

no. 7

West-me Cattle
 1008-4-30-31
 (2)
 856 14 37
 853 x 9 8
 3 Total 14-8--14-0
 Total 14-3
 in Fayed 2736
 Excess 800

954 350
 956 340
 958 280
 Total 117-1-2718
 As per Kyle
 117-4-2690
 Exhibit 7
 Exhibit 48

Landing (Dr)
780
793
890 x 1.4

= 2 1/2 at 12-136
As per Freight note - 1 y.
Excess to Ben

$$\begin{array}{r} 857 \\ \times 939 \\ \hline 857 \\ 1714 \\ 7713 \\ \hline 803083 \end{array}$$

Actual (on
 422 5
 981 1
 * 3 Total 11-5-27
 for Fiscal 11-10-27
 Excess

Care no 12

For the
support of
Neyam
Guedes
Mazara
Malai
springs
Mission
Clipped
once a year
on inclusions

for the
14 Suppl of
6 Hagen
7 Journal
13 Tacodch
11 Mayara
Munip
may Nika
path
M. p. w. z
Shipped
on Saturday
20 at a c.

For the
10 Support of
13 Mind & Co
8 Amman
15 P. C. O. S.
Madura
It is well
kept up

For the
9. Caspian
8. Murwa
12. Sivas
13. Beek
Magam
Oraltat
It is in
Caspian
on the
This is
the

For the
3 support
15 a Chair
2 and a
Panda
in the
Cinick
Palace
The three
They go
in the
main
It is a
Hoso
Ch. the

See Collector's letter of 14th July/87 no 270
The best land on this case has been
converted into dry owing to permanent
failure of irrigation. Total dry extent
including the compensation granted is
acres 24.91 approx. Rs 14-11-
Total seed will be revised accordingly.

Yours
Sampson
WPK/88

$\frac{20}{2}$ $\frac{20}{2}$ $\frac{20}{2}$ $\frac{20}{2}$
 McCannery Lawrence Co.

$\frac{10^0}{-}$ $\frac{10^0}{-}$ $\frac{10^0}{-}$ *Line*
h
ans
tu
le

h
 $\frac{1}{2} =$
le
ind

ny
nes

Hagar Dec 1813 In 1837 Mayara Mairindayck Kanpath
 Terminal Hagar Hagar Hagar Terminal Hagar
 Hagar Terminal Terminal Washippen
 Dec. 1815-18-2 Washippen
 1818-18-3 Hagar Hagar Pitani
 The difference
 in the quantity of dy
 land forms the In p
 2 destroyed Hagar
 by Road use the same Terminal

Miniathe June 13 Ch 1237 Madusa -
 Common Miniathe Madusa Miniathe Amm. Jacode
 Jacode Jacode Miniathe, Arhangy species -
 Common
 Chelium
 Jacomacany from 1243 -
 "Seas" - waste up to 1265, and the
 to 1270 had been mine property
 In 1268 Madusa by a riot named Lame
 Miniathe made by the Lame who
 Common

[illegible]

Chattram In 1213 In 1237 Palayakottai Cink
 and Water water Chattram and Water Pand
 water Pandel Pandel
 Pandel Chattram Chattram
 G. 50-5-3 Ayadaya
 Pandaram
 The diffen
 destination In 1068
 by road Water
 Pandel

Galt In 1213 In 1237 Mayara Anukkanattam
 Pawan Joseph Josephians Pukata Krishna G. L. 1892 1893
 Ceylan Ceylan Ceylan 45 5th 1892 1893
 In 1898
 Pukata
 Krishna
 Ceylan
 G. L. 1892

To be confirmed free in
our S. D. so long as the Pagoda
exists

J. J. E
3/5/64

To be confirmed free in
one J. D. so long as the Deed
exists

$\frac{52}{3/5/64}$

To be continued free in one y^d.
to the managers of the Pagoda for
the term being -

It appears that the same man
appears that
of terms of a cultivated during 7/2 66
Dyke & Co. 1826 the Reg. of
is appropriated by him, an enquiry
to the U. S. Treasury on a card

To be confirmed from
one T. P. so long as the Church
exists.

7-X
2/5/64

A Manager appears to have been named
the same under John's order 13 April 1832
to no. 8/1234 had also named -

To be confirmed free air on 5-2
to the Charity is maintained -
to as at present, of disbanding
Says - and Butler chief to
lead in the Charter men - he is de-
signed of taking care of the Bond done

$\frac{7-8}{315/64}$

To be confirmed in one R
 Let at 1/8 annuo - 6 - agreed to -

5-12
3/5/64

Lebd
Re

Leopold
H.

Le f

Lebede
22/10

1340

Leaf
No

Leipz.

