

[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 to the 5 Jains, 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 1st March 1863, and filed statements for the 5 Jains 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 Pudurreddy was left by her husband in charge of Kadappa Siminassai. The Jains saw 20 or 30 years, and that one half of the produce was given to the 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 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

Chinnu
of Madras and 11 villages

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

Carried on the cultivation, but that the cultivation was now managed by Siminassai, and from 5 years by his son Krishna Rao 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
of Madras and 11 villages

Speaks regarding Chittoor, Chittoor, Chittoor, and Chittoor. Declares the enjoyment of 30 years in the family of Lakshmanamma and her son, states that the Jains, at Kadappa and Pudurreddy were held jointly by Plaintiff, and one Subba Rao, and states that he has heard that both Plaintiff and Subba Rao

to Venkateswara have been enjoying the Chinnu, that Krishna Rao had no enjoyment, and that, if any in fact, it must have been that of Siminassai who is under his protection.

The Kadappa Chinnu states D. about 10 Kadappa Jannu. He says to his having many years accompanied Lakshmanamma to Kadappa &c and brought the produce of the lands given by Siminassai and his son and his son Krishna Rao also. Ready money was paid also some years.

Subba Rao, states that a big field of Kadappa was rented to him by one Subba Rao in 1847, 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 Lakshmanamma 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 Mableton some 4 years ago and he in fact the claim to him; and afterwards, from 2 or 3 years, to Purchase his son, it does not have anything of substance.

Minigan of Puducherry

Spinyon of Sankaraball
Descendants of Sankaraball Subbaya gave him the land off Sankaraball 20 years ago. Subbaya died 10 years ago, that afternoon Simravaya ordered him to give the land to Subbaya's wife Lakshmanamma, that is, put the land according to Lakshmanamma. He accepted the statement 2 days after, and said he put the land to Lakshmanamma, and not to Lakshmanammal. He is a boy, stated to be Simravaya.

Cassidix, Rodolphe

Documents filed before the Builders by Defendant Newknyazov.

The Karaman Amang said that the Pannagar detained the enjoyment of Lebhamamuel, then evidence was
 taken by the testimony of the satisfying people. I therefore, inform the Court in the name of Kuthangam as
 and in favor of them of possession a proper ruling evidence was produced and whose enjoyment was admitted
 of Suldaya in Pannagar in inhabitation 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 Rights.

It appears that the same list of Chakras showed the same of Danda 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 same 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