

(1-4)

1-13-8	8.	9.	10	11
ave	Forster	Long	Blair	Carl Pearson
	Wright	Lee	Ward	
<u>1-13-8</u>	g. Bismarck			
	Deane &			
	Carl Bonfatti			
	Ph. Emplis			
	in progress			

383 m
 10
 12 Months
 7

1-10-8 Halls 2 2 2
3-2 Colport
1-9-8 2 Perwaka
Lewy at
Bankers Hall
The Empire
in 100 men

to Cause <i>Dr</i> deposited in the State Bank of New York	to Cause to Cause to Cause to Cause to Cause	to Cause to Cause to Cause to Cause to Cause	to Cause to Cause to Cause to Cause to Cause
---	---	---	---

Schubert
Lied
In D major
1819/20
Op. 10 No. 7

12-2 *Frax* 3-0-0
 12-2 *Suffr*
 12-2 *Yucca*
 Gemma
 at *San Rafael*
The struggle is
in good order

[illegible]

To the
Rev. Mr.
Dr. Williams

179 Blake Jof b 11
179 250
384
179 250
384
384
508

<i>Am. Coum.</i>	<i>de Guss</i>	<i>de Guss Kadablio</i>
<i>Lv</i>	Papaya eat the surveys Papaya	Bumaka Paganaka some Pindanaya com Apar
		Title Supplemental Remarks Africa

Produced in
speed of 9999
on stamping
Kadpan ~~Ward~~
of 12134 800
a part - the
has been enjoying
the whole will
but the
words of salt
are produced

To be Confirmed
Jodi a - 5 -
Said Part 2 - 4 -
anybody
227 A Marine Blvd
Respectfully
7/6/62

Abstract of Lucerne in the Valley of the Rhodanese

Age	Sex	Species	Length	Wing	Tail	Culmen	Tarsus	Middle toe	Claw
3	♂	Swainson's	330	214	148	50	122		
2	♀	Swainson's	310	195	140	48	115		
5	♂	Swainson's	325	205	145	52	120		
1	♀	Swainson's	310	195	140	48	115		
6	♂	Swainson's	330	214	148	50	122		

In your Register of Matrimonialties No 1 in the Village of Eden in the County of York
 Vol 15000 of the City of York

There is also a Village of the same name near
the capital is small -

2-11-77 North Bay Pointe au
 Caprice for West Kanan.
 2-11-77 7 Mainamoa
 at Mahale's place.
 The sample is in
 for over

¹⁰	¹³	¹⁴	¹⁵	¹⁶	¹⁷	¹⁸
La Ramad	La Morte	La Mort	Maria Selli			
Grafen	Maryanne	Papa	Maryanne			
Waltz		Katharina	Papier			
Achtzehn						
Sechszehn						
Fünfzehn						
Vierzehn						
Dreizehn						
Zwölf						
Elf						
Zehn						
Nach						
vor						
bei						
aus						
in						
unter						
über						
gegen						
mit						
ohne						
von						
zu						
für						
pro						
per						
propter						
ob						
sub						
super						
contra						
inter						
intra						
extra						
subter						
superior						
inferior						
medius						
extremus						
proximus						
remotus						
vicinus						
alienus						
proprius						
communis						
privatus						
publicus						
secundarius						
tertius						
quartus						
quintus						
sextus						
septimus						
octavus						
nonus						
decimus						
undecimus						
duodecimus						
tredecimus						
quadraginta						
quinquaginta						
sexaginta						
septuaginta						
octoginta						
nonaginta						
centum						
mille						
millia						
decies						
viginti						
triginta						
quadraginta						
quinquaginta						
sexaginta						
septuaginta						
octoginta						
nonaginta						
centum						
mille						
millia						
decies						
vicesima						
trigesima						
quadragesima						
quingentesima						
sesquagesima						
diagesima						
triagesima						

[illegible]

Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor
Chittoor

Sheet No 130

1. Then Chinnu the 5 villages were settled by Supplemental Register on 3rd May 1862, in the name of Chinnu, partly as a son, and partly by alleged purchase. He produced a stamped deed of gift dated 17th Aug 1856 p. to show that he obtained the villages and pleaded that he obtained the remaining by purchase &c for which he had no documents.

2. Then one Lakshmanamma wife of Jannarayana, and daughter-in-law of Dapiga, 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 Chinnu, and as the legal descendant of the Sany Chander Dapiga. She deposed before me that the Chinnu 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. Her complaint was referred to the Sany. A report has been received this day from the Tahsildar through the Collector of the Salem District for Madras here. The abstract of the evidence on both sides appears to be as follows:

Plaintiff witnesses

Chinnu Narayana
of Madras and 11 villages

Speaks of the Chinnu at Kadappa, at Puduraddiyer, Chittoor, and Chittoor. States that Krishnaiyager, Narayana, Subbaya, Jannarayana, Venkateswara, and Subbaya son-in-law Simiassai (father of defendant - Chinnu) were enjoying the Chinnu 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 Lakshmanamma has been coming once a year and looking after the produce, but that he does not know if she ever took any produce.

