287 — 5 — [illegible]
128 — 6 — 1¾
39 — 28
317 — 18 — 12
385 — 10 — 10
386 — 38 — 3
387 — 6 — 4
414 — 2 — 12
3 — 5 — 2 3 : 3 7 — 2 — 3

At the average rate [illegible] 2-4-6 [illegible]

Register No 331

For the free [illegible] not known expenses of the Swami of Apatsahayeswara Swami's Pagoda in the village. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition & the worship is rendered.

No documents

Apatsahayeswaraswami

No 7216 Apatsahayeswaraswami Swamy — 8 — 9¼

No 7239 Apatsahayeswaraswami Swamy 3 — 5 — 2

Apatsahayeswara Swami at Alangudi
Trustees
Chinnappa Mudali
Muthusami Mudali
Chetambarattadaiyan
Ramanujaiyangar &
Anantanarayanadikshatar

To be confirmed. The Inam in the Inam is [illegible] the average [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

20/10/62 [illegible]

[illegible] 20 June

1 Clm / 899

Register No 332

Register of Inams in the village of Tiruveenamangalam No 149 in the above Magaanam Kumbaconum Taluk Tanjore District

Sheet No. 119

624 2 — 26 — 9½
625 3 — 11 — 8½
627 1 — 19 — 4
629 — 22 — 7½
617 1 — 3 — 11½
618 1 — 24 — 5½
619 2 — 39 — 6½
620 2 — 11 — 3
621 3 — 26 — 3
622 — 30 — 6¾
623 — 32 — 5¾
641 — 12 — ½
22 — 14 — 11¼ 22 37 21 — 3 — 2
At the average [illegible] 15-2 per [illegible]

As above do do do do

Apatsahayeswaraswami

No 7216 Sri Apatsahayeswaraswami [illegible] 3 — 6 — 57

No 7239 The same 22 — 14 — 11¼

As above

To be confirmed

6/10/62 [illegible]

1 Clm / 900

[illegible] 14 — 12½ 37 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in

[illegible] 6 8 — 7 as above

For the expenses do do do do of Periya Alaiyamandalamman Pagoda in the village. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition and the worship is rendered

Pedari

No 7216 [illegible] Pagoda Inam Tope — 1 — 76

No 7239 Alaiyamandalamman Pagoda Swami — 22 — 6¾

Alaiyamandalamman at Tiruveenamangalam
Worshipper
Sokkalingam

To be confirmed

6/10/62 [illegible]

1 Clm / 901

[illegible] 3

Register of Inams in the village of Perumalkoilpettai No 151 in the above Magaanam Kumbaconum Taluk Tanjore District

[illegible] — 1 — 3½
— 3 — 14¼ 10 — 15
247
240 2 — 12 — 8½
252 2 — 29 — 13
253 — 23 — 5
260 — 28
257 2 — 38 — 3½
258 — 38 — 11
259 — 7 — 9
260 — 29 — 12
262 — 24 — 14
33 — 9¾ 11·82 11 — 7
[illegible] 11·92 12 — 5
Perumal [illegible]
255 — 2 — 12¾ ·07 — 5
— 39 — 5¼ 11·99 12 — 10

At the [illegible] and [illegible] 15 — 9 [illegible]

[illegible] Varadarajaperumal's Pagoda in the village. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition and the worship is rendered do do do do

Varadarajaperumal

No 7216 Sri Varadarajaperumal [illegible] Inam Tope 1 — 14 — 81

No 7239 The same 11 — 39 — 5¼

Varadaraja Perumal at Perumalkoilpattu
Trustee
Chinnappa Mudali
Vasudeva Mudali

To be confirmed

6/10/62 [illegible]

1 Clm / 902

As a portion of the Inam a Choultry was built by the Sircar in 1848 or 1849. The [illegible] planted in the backyard in behalf of the choultry [illegible] before the above [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Superintendent [illegible] choultries in [illegible] was disposed of requesting that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] only [illegible] in the above [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] choultry [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that there is not [illegible]

Fairchild

[illegible] ... [illegible]

452 — 20-13½ · 52 — 13-9 —

at the average dry rate [illegible] — 13-6 per [illegible]

For Expenses of Sivalokanadha Swami Pagoda in the village. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition and the worship is rendered.

not known

No document

Sivalokanadhaswami

F. 1218 Sivalokanadha Swami Pagoda Swamy tope — 1-57.

F. 1239 Sivalokanadha Pagoda Swamy tope — 20-12½

Sivalokanadhaswami at Sattanur

Worshipper

Rama Gurukkal

✓

Title confirmed

6/10/62 [illegible] Dy. Collr.

Kdn 903

Register No. 335 Register of Inams in the village of Veppattangudi No. 171 in the above Maganam Kumbaconam Taluk

Do dry

155 — 5-7½

158 — 9 —

159 — 23-12½

160 — 19-11

162 — 14-12½

1-37-11¼ · 1·94 · 2 — 4 —

at the average dry rate [illegible] per acre.

