the village to one Subbapattin Annaiya Sank (Annaiyan's 2). This sale does not seem to be a proper one. The Villanapatti Shrivastava Papabhat, a person of 77 years old, states that he knows more than 30 years' enjoyment of this village which is adjoining to Villanapatti. His account is, that the village belonged to the Mulabazula Mattam that the Mattam Gram had direct charge of the village till Samiya (1789); that then Sammanachari who came from Mysore District, was employed as the agent of Mattam; that at the Survey also the Mattam's enjoyment was recorded for the village; that Sammanachari & his son Nistachari enjoyed the village accordingly; that Nistachari died leaving a young widow Venkamma, that her brother was Annaiya; that these parties enjoyed the village for some years, that then one Annachellaiya of Sivunamattai joined them & was kind to them, that this Annachellaiya & Venkamma enjoyed the village till 30 years ago, that Annachellaiya was asked by Venkamma 30 years ago to take charge of the village on their behalf, that he & his father refused to take it up because it was the property of the Mattam, that then they left the village in charge of Venkamma's brother of the present enjoyer, & went away somewhere to the East - that since then Venkamma & brother were enjoying the Gram; & that in a recent partition the village fell to the lot of the present enjoyer. He further states that he is not aware of the alleged sale in auction nor of the sale to Annaiya before at Ramavillalloor, the Annaiya brother of Venkamma. It seems that Annaiya made only rare mentions of this village, & that he promised to come back shortly. According to that evidence the fact of the grant belonging to the Mattam is established & long time having elapsed we cannot now recognize the claim, But leaving the Mattam & the other claimants to seek redress in the Courts, I would confirm the village in the name of the present enjoyer Annachellaiya & recommend a Dist Rent of $\frac{1}{2}$. Proposed Berig 192 Pappu - Pantham Busa Nam 38 Rs.

If the right of the Mattam should ever be established in the Courts the grant would have to be confirmed in the name of the Mattam without any Dist Rent under the Rules & the Dist Rent now charged would have to be given up.

(Signed) S. Narayana Rao
Deputy Collector

The only account of the Ajakah pertaining to the survey account with the Karam & the Jamnabai account of Surmaki is F.12. In F.12.2 Mutlasi tenure was introduced & the Government right in the village was made over to the Mutlasi.

This is a small village supported by a Tank & the assessment is generally simple.

[illegible]

In 1870 & from long time it is
said only the extent of the Durmatte pambundu
is under cultivation viz 41-7-8
It is true the sillage is a poor one
but it appears the cultivation has
extended to some degree. It is said
that the Aggarhadas gain is 50 Rs
per Annum - I propose the Bezir
at the amount of the increase expected

2 1871 viz 41-7-3
Plus $\frac{1}{2}$ of the waste 23-13-
Total 65-4-3

An Ayakhat account of 1832 has been since found in which the Ayakhat is entered as 58 acres but referring to the survey account it appears four measurements were made of the village & the total of the four measurements was 162 acres. In the account of 1832, a mistake seems to have occurred and it appears that only 3 measurements were then added up for the Ayakhat. According to this account the cultivation was reckoned at $27\frac{1}{2}$ acres and } assessment
but $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres — } 33-4-11
Grass — — — — — 16-15-3
61 — — — — — 49-4-3

40-4-3
It is entirely incorrect & has been therefore now set aside.

(Lid) Aharayana Rai

In F 1232
It is outside
as Vellarapatti
Jumeham
Nissa Rajyapeddi son of Brother-1
village Paipaiya Buehi Brothers
withind 77 bhat. son in law
the name
of the
Jumadar.
41-7-
In F

This was a Kanyam Sodi village. It was converted into a village on the sharing system - The share of the Affgharadar & Government being 1/4 respectively on the Beriz. In 1821 the Beriz was as recommended 41-7-8 & $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Beriz was collected. In 1822 the village was included in the ~~Kanmanellur~~ Mutta. The village was re-measured as under Government previous to the formation of the Mutta in the hands of the Shothrayamdar. The Mutthadar has been collecting from 1823 to the present day, an annual tax of 17-10-3. This has been collected since the Jomalabanki of 1822. The Beriz of that Gadi was 33-1-0 The Panekam Kissa was 6-6-7 and the remaining circular Demand was 17-10-5

The Proposed Being is $\text{Rupus } 65^{\frac{1}{2}}$
 $\frac{1}{5}$ - shown in this is $\frac{1}{3}$
 To be confirmed
 Unit Rent $\frac{1}{8}^{\text{th}}$ 1-15
 agreed to

Papa Chato's brother Subbaya a claims register in this village as an undivided brother - But he has no enjoyment & the 3 brothers have since come to an understanding between themselves, about the future disposal of the property -

(Signed) A Narayana Rao
Deputy Collector