Chinnu Narayana } Speaks regarding Chittoor, Chittoor, Chittoor, and Chittoor. Declares the enjoyment of 33 years in the family of Lakshmanamma and her son, states that the Chinnu 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 Chinnu, that Krishnaiyager had no enjoyment, and that, if any in fact, it must have been that of Venkateswara who is under his protection.

The Kadappa Narayana states D. about 10 Kadappa Narayana.

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

Subbaya, states that a big field of Kadappa was rented to him by one Subbaya in 1847, and since then he has been paying the rent to him and his wife came 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 Lakshmanamma had some right in the lands.

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

1. Deposition of Subbarayan states that the defendant Subbarayan wanted to have the said Chann land, Kadathur, some 20 years ago, and it is found the same to have been sold afterwards from 20 or 25 years, to Panchayagan his son, and does not know anything of Lakshmanammal.

2. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan wanted to have certain Chann lands (situated at Kadathur) 20 years ago, that he witnessed the land 20 or 25 years ago, and gave the same to Subbarayan and came to Lakshmanammal, Channiff.

3. Deposition of Subbarayan states that he himself cultivated the Chann of Kadathur and rents were paid to Subbarayan and after his death to Subbarayan and now to Subbarayan's adopted son Panchayagan and knows nothing of Lakshmanammal.

4. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Panchayagan wanted to have the same land 20 years ago, and knows nothing of Lakshmanammal.

5. Deposition of Subbarayan states that the Dry lands of Paduradigai were wanted to him 20 years ago by Panchayagan which he left only to the year 1890.

6. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan gave him the land of Channaballu 20 years ago. Subbarayan died 20 years ago, that afterwards Subbarayan's widow came to give the cost of the land to Subbarayan's wife Lakshmanammal, that she paid the same accordingly to Lakshmanammal. He submitted the statement 2 days after, and sold the land to Subbarayan and not to Lakshmanammal, and does not know anything of Lakshmanammal.

7. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Kadathur, Paduradigai and Channaballu were engaged by Subbarayan from 20 years ago and the same Panchayagan was engaged then.

8. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Panchayagan engaged him at Paduradigai, Channaballu from 20 or 25 years ago, and since the same was registered as Subbarayan's.

9. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Kadathur, Paduradigai and Channaballu were engaged by Subbarayan from 20 years ago, and that after Subbarayan's death some years ago, his son-in-law Panchayagan has been enjoying it solely himself, after his death Subbarayan's wife Lakshmanammal, and Subbarayan's adopted son Panchayagan have been enjoying.

10. Deposition of Subbarayan states that the Dry Chann at Kadathur, Paduradigai and Channaballu belong to his husband Subbarayan, that she has been receiving the rents of the land, that her husband Subbarayan told that the Chann above said and the Chann at Kadathur &c should be enjoyed by his nephew (Doraiman) Subbarayan &c, that Lakshmanammal has been had enjoyment.

11. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

12. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

13. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

14. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

15. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

16. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

17. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

18. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

19. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

20. Deposition of Subbarayan states that Subbarayan died of old, dated Channaballu for certain portion of the Chann.

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 established. It is clear that from the evidence in the case, the Judge is of opinion 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 filed by the Civil Judge, who is of opinion that the parties might sue Shashnagar.

8. The Subordinate believed that both Shashnagar and Lakshminarayana have joint enjoyment in the lands which is contradicted by the evidence which will be stated to below. In what proportions and under what title he cannot conclude. As regards the forged document, the Subordinate says he is not able to perceive that Shashnagar committed the forgery himself. As regards the joint or several enjoyment of the lands, the Subordinate's remarks show that the defendant Shashnagar 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 Kankatammal. 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 Shashnagar'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.

10. The annual charges of Shashnagar have been already duly charged with their fitting Court Fees.

11. It appears that the same list of charges should the same of Dindal Kankatammal as the enjoying Shashnagar.

12. It is found on Kankatammal was duly for Kankatammal on the 11th January 1861 for Kankatammal on the 16th January 1861.

Sheet No 131

for Kankatammal
for Kankatammal
for Kankatammal
for Kankatammal
for Kankatammal

The Court are set down among Dindal to be attached. When Shashnagar appeared in May 1862 and deposed to his right. Lakshminarayana appeared on the 14th March 1862. The case was referred to the Subordinate on the 21st March 1862. 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
Dindal

Sheet No 131
Kankatammal
Salem District