Do do of Do Do Do Do Agastiswara Swami's Pagoda in the village of Kottaiyur. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition and the worship is rendered.

Agastiswaraswami

F. 1216 Sri Agastiswara Swamy's Inam tope — 4-74½

F. 1239 the same 1-37-11¼

Agastiswaraswami at Kottaiyur

Worshipper

Vaidyanadha Gurukkal

✓

Title confirmed. The assessment on the Inam [illegible] at the average [illegible] is [illegible] plus 10 p.c. is only a [illegible] per [illegible] charge is therefore [illegible]

6/10/62 [illegible] Dy. Collr.

Kdn 904

---

336 **Register No. 336** Register of Inams in the village of Kottaiyur No. 170 in the above Maganam Kumbaconam Taluk Tanjore District

Do

garden

544 — 4-8 · 11 — 6-7

dry

544 — 1-27-15¼

[illegible] — 2-8½

678 — 2-4

[illegible] — 9-5½

[illegible] — [illegible]

[illegible] — 37-12

3-31 — 3·78 · 8-1 —

3-30-8 · 3·89 · 8-7-7

at the average dry & garden rates of Rs 2-2-2 & Rs 3-10 — per acre respectively.

As above Do Do Do Do

As above

F. 1216 Agastiswara Swami Inam tope — 10-70¾

F. 1239 the same 3-35-8

As above

✓

Title confirmed. The Inam [illegible]

[illegible]

Tanjore 905

Kdn 905

176

[illegible] · 18 — 7 — Do Do Do Do Do

Sri Santana Rama Swami

in the village of [illegible]mangalam

Settled in Special Register 13/12/66 [illegible]

Ascertain the Raja granted the Inam to the Pagoda & whether [illegible] before the [illegible]

And [illegible] the [illegible] the district the Raja of Tanjore afterwards Collr. [illegible] 15/11/57

[illegible] 15/11/58

Register No. 337 Register of Inams in the village of Sivapuram Tottam (No. 390) in the Cumbaconam Maganam Cumbaconam Taluk

Do

Tope

5 — 1-22-7½

11 — 39 —

7-27-7½ · 7·69

For the expenses of the Pagoda of Sri Sivapuranadha Swami at Sivapuram. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition & the worship is rendered.

Do Do Do Do

Sri Sivapuranadha Swami

F. 1210 [illegible] F. 1225 Siva[illegible] swami Pagoda Inam tope — 12-50.

F. 1216 Sri Sivapuranadha Swami Pagoda [illegible] tope [illegible] 7-27-7½

Sri Sivapuranadha Swami at Sivapuram

Trustees

Ramaiyan

Sami Aiyan

Ramachandraiyan &

Muthukkomaran Chetumbara Chetti

✓

[illegible] Raja granted [illegible] which is about 32 p.c.

[illegible]

[illegible] it was [illegible] But which the [illegible] says was shewn [illegible] the "Sivapuram" village [illegible] that [illegible] belonging to Sivapuram [illegible] Sivapuram Tottam [illegible] village [illegible] which [illegible]

The [illegible] Punjah and [illegible] villages [illegible] formerly the Raja. But [illegible] Government in exchange [illegible] villages belonging to them for the better [illegible] In such villages there is only one [illegible] available [illegible] F. 1239 [illegible] year [illegible] This village [illegible] the Inam [illegible] The [illegible] of the Inam [illegible] 50 in the [illegible]

[illegible]

Tanjore 979

[illegible] 479

Examined

[illegible]

Extract from the Register of Inams of the Village of Kottayur in Kumbaconum Taluq, Tanjore District

Religious Endt.	Tope	540	395	98	2-1-7	For the support of the Santana Rama Swami in the village of Nidamangalam	Free of tax	Not known	Not known	No Document	Sri Santana Rama Swami	~~In the Bingar accounts of both Fuslies 1216 and 1234, Santana Ramaswami Pagoda.~~ Not entered in the Register prepared under Reg XXXI of 1802.	In the Paimash accounts of both Fuslies 1216 & 1234, Sri Santana Ramaswami Pagoda	"	"	This minor Inam is not supported by any grant, but has been held as an endowment of the Pagoda named in column 8 for upwards of fifty years, being shown in the Paimash account of Fusly 1216 (A. D 1806) as Inam Tope of the said Pagoda. To be confirmed free of all charge under rule 3. 2. The Pagoda is at present under the charge of the committee appointed under Act XX of 1863, and is duly maintained. 3. In the old Paimash account above referred to, the extent of the Tope is shown as 3 Mas and 17¼ Gulies, by the old measure of 12 feet rod, while that entered in the later Paimash and now in actual enjoyment of the Pagoda, is only 2 Mas and 97 5/16 Gulies, equal to 39 5/16 Gulies of new measure of a 33 feet rod, entered in column 4, thus showing a deficiency of 19 15/16 old Gulies. The cause of this difference is not ascertainable.

