

The name Sarney is not a success in terms on the old name. I don't see how we can do but cases, as we have already reported, with the same.

to the same entry M.
for the old name
and old name

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

Shakno 83

and undoubtedly the same name
and undoubtedly the same name

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

For the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6
for the old name
1820-1-1 1.52 13-102
Returned 10-11-6

retained the same. The sanction of
 Govt for transferring the land to the
 heads of Inam is not necessary
 as it has been claimed as Inam since
 since it was treated as Ager field
 in possession of Ramayyasa. The
 Revenue Pottah has simply been
 cancelled without any necessary
 change in No 92 as the new Inam
 has been introduced into the Taluq
 in possession according to the Survey
 Settlement (S 84)

12. If even the Mamdar must obtain
 possession of the land through a
 Civil Court as under Sec 10 of
 Act 8 of 1865.

21-11-86

J. M. M.

Opps Inam Committee:

The SD with the sanctioned of D. M.
 20
 No 111-11-1782.

Case No 8 Reg 1847 - Kuchan Taluq
 Chikambaram - South Arcot Dist.

I have perused the record sent by the Tahsildar
 on the complaint of the Mamdar made
 in 1845 & 1847. The Tahsildar's Report
 is dated 8th Dec 1853 No 275. This is the
 record referred to by the District Collector in
 his remarks, it was forwarded to this
 Office with the Mr. C. M. letter dated
 5/6/60 No 573.

2. The locality under dispute had
 long been waste prior to Feb 1250
 when it was included in the Ager field
 of Ramayyasa as being the site of the
 Ager field No 92. No exception is taken
 by the Mamdar claiming it as his
 Inam No 86 & Ramayyasa as his
 Ager No 92.

3. The Mamdar's first complaint was in
 1845 & was an inquiry why he did
 not complain earlier. Only four years have

Last elapsed since the granting of the Patent
the land perhaps was not actually
cultivated ^{before} 1845 -

4. The Curmure stated before the Tribunal
that at the Survey this localit^y was 8.
Miebiaka measured both as Inam & as Ager
& that consequently he treated it as Ager,
but he does not give any proof of his
assertion as to the same portion of land
having been measured twice over.

5. The Tahsilदार deputed a Taluq
Somestath to inspect the Cause & to
report. His report was to the effect that
it was impossible to trace out exactly
the Survey fields as their boundaries had
hardly been obliterated, but that on
measuring the land actually held by
Ramezengam, his limits, & the
rights which were entered in the aforesaid
being in possession of Ager fields
Nos 87 to 105 - the extent came to
1/4th of a Canary more than that entered in
the Survey against those numbers & that

the measured land in
localit^y was not included. Taking this
disputed localit^y to be the Inam Nos 86
the extent of the whole Inam was found
on measurement to be $7\frac{1}{2}$ lbs of a
Canary above that recorded in the
Survey. This excess is within 10 per cent.

6. Under these circumstances, & considering
that the disputed localit^y was situated
close to the Inam Nos 82 to 85 - the Tah.
considered that the Ager fields Nos 82
must be among the limits of the Ager
Sukthah holders of Nos 87 to 105 - & that
the disputed piece of land was Inam.

7. The D^r Col^l is of the same opinion.

8. Ramezengam is now in possession
of the land.

9. I fully agree with the D^r Col^l that
the disputed land cannot be Nos 82
& that there is every reason to believe
it to be Nos 86.

10. As the Inamdar has repeatedly put
forward his claim to the land & has not
considered that his right is barred & lapses of time

