

Year	Month	Day	Time	Place	Wind	Temp	Bar	Hum	Dir	Dist	Remarks
1892	Jan	1	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	2	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	3	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	4	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	5	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	6	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	7	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	8	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	9	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	10	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	11	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	12	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	13	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	14	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	15	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	16	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	17	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	18	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	19	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	20	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	21	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	22	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	23	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	24	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	25	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	26	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	27	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	28	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	29	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	30	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear
1892	Jan	31	10:00	St. Louis	W	55	30.0	80	SW	10	Clear

[illegible]

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 lease, and partly by alleged purchase. The produce of the 5 villages was divided 1/3 to share in the 5 Inams, and pleaded that he obtained the remaining 2/3 by purchase or 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 Inams in the name of her son Biddi Narayana as the actual possessor of the Inams, and as the legal descendant of the Sany Chander Dargaga. She deposed before me that the Inam in Puduraddiyer was left by her husband in charge of Kadappa Simiassai, a gangar over 20 or 30 years, and that one half of the produce was given to her husband and since two years ago she herself, and that the other half was given to a cousin under Venkateswara, who has remained

under the protection of Krishnaiyager. The complaint was referred to the Taluk. 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

Annam Nayana
of Katur and 11 villages

Speaks of the Inam at Kadappa, at Puduraddiyer, Chittoor, and Chittoor. States that Krishnaiyager, Subbaya, Subbaya, Jannarayana, Venkateswara, and Subbaya son-in-law Simiassai (father of defendant - Subbaya) were enjoying the Inams 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 Simiassai, and from 5 years by his son Krishnaiyager who enjoyed the lands, and that Lakshminamma has been coming once a year and looking after the produce, but that he does not know if she ever took any produce.

Annam Nayana
of Chittoor

Speaks regarding Chittoor, Chittoor, Chittoor, and Chittoor. Declares the enjoyment of 50 years in the family of Lakshminamma and her son, states that the Inams at Kadappa and Puduraddiyer 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 Inams, that Krishnaiyager had no enjoyment, and that, if any in fact, it must have been that of

Annam Nayana who is under his protection. The Kadappa Inam was settled on 12th March 1862, about 10 Kadappa Inam. The Puduraddiyer Inam was settled on 12th March 1862, about 10 Puduraddiyer Inam. The Chittoor Inam was settled on 12th March 1862, about 10 Chittoor Inam. The Chittoor Inam was settled on 12th March 1862, about 10 Chittoor Inam.

Subbaya, states that a 1/2 field of Kadappa was rented to him by one Subbaya in 1862, and since then he has been paying the rent to him and his wife and not known, and that Krishnaiyager 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.

Subbaya, states that a 1/2 field of Kadappa was rented to him by one Subbaya in 1862, and since then he has been paying the rent to him and his wife and not known, and that Krishnaiyager 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.

the alleged right of purchase. In the inquiry before the Judge, he failed in addition to answer the question of the nature of the 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 possession or generally established. I leave the nature of the documents to be settled by the Civil Tribunal, where the Subordinate or others might see. Krishnagangai.

8. The Subordinate believed that both Krishnagangai and Lakshminammal 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 Krishnammal. There is no doubt to the forgery and concludes the statement showing that both parties seem to have enjoyment.

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

10. The annual charges of Krishnagangai have been already duly charged with their fitting Court Books.

11. It appears that the Subordinate showed the same of Dindal Karambhaia as the enjoying Pradhan.

12. It appears that the Subordinate showed the same of Dindal Karambhaia as the enjoying Pradhan.

13. It appears that the Subordinate showed the same of Dindal Karambhaia as the enjoying Pradhan.

Sheet No 131

The Court are set down among Decrees to be attached.

When Krishnagangai appeared in May 1862 and deposed to his right. Lakshminammal appeared on the 14th March 1863. The case was referred to the Subordinate on the 21st March 1863. Subordinate's report dated 28th January 1864 has been received this day through the Salem Collector.

(Signed) J. Narayana Rao
Dy. Collector

Impd 24/1/64
Salem District

Sheet No 131
Salem District