Confirmed to the Pagoda in Col 8 on present tenure See Collector's letter dated 13th October 1866 No 1144

W Man

13/12/66

Reg No 336 / 31

Register No 336

c d M Sheet No 120

Fair [illegible]

(True Copy)

W Muir

Off. Inam Commr.

Inam Commr's Office
Madras 12 July 1866.

Tanjore Collr's Office
Vallam
8th December 1866

G Lee Morris
Collector

Received with Collr's letter d/ 8th December 1866 No: 1362

Enr 1886

~~No 2~~ 147

Regr No 147

Tanjore

	100-26-4½		100-66	
Deduct [illegible]	47-26-12		17-67	
Remainder Wet	58 15 1		58 38	
Dry	6 16 6¼		6-40	
Tope	15 14 10½		15 37	
Garden	2 35 6½		2-53	
Total	82 37 8¼		82 98	

Add the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] from [illegible]

Dry	" 13 10¼	" 34
Garden	3-39 10½	4 "
	4 13 7¾	4 35

Total Wet	58 15 1	58 38	378 13 4
Dry	6 31 2½	6 74	15 1 "
Tope	15 14 10½	15 37	34 4 5
Garden	6 33 1	6 83	30 7 6
	87 12 [illegible]	87 32	458 10 3

Wet 6 " "
Dry 3 15 "
[illegible] 1 15 "
11 10 "

Petition No 147

Sheet No 263

[illegible] in the same year for [illegible]

[illegible] original deed [illegible] in [illegible]

[illegible] by himself [illegible] in the year 1837 [illegible]

[illegible] whose father [illegible] No 3 [illegible]

[illegible] No 14 [illegible]

[illegible] in the year [illegible]

[illegible] father in the year [illegible]

[illegible] himself in the year [illegible]

[illegible]

Kumbakonam Taluq
Tanjore D

[illegible]

... No. 30 ... grandfather in ... the y[ea]r ... No. 31 purchased the ½ ... which ... in the year ... No. 10 — ... No. 15 was purchased by ... (who had ...) ... Madam) in 1859. ... 75 ... of 15 was ... attachments ... different ... be released from attachments.

... Ahobala Madam it appears from a statement filed by ... in its name ... claims ... Registration of the whole village ... what grounds the claim is based ... the portion of the village was alienated ... to different parties, is not known. ... I would recommend that ... engagements ... Nos. 1 to 31 & 33 be ... land held by ... rests ... at ...

Madam No. 32 ... 1.

... No. 32 ... as ...

A Title deed will be issued in the name of the Priests ~~for the~~ ~~two~~ temples of the Ahobala Mutt — Vide High Ct. Judgt. decided on [illegible] 20. 721 of 1875 —

C. T. Longley
D. C.

July 28.
1881.

T. Dt.
2214

Received from the manager
1/11/7/67
[illegible]

Received
...
N. A. M.
11/7/5[illegible]

Kumbakonam Tanjore Dist.

[illegible] Register of the [illegible] village of Narasimhapuram ([illegible]) in the [illegible]

16

[illegible] Dittam District [illegible]

[illegible] 14

Register No. 146 Kottayam [illegible]

5 [illegible]

244 — 11 — 8
277 — 2 — 4
[illegible] — 11
321 — 8 — 1¼
— 33 — 2¼ 33 5 [illegible]

For the personal benefit of the holder

[illegible] for the [illegible] Not [illegible] — 5 —

No. 226. [illegible] Inam — 3 — 10. No. 238. [illegible] Govindadeekshita [illegible] and Inam — 33 — 2¼

Tanjore [illegible] Govindadeekshita [illegible] 36.

[illegible] 3

This Inam being apparently ~~apparently~~ entd. as the [illegible] Inam [illegible] omitted in this Register with the view of [illegible] it in the [illegible] villages Service Inams. But the party in No. 16, [illegible] in Enqt. having included it in his statement from the Inam in Case No. 102 the [illegible] understanding it being entd. in F.238 [illegible] as being in [illegible] Enqt. as being part of the Inam of Govindadeekshita ancestor of the present holder, [illegible] it appearing [illegible] from their [illegible] to the No. in the [illegible] referred to. Probably that they may have formed originally part of the [illegible] Inam [illegible] by that family, and this part being [illegible] to the Inam having been [illegible] by the [illegible] widow by [illegible] agreement in 1862 to Govindadeekshita [illegible] in share [illegible] in this Register. It may be included in either of the two Cases No. 102 or [illegible] [illegible] for both — [illegible]. [illegible] Rs. ⅛ [illegible] 12 [illegible]

Major [illegible] Deputy [illegible]

[illegible]

Register No. 146

Sheet No. 262

A. P. No. 28 of 1866 from the Party [illegible] [illegible] Endorsed that the [illegible] will be delivered in due course

15 May/66

Leg. [illegible] 10/5/68

1-4

[illegible] Case No. 172 [illegible]

[illegible] 1842-

[illegible] [illegible] taken
[illegible] of No. 170.

