Tribhuvandas Dhanukakonnar Taluk, Panruti District

Page 156
Sheet No 286

Kunjukaran(?) T.R.

Wet	Dry	Garden	Total	Assmt.	Fasal(?)	Q. R.(?)
32-6½	„	„	32-6¾	„-5-„	3 „	„-7-8
8-⅗	„	„	1-8-15	6-1-2	„-4 „	„-11-8
„	„	8-11½	8-11½	1-8-1	„	„-3-„
3-8¾	11-8	„	1-7-13¾	5-3-7	„-3 „	„-10-1
„	„	10-1	10-1	1-11-10	„	„-3-6
„	„	10-¾	10-¾	1-11-9	„	„-3-6
„	„	2-5	2-5	„-6-5	„	„-„-10
„	„	16-9	16-9	2-13-9	„	„-5-9
„	„	20-1¼	20-1¼	3-7-7	„	„-7-„
„	1-8	„	1-8	„-1-5	„	„-„-2 / 8-4-7
19-5	„	„	19-5	2-6-4	„-1-6	„-6-„
22-10	„	„	22-10	3-2-7	„-2-6	1-10-2
13-1	„	11-10	2-24-11	13-9-2	„-8 „	1-12-2 See rev. side
18-3	„	„	18-3	2-4-1	„-2 „	„-4-3
10-7½	„	„	1-10-7½	9-6-6	„-4 „	1-2-4
„	„	17-2¾	17-2¾	2-15-6	„	„-6-„
„	„	17-2	17-2	2-15-6	„	„-6-„
331-31-13	22-10-6½	85-21-4½	444-13-8	2422-14	74-10-4	7-12-6

Total 234

Two hundred & thirty four [illegible] rupees

Quer No 156

Sheet No 288

as professing to be an agent of No. 85, without letting a Vakalatnama for him. It appears that nothing but the [illegible] Mahalingaier's name there was only R. 37-11¼, this name entd. only there in the statement. In the Vencata Pandaram, Lutchmanan Ram, who seems to have thought but then that he had no lands in the village, having no [illegible] perhaps he had left in it to No. 47 Andiya Pillai, appearing, [illegible] a statement for the piece entered in his father's name. Subsequently No. 85 himself making his appearance represented that the statement for his lands had been received for one, whom he had not authorized to file it, & that that man had undertaken the entire [illegible]. The piece in question appears to be included within the boundaries specified in No. 85's documents. With its only the other piece entd. in [illegible] Mahalingaier's name, amounts to [illegible] 4 [illegible]. In 1861 Vencata Pandaram, disposed of all that he had in that locality, nor is further in the village [illegible] the said [illegible] deed. He does not speak as if he had any more lands there. If the piece in question be said not to be included within the boundaries mentd. in his deed (it appears true that it is not) it is not the [illegible] land (No. 85's) might to have been entd. as bounding [illegible]. Again if, as Lutchmanan Ram states, "[illegible] land" specified in the deed refers not to the land of the [illegible] No. 85, but to that of another [illegible], situated beyond the disputed piece, then No. 47 Andiya Pillai, [illegible] be the owner of the piece under reference, its being included in the boundaries, by right of purchase, & Lutchmanan Ram has nothing to do with it. But Andiya Pillai, whose father [illegible] Pillai is entd. in the Pann. as the [illegible] of the lands of both Mahalingaier & Vencata Pandaram, who still cultivates those lands, states that the piece under dispute belongs to No. 85, & that his father who died only a few months ago has been paying its rental to him. The is [illegible] [illegible] for all this & I strongly believe that Lutchmanan Ram having really no title to the disputed land has sought to [illegible] it himself by the entry of it in his father's name in the Pann. [illegible] & the fact of an unauthorized agent of No. 85 having omitted it in his statement. I have therefore entd. it in the name of the rightful owner No. 85 & [illegible] Lutchmanan Ram's claim, [illegible] him, if he wishes, [illegible] seek redress in the Courts.

The rates of [illegible] adopted are the averages of those obtaining on the [illegible] lands in the villages of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] & [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], & they are Rs. 32-13-5, 45-11-2 & 16-4-6 per Veli respectively of Wet, Garden & Dry. Certain of the [illegible] cultivated subsequently to the Pann. have been brought [illegible] [illegible] lands have been charged half [illegible] for the second crop.