Tulasi Ammal
mother of No. 85, brought
a suit in Court in the year
1857 against her uncles' sons
Kristnasekka & Kodandarama
Chetti, for the recovery for them of
the estate entd. in her own name
alleging that it had been given them under
Manjakkani, which fact was disputed by the other
[illegible]. The documents produced to support the Plain-
tiff's claim were an [illegible], executed by [illegible]
& the first defendant's father & the mother of [illegible]
and of the 2nd Deft. in the year Pramadicha [illegible]
arbitrators to effect a division of their family property
& in which it is stated that all Punja, Punja &c. lands
purchased by them in [illegible] villages of Kottaiyur
being [illegible] [illegible] Manjakkani or [illegible]
the remaining property alone should be subjected to
division, & an agreement given them in the year [illegible]
by the first deft. promising to make over to them the [illegible]
for the lands given them under Manjakkani. The original
Court decreed for the Defts. In appeal the decree was reversed.
A special appeal was preferred in 1863, whilst yet it was pending, the
first or second Defts. filed a statement in this Office for the Wet, stated in
the Col of remarks, whence been [illegible] for , & the Deft. belonging to [illegible]
[illegible] Sastri, as having purchased them in [illegible], & brought in one [illegible]
to file a statement in his name for Annappa Sastri's Wet lands, which with the
until the Deft.) his [illegible] in the statement had been bequeathed to him in the year
Raguna by the said Annappa Sastri's daughter-in-law. No. 85 states, in claiming [illegible] in his name
of the lands decreed to his mother, whose opinion from the decree to the estates from which the two Defts
& Muthukristnian had filed statements, that the [illegible] last named had really no right to the lands he had
entd. in his statements, & were had been [illegible] set up by the Defts with a view to deprive him of his lands.
Accordingly when I sent for Kristnasekka yesterday & asked him to produce the deed of sale from Annappa Sastri for
the lands, which is entd. in his statement — he stated that no purchase was made from Annappa Sastri, that he & his [illegible]
were in possn. only as mortgagees — but that as the Curnum told him that the lands, entd. in their statement, appear in
the acts as "purchased". they gave the statement from them & that the real owner of Annappa Sastri's lands (Wet & dry) was
one, different from even Muthukristnian (whom they had set up) & produced a private copy of a mortgage deed executed by Annappa
Sastri for the Wet. He began foolishly to question the correctness of the successive appeal decisions. His animus in making the above statements
is quite evident. Justice having dismissed his opinion he had conceived, he had now resorted to fraud, to deprive the other of his just rights. The
[illegible] that Annappa Sastri's lands are only under mortgage only, appears never to have been put forward before in the course of the judicial pro-
ceedings — nor Muthukristnian who has claimed the Wet as bequeathed to him, seems to have asserted his rights at any stage of the proceedings,
tho' the property was under litigation for 8 years. The deed by his sister apparently makes over to Muthukristnian 13 [illegible] Wet dry &c. & this is what the
[illegible] specified in the appeal decree. Now while the Punjah lands also had been bequeathed to him he confined his claim to wet only [illegible] portions, the
why cannot be understood. This man has not made his appearance again though told to be present when the case is inquired into. Should
[illegible] the circumstances above detailed registered in No. 85's name, the extents for each the two Defts & Muthukristnian filed their statements
the having been put in possession of them by the Courts. Whatever claim the last may have should be preferred in Court.

The other extents of Nos. 86 & 87 are not known — to be confirmed and continued in one T.D. [illegible] R. The amount
payable by each holder is specified in the marginal statement. The Pagoda of No. 76 being in a dilapidated state the owners of it
[illegible] the descendants of the [illegible] promise to rebuild it in 12 months.

Majampola Thandary

2457/82

Register No 146

Sheet No 261

Kottaiyur village, Kumbakonam Taluk, Tanjore district

No Mayas (Continued)

(Second Continued)

[illegible]

57 Tiruvenghadaiyangar
25

58 Annadachari
60

59 Raghunadachari
26

60 Minakshiammal
22

61 Appanaiyangar
87

62 Viswanadaiyan of
Vinaitillai Settiyaram
at Alambacamam

Worshipper

Nagamadayagurukkal

63 Ulaganadayan
at Kottaiyur

manager

Setti Srinivasa Setti

64 Rajagopala Setti

65 Pidari
at Kottaiyur

Worshipper

Mutturaja Pusari

65 Dharmachavadi
at Kottaiyur

manager

Setti Srinivasen

66 Setti Srinivasa Setti
55

67 Rangaiyengar
42

68 Narasimhaiyan
80

69 Ramaswami Pattar
35

70 Alamelammal
22

71 Kumara Setti Nandavanam
at Kottaiyur

manager

Nandimani Setti

72 Subbayyan Nandavanam
at Kottaiyur

manager

Sokkalinga Setti

73 Viswanathaswami
at Arunmali

Worshipper

Aiyagurukkal

74 Venkateswara Perumal
at Sri Purandan

manager

[illegible]

(57)
Wife 1 Son

(56)
Wife 1 Sons 2/3

(59)
Wife 1 Sons 3/4

(60)
Husband 1
Son 1/2

(61)
Wife 1/1

(66)
Brother 1
Do Son 1/2

(67)
Wife 1
Son 1
Brother 2
Do Sons 2/1

(68)
Wife 1 Sons 2/3

(69)
Wife 1 Son 2
Daughter 1/4

(70)
Husband 1
Son 1/2

[illegible]

Kottayur (Continued)

[illegible]

77 Srinivasa ... 50

78 Srinivasa ... at Kottaiyur

Manager

Nadesan Ramanadhan

Ramaswamy Aiyan

55

Lakshmana chetti

30

79 Sita ... Kandasamy

Manager

Gopala ... chetti

80 Dharmma chetti

(75)	
Head	
(77)	
Wife 1, Sons	4
Brothers	6/9
(78)	
Wife 1, Son	1/2
(80)	
Wife	1
Daughters	3/4
(81)	
Wife 1, Son	1/2
(82)	
Sons	4/4
(84)	
Unmarried	
(85)	
Wives	2/2

82. Mangalam
30
83. Ramalinga Pillaiyan
at Kottaiyur
Worshipper

84. Narayana Aiyan
29
85. Nannu ...
24. chetti

[illegible]

Regr 146

Kottaiyur village.
Kumbakonam Taluk.
Tanjore District

Extract is received from the Collr and the same sheet No given (260)

Register No 146

Sheet No 260

W.P. No 2137 of 18[illegible] from Nos 2 & 27 objecting to the [illegible] of the Depy Collector.
Endorsed to specify their objections

[illegible]

[illegible]

Confirm recommended in all 7 Ds including the share of the absentees

[illegible]

[illegible]

12½ — 12½ — 9
2 — 2 — 3 — 5
2 — 13 — 2 — 13 — 4 — 9
1 — 3¼ — 1 — 3¼ — 1 — 3
17 — 17 — 14¼ — 26 — 15 4 — 21 — 13¼ 33 — 14 — 7
15¾ — 15¾ — 1 — 4
14 — 18 — 14 3 — 5 — 9
7 28 — 13 — 3¼ 23 — 6 — 10¾ 214 — 2 — 5 152 5 — 14 — 10

6 — 8 } clear [illegible]

~~187~~

188 — One hundred & Eighty Eight

[illegible]

Wife — 1
(30)
Wife
Daughter
(31)
Wife & Son
(32)
Wife
(33)
Wife & Son
(34)
Wife & brother
(35)
Wife & Son
Daughter in law
(36)
Brother
(37)
Wife
(38)
Wife
Uncle
(39)
Wife & Son
(40)
[illegible]
(46)
Woman
(47)
Wife & Son
(48)
Wife & Son
(49)
Wife & Son
Brother
Uncle
(50)
Wife
(51)
Wife & Son
Mother
(52)
Wife
Daughter
Brother
(53)
Wife
Brother
(54)
Wives
Mother
(56)
Wife & Son

[illegible]

P. 371

Register of Inams in the Village of Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk Tanjore District.