⊛ See final decision

One Nagamuttu Nayakkan filed the statement for the extent entd. under No. 156, alleging that he purchd. it in the year 1862 for the [illegible] of Kattara(?) Subbakutti(?) No. 68 in [illegible] & [illegible] in the village, by name Ranganayaki, appearing stated that the alleged purchase did not really take place – that the said Subbakutti having mortgaged the land in the [illegible] with her husband & Nagamuttu Nayakkan, on condition of its being sold to them both for a sum specified in the bond, should he fail to refund the money [illegible] [illegible] before the [illegible], [illegible] her husband & [illegible] herself & Nagamuttu Nayakkan are in enjt. since the date of the mortgage – that the latter 2 years ago, obtaining for himself [illegible] [illegible] a purchase of the land in the name of both as per condition in the bond, has produced [illegible] a deed in his sole name. Nagamuttu Nayakkan admitting the fact of the mortgage in the [illegible] himself & Ranganayaki's husband, the terms in the bond as stated by her, the joint enjt. & his having obtained from her the deed, at first said that as Ranganayaki did not [illegible] [illegible] the land, he paid her, her moiety of the sum advanced & purchd. the whole of the land for himself. The woman challenging him to [illegible] [illegible] & having paid her the money, he hesitated [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] be sd. now pay her half or as suggested [illegible] her one third of the land. The deed [illegible] appears to have been executed somewhere in the [illegible]. The attesting witnesses are all residents of that [illegible] [illegible] not bear the signature of any public officer & the villagers know nothing of the transaction. Nagamuttu Nayakkan, when I took a deposition from him regarding the purchase [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that he had just before said. He in fact ignored the condition in the mortgage bond & denied having said before me that he would pay Ranganayaki her half. This man who has not the least [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] falsehood & [illegible], under the above circumstances be [illegible] in his statement that he purchased the land. Though I told him several times, he has not proved the seller's [illegible]

Res. No. 156 [illegible]

the sale or the witnesses to testify to the transaction & the previous mortgage deed, which he says in his deposition wantonly that he has destroyed it with [illegible] in his absence, whose name he does not know, & has sent him word through another unknown person to send it. I have not therefore thought it proper to register the land in his name [illegible] notice has been sent to the owner of the land, the said Subba Sastri's cont. or pending his attendance the case should be [illegible]. It appears that [illegible] [illegible] of the land in the year before the last, & that in last year it was made. To be confirmed in one Title Deed [illegible] 2 R. | The amount payable by each holder is [illegible] the marginal statement — . Nos. 157 to 160 have now attended

[illegible]
Dy Collr

X Since Registered on another sheet
29/11/65 AS

Appl. petn. of Lakshman Rao [by Vakil] dated 1 Feby 1865 No. — complaining of the decision passed by the Depy Collr ~~[illegible]~~ rejecting his claim to a piece of land A .. 12-4 measured in the Pymash in the name of Venkoba Rao. his father.— The land now claimed by Petr though by an ~~[illegible]~~ oversight was measured in the Pymash in the name of his father, this accidental circumstance cannot confer on him a title to the same, while it has along been in the possession of Rangammal [illegible] as stated by the cultivating tenant, who ~~[illegible]~~ is also the cultivator of Petr's ~~[illegible]~~ late lands in the village. Other reasons of a weighty character are also given by the Dy Collr agst Petitioner's claim, which is therefore rejected. If he likes, he may seek redress in the Civil Courts.— Approved WRS 11 Feby 65. AS
25/2/65

Regarding Share No. 156 in Col. 6 — "Kumarasamy" —

Petn of Kumaraswamy dated 25 Feby 1865 No. 22 admitting the sale to Nagamuthu Naicker [illegible] requesting that the registry be made in his name —

There is no objection to such registry and the woman who objects to the sale may be ~~[illegible]~~ establish her rights in the Civil Courts —

Approved WRS 30/11/65 29.11.65 AS

[illegible]

Register No 156
Sheet No 284

Tubbumaiaam, Ammbalkoraam Taluk, Tanjore District