No 1 Dharmádáyem	Dry .. 30-53 .. 77 852 .. 2-32 .. .06 891 .. 7-21 .. .18 974 .. 4-08 .. .10 1003 .. 16-56 .. .43 .. 30-53 .. .77	.. 15 .. 7	For the support of Nandavanam at Teppermánallúr Combaconam Talug now kept up	Tax free	Permanent	Survey Account of Fasly 1239		Survey Account of Fasly 1239 Nandavanam Inam	Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk Nandavanam In charge of the Mirásidars of the Village. Fair copied To be confirmed [illegible] 26/12/70 T.D. No 2089.
No 2 Déváláyem	Ayakut 3-35-12 2-88 deduct Poramboke .. 12-48 .. 32 3-22-25 3-56 Particulars Dry .. 28-34 .. 71 Garden 1-2-30 1-21 Tope 1-25-28 1-64 3-22-25 3-56 Dry 740 .. .22 741 .. .37 749 .. .12 Tope 742 1.64 2.35 Garden 1163 .. .1 1164 .. .13 1265 .. .47 1.21 [illegible] .56	.. 14 .. 5 4-15-10 2-1-2 7-15-5	For the support of Visvanádaswámi Pagoda at Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk now kept up.	Tax free	Permanent	Survey Account of Fasly 1239	Visvanáda-swámi Pagoda	Survey Account of Fasly 1239 Visvanádaswámi Pagoda	Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk. Visvanádaswámi Pagoda. In charge of the Mirásidars of the Village. Fair copied To be confirmed [illegible] 26/12/70 T.D. No 2090
No 3 Dévádáyem	Ayakut 2-3-26 2-8 deduct Poramboke .. 6-48 .. 16 1-36-42 1-92 Particulars Dry 1-2-40 1-7 Tope .. 34-2 .. 85 1-36-42 1-92 Dry 1006 .. .13 1007 .. .05 1110 .. .89 1.07 Tope 737 .. .78 1113 .. .07 .. .85 1.92	1-5-7 1-1-2 2-6-9	For the support of Varadarájaperumál Pagoda at Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk, now kept up.	Tax free	Permanent	Survey Account of Fasly 1239	Varadarájaperumál Pagoda	Survey Account of Fasly 1239 Varadarájaperumál Pagoda	Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk Varadarájaperumál Pagoda In charge of the Mirassidars of the Village. Fair copied To be confirmed [illegible] 26/12/70 T.D. No 2091.
No 4 Déváláyem	Ayakut .. 6-56 .. 17 deduct Poramboke .. .. 8 .. .. Tope .. 6-48 .. 17 Tope 9 .. .06 11 .. .11 .. .17	.. 3 .. 5	For the support of the Pagoda of Múkkara Pillayár at Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk now kept up.	Tax free	Permanent.	Survey Account of Fasly 1239.	Múkkara Pillayár Pagoda	Survey Account of Fasly 1239 Múkkara Pillayár Pagoda	Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk Múkkara Pillayár Pagoda In charge of the Mirassidars of the Village. 26/12/70 Fair copied To be confirmed [illegible] T.D. No 2092.
No 5 Déváláyem	Ayakut .. 18-20 .. 46 Deduct Poramboke .. 3-60 .. 10. Tope .. 14-24 .. 36 № 850	.. 7 .. 3	For the support of the Pidári Cóil at Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk now kept up.	Tax free	Permanent.	Survey Account of Fasly 1239	Pidári Cóil	Survey Account of Fasly 1239 Pidári Cóil	Fair copied Teppermánallúr Combaconam Taluk Pidári Cóil. In charge of the Mirassidars of the Village. To be confirmed [illegible] 26/12/70 T.D. No 2093.

Sheet No 336

Sheet No 336

P. 372

Village of Teppermanallur, Combaconum Taluq.

P. 372

No 6 Dévádáyem Ayakut -- 13-41 -- 34 Deduct Poramboke -- 3-60 -- 10 Tope -- 9-45 -- 24 856	-- 6-10	For the support of the [illegible] Mariam-maacoil free-rent at Teppermanallur Combaconum Taluk Now kept up.	Survey Account of Fasly 1239	Mári Amman Coil	Survey Account of Fasly 1237 Mariam-maacoil	Teppermanallur Combaconum Taluk Máriammahcoil In charge of the Mirassidars of the Village. [illegible]	To be confirmed and title deed be issued 26/12/70	[illegible] T.D. No. 2094.
No 7 Dévádáyem Ayakut -- 13-40 -- 34 Deduct Poramboke -- 5-16 -- 13 Tope 8-24 -- 21 893	-- 4-8	For the support [illegible] free-rent of Drópadai-amman Coil at Teppermanallur Combaconum Taluk. Now kept up.	Survey Account of Fasly 1239	Drópadaiamman Coil	Survey Account of Fasly 1237 Drópadai Amman Coil	Teppermanallur Combaconum Taluk Drópadaiammahcoil In charge of the Mirassidars of the Village. [illegible]	To be confirmed and title deed be issued 26/12/70	[illegible] T.D. 20

Closed

[illegible] Inams [illegible] village of Tittaicheri [illegible] in the [illegible]

7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Tittaicheri village, Kumbakonam Taluk, Tanjore District.

1 [illegible] 6-2-3 6·30 6-7-6 ---- Abt 1-8-0 per do. The assmt. is the average of the assmt. on the adjoining villages.
For the free expense of Kodanda Ramaswami's Pagoda in the village. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition & the worship is performed.
not known not known
no documents
Kodanda Ramaswami
No 71214 Ramaswami Pagoda 1-15
No 71238 Kodanda ramaswami Pagoda Swami 4-12-3
Kodanda Ramaswami at Tittaicheri
Worshipper
Ayyavaiyangar ————
This is an [illegible] inam village. The [illegible] of 1820 [illegible] & hence the entry in the acct of 1818 [illegible]. To be confirmed and continued to the Pagoda.
13-10-62. Rajagopala Chariar
Confirmed on tenure 10/2/65 [illegible] T.D. 1292 7 T.D.

Register No 145
Sheet No 259

2 Do. Tope 266 -32-15 ·83 1-3-9 ---- as above
Do. Do. of Do. Do. Do. Visvanadha Swami's Pagoda in the village. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition & the worship is rendered.
Do.
Visvanadha Swami
No 71216 Viswanadha swami Pagoda 2-50
No 71238 Viswanadha swami Pagoda 32-15
Viswanadhaswami at Tittaicheri
Worshipper
Ramanadha Gurukkal ————
Vide remarks in the preceding case.
To be confirmed
13-10-62 Rajagopala Chariar
Confirmed on present tenure 10/2/65 [illegible] T.D. 1293 7 T.D.

3 Chy. Enad. Entire
Garden 605-37-2½ 605·93
[illegible] 37-57
Rem of Wet 226-[illegible] 226·31
Dry 264-[illegible] 264·58
Garden 14-14-11½ 14·37
Tope 13-4 13·10
518-11-1½ 518·36
Deduct Inam
Tope 5-5-2 5·13
Rem of Wet 226-12-7½ 226·31 1453-5-6
Dry 264-23-1½ 264·58 398-15-10
Garden 14-14-11½ 14·37 43-1-10
Tope 7-38-1½ 7·97 11-15-4
513-9-2½ 513·23 1905-1-6

Extract is received from the Collr. and the same sheet No. 259 is given.

Do. Do. of Anna Chatram at Tittaicheri. The building is said to be in good condition & the charity is well maintained.
Kanul fees 86-11-2 do.
Granted by the Right Honble Lord William Cavendish Bentinck Governor in Council of Fort St. George on the part of the Honble the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies on the 24th July 1805.
Original Sanad produced. This sanad states that the village of Tittaicheri containing [illegible] 80 Velis 10 Mahs & 2 Ganteas is granted to [illegible] the [illegible] Raja of Tanjore [illegible] of the Chatram [illegible] the village inclusive of the [illegible] is invariably [illegible] appropriated for the support of the Chatram.
[illegible] Chatram.
No 71216 as per part of 71220 Tittaicheri Wet 30-7-76 Dry 42-7-30 Tope 2-10-8½ 75-15-99 Tr. 4-14-3 80-10-2
No 71210 Tittaicheri 80 including Inams
No 71238 [illegible] Tittaicheri [illegible] belonging [illegible]
* institutions for which they were granted
8-11-62 Rajagopala Chariar
Annasatram at [illegible] Chatram
Manager
Ramalingaswami ————
* of the Inam is [illegible] to the Royal family of Tanjore. On the death of the [illegible] the Inam [illegible] placed under attachment under the impression that the Inams were [illegible] attached
This is what is called [illegible] Sarvamanyam village. The [illegible] which the Melvaram or Government share alone is enjoyed as Inam by the Inamdars. It was confirmed [illegible] by the English Government, as is stated [illegible] belonging to the family. The [illegible] (Vide col. 12) there are none of the kind under the head "Inam lands" [illegible] the Pagoda [illegible] 2 preceding cases. This Inam has been [illegible] the [illegible] village. To be confirmed & continued for the support of the Chatram [illegible]
Confirmed on present tenure 10/2/65 [illegible] T.D. 1294 7 T.D.
[illegible] were [illegible] the Inam being [illegible] that the adoption was invalid & the Inams were [illegible] restored [illegible] the Chatram charged with the support of the *

Register No 146 Register of Inams in the Sarvamanyam villages of Kottaiyur &c in the Combaconam Mayavaram Combaconam Taluk Tanjore District

1 Personal Wet [illegible] 75-12-4 1-2 75-13-6
For the [illegible] of the [illegible] or [illegible]
Kanul 20th [illegible]
Granted by [illegible]
Sikka register of 1809 [illegible] with a [illegible]
Govinda balaji [illegible]
In the Regr of 1809 Lakshmana [illegible] of the original grantee [illegible] 14
No 71238 Govinda balaji [illegible] 20-4½ 1-3¼ 27-7¼
Tanjore
Visvanadha Gosaivi alias Govindabalaji for [illegible] 36
lands to parties [illegible]
Wife 1 [illegible]
The Inam in this case was originally granted to a different individual, was afterwards conferred on the persons who had the Inam in this case. Both these Inams lay close to each other. In the survey of 1238 each of the several fields [illegible] was surveyed in the names of the original grantees. [illegible] the two Inams in this Regr. as two cases [illegible] one half of the extent of each field [illegible] the village in which these Inams are situated is an entire Sarvamanyam village [illegible] regarding the [illegible] *
Confirmed as recommended on 2 R of 1859 10/2/65 1295 T.D. 1-4
* Inam [illegible] To be confirmed [illegible]
21-1-63. Rajagopala Chariar
* regarded & recognized as the [illegible] religious [illegible]. The family of the Inamdars generally [illegible] in a private [illegible] the [illegible]
20-1-63 Rajagopala Chariar

It was conferred on Govindabalaji [illegible] hereditary [illegible]
Kanul
Granted [illegible]
Sikka regr. in 1809 [illegible]
In the Regr of 1809 Lakshmana [illegible]
No 71238 Govindabalaji [illegible]
As above
Vide remarks in the preceding case. To be confirmed [illegible]
Confirmed as recommended 10/2/65 12[illegible]

[illegible] 6 and.

For the personal benefit of the holder

Karal 3

Hereditary

Granted by Pratapa Sinha Raja [illegible] in the [illegible] Mohurram [illegible]

Sitka registered in 1809

Extent of grant Wet 8-8

1-8 with a road of the [illegible]

Srinivasacharri

In Regr of 1809 Srinivasacharri Grandson of the grantee W 8 [illegible]

In F 1238 Tulasi[illegible] is Inam enjoyed by his descendants Srinivasacharri & Subbi[illegible]

W 5-20
D 2-79
1-8 with a [illegible]

11-20-7¼

"Tulasicharri" [illegible] the original grantee

Cumbaconum

1 Pinnaperu[illegible]charri 30
2 Lakshmiammal 25
3 Subbicharri 45
4 Narasimhacharri 28
5 Kokilammal 50
6 Mahalakshmiammal 42
7 Narasimhacharri 30
8 Gopalakrishnacharri 45

(1) Son
(2) Brother's grand daughter of the party
W & D 14

(1) Wife ¼
(2) Husband ¼
(3) Wife 1 daughter daughter's son ⅛
(4) Wife 1 son ½
(5) None
(6) None
(7) Wife ½
(8) Wife — 1 wife's brother's son adopted ½

	Wet	Dry	Nanal	Rs	
1	1-17-10½	10-4	6	2-4	[illegible]
2	1-17-10½	10-4	6	2-4	do do
3	1-17-10½	10-4	6	2-4	[illegible]
4	1-1-2½	7-5	4-8	14	do do
5	25-6½	4-8-4	2-7½	2-4	do do
6	1-1-2½	7-8	4-4	1-8	do do
7	4-3-10	29-4	1-1½	3-8	do do
8	4-15-2¼	2-10-4	1-9¼	10	do do
	11-20-7¼	81-13-4	8	14-8	

Whom she three [illegible] No 6 enjoys 2½ [illegible] her husband purchased them [illegible] Gopalakrishnacharri [illegible] father had [illegible] No 7 ½ [illegible] No 5 [illegible] No 4 enjoys [illegible] which his grand father & father acquired [illegible]

Which No 8 [illegible] purchased by his father in [illegible] The 2½ [illegible] No 4 [illegible]

Vide remarks in [illegible] last case.

To be confirmed in 8 [illegible] No 1 & 2 consent [illegible] There is no excess in the [illegible] to be charged. The amount of [illegible] payable by each holder with the rate at which it has been charged is specified in the general table.

20-1-63 Major [illegible]

the sale of 2½ [illegible] acknowledged. Of the 2½ [illegible] the sale of ½ [illegible] by the [illegible]

Confirmed
Recommended
8. T. Davis
10/2/65

T.D.
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304

T.D.
8

Cumbaconum

1 Tirumalachar 22
2 Egnanarayanachar 55
3 Srinivasapatrachar 50
4 Govindachar 60
5 Vedantachar 25
6 Srinivasaraghavapatrachar 32
7 Srinivasachar 65
8 Srinivasaraghavachar 27
9 [illegible] 32
10 Annadachar 70
11 Viraraghavayengar 22
12 Anandachar 51
13 Raghunadachar 30
14 Tirumalanambi [illegible]
15 Kistnamachar 55
16 Raghunadachar 55
17 Raghavachar 45
18 Sellathammal 30
19 Venkatachar 60

In the Regr of 1809 [illegible]

In F 1238 Srinivasacharri [illegible]

W 13-34-7¼
D 4-14

(1) Wife 1 brother ⅔
(2) Wife 1 son ⅔
(3) Wife 1 son ½
(4) Wife 1/1
(5) None
(6) Wife 1 son ½
(7) Wife 1 son 1, grandson 2/6
(8) Wife 1/1
(9) Wife 1/1
(10) Wife 1 son ½
(11) Wife 1 son ½
(12) Wife 1 son ⅔
(13) Wife 1 son ¾
(15) Wife 1 son ⅔
(16) son 2 daughter in law ⅓
(17) Wife 1 son 2 daughter in law ⅖
(18) Daughters 2/2
(19) Wife 1 son ⅔

Of this Inam the extent [illegible] in the name of No 19 [illegible] enjoys [illegible] arranged them in 52¼ shares of which

No 1 enjoys 2 13/32
2 — 2 13/32
3 — 3 5/16
4 — 7¼
5 — 2 5/32
6 — 2 5/32
7 — 1 11/16
8 — 2 15/32
9 — 1¼
10 — 1 11/16
11 — 4
12 — 3
13 — 1
14 — 3½
15 — 3½
16 — 3½
17 — 5 7/32
18 — ½

that No 3-7-9-10-11-12-13 & 17 [illegible]

As has been already shewn in Case No 1 [illegible] the whole [illegible] Palace list [illegible] Srinivasa[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] the rates of assessment adopted for this village are the average of the 3 adjoining [illegible] villages [illegible] per veli respectively [illegible]

To be confirmed in 27 [illegible] one No 1018 & the other No 19 [illegible]

Major [illegible]

Confirmed
Recommended
in 27 [illegible]
10/2/65

T.D.
1305
1306