LL
SD. 10
1341

3
The Carnam told him to go to the Village giving him to understand that
when the Carnam produced the order under the misrepresentation that Venkta
I learn that the Carnam played a dodge & concealed the fact of the agreement and ^{of charge} ~~Enjoyment~~ of income from me at the first settlement - This move
of the Carnam and Venkatakrishnayasa himself that he notwithstanding the order as mentioned the latter has never up to this time
management of the Charity nor ever enjoyed the income - It further appears that the Tahsildar's order was issued under the Collector's order of
Collector's order alludes to the Tahsildar's order on the subject to the effect that Venkatakrishnayasa had claimed the income as being the descendant
dal servant, that for some time the party in 1239 was the Carnam had given an attachment to the effect that after Venkrishnayasa's ancestors had given up
to be performed by the party who had entered in 1239; and that that party had then absconded - The Carnam's order further empowers the Tahsildar
to be being true to appear to the claimant Venkatakrishnayasa for the service and to take a security allahilka from him - Although the Tahsildar
Venkrishnayasa for the service was issued, it does not appear that any allahilka was taken from him - or he ever undertook the service - Thus the
has been nominal & in abeyance - It further appears that the party in 1239 was not in good terms with the Village officers which led to these orders -
in supersession of the 1st Decision that the income may be conferred to ^{on V.D. free} ~~to~~ Arumaphad Pandaram as the manager of the Charity so long as it exists -

Enquiry is confined to Pagoda Lunnis, & does
Charity and the
Krishnayasa was in charge of the Charity and enjoyment of the Income
of charge
Enjoyment of income from me at the first settlement - This move
of the Carnam and Venkatakrishnayasa himself that he notwithstanding the order as mentioned the latter has never up to this time
management of the Charity nor ever enjoyed the income - It further appears that the Tahsildar's order was issued under the Collector's order of
Collector's order alludes to the Tahsildar's order on the subject to the effect that Venkatakrishnayasa had claimed the income as being the descendant
dal servant, that for some time the party in 1239 was the Carnam had given an attachment to the effect that after Venkrishnayasa's ancestors had given up
to be performed by the party who had entered in 1239; and that that party had then absconded - The Carnam's order further empowers the Tahsildar
to be being true to appear to the claimant Venkatakrishnayasa for the service and to take a security allahilka from him - Although the Tahsildar
Venkrishnayasa for the service was issued, it does not appear that any allahilka was taken from him - or he ever undertook the service - Thus the
has been nominal & in abeyance - It further appears that the party in 1239 was not in good terms with the Village officers which led to these orders -
in supersession of the 1st Decision that the income may be conferred to ^{on V.D. free} ~~to~~ Arumaphad Pandaram as the manager of the Charity so long as it exists -

Y. R.
9/7/64

...one near one of the ...
...Sernie for the Pagoda, and that he had on two occasions p^d Rs 5-8-0 to him.
The ... can not make out how the Battar was connected with the man while he lived
& ... a reference may be made to the Col^l of Madurai on the subject. Vide Chryse
26th August 1861 p. 409. The Col^l however appears to have taken no notice of the subject.
Vide Col^l's Journal to one 13th May 1864 p. 17. Now in my Enquiry the Redd produced
before me 2 receipts of Karpura Battar in acknowledgement of the sums of Rs 2 & 7 1/2
p^d by him & stated that a 3^d receipt for Rs 22-8-0 has been lost. From early 1271
the Redd has given up the land, and the Manager of Pagoda collects rents from other
Cottenters to whom he has leased the man. Vide the Manager's receipts produced by
Raya Kaveriam & Kudathelli & appears, and a Shan - for 1271 & 1272. Now neither
the Pagoda Manager nor the Karpura Battar have ever claimed the man. The Shan
& Curium of the Village have given a statement for the man on account
Pagoda.

There are inscriptions on the four stones marking the boundaries of the
man. The grant to be one for Archana Sernie - Perhaps it was in consequence
of the condition of the grant, and of Karpura Sernie being the performer of the
that the sum to him p^d to him till 1270 - It is not clear how on what ground
Manager has interfered - and what are the respective rights of the Sernie
Nor is it necessary for me to decide on this point while neither party appears
is still well maintained, I have thought it proper to make the above
confirmation of the man. - J. H. 2. 15/6/11

...
a letter from the Pagoda, and that he had on two occasions p^d Rs 42-8-0 to him.
The Govt can not make out how the Battar was connected with the main which he found
& stated a reference may be made to the Coll^r of Idengura on the subject. Vide Arjuna
26th August 1861/91-409. The Coll^r however appears to have taken no notice of the subject.
Vide Coll^r's G. adnat to me 13th Dec^r 1864/91/7. Now in my Enquiry the Reddi produced
before me 2 receipts of Karipura Battar in acknowledgement of the sums of Rs 42 & 7 1/2
p^d by him & stated that a 3^d receipt for Rs 22-8-0 has been lost. From Feb^r 1271
the Reddi has gained the land, and the Manager of the Pagoda collects rents from other
Cultivators to whom he has leased the main. Vide the Manager's receipts produced by
Praya Karamdani & Kudanthalai & an appeal, and a flag on p^d 1271 & 1272. Now neither
the Pagoda manager nor the Karipura Battar have ever claimed the main. The present
stationary & Caravan of the Village have given a statement for the main on account
Pagoda.

There are inscriptions on the four stones marking the boundaries of the
make the grant to be one for Archana Sarni. Perhaps it was in consequence
this condition of the grant, and of Karipura Sarni being the performer of the
that the rent was p^d to him till 1270. This is clear from on what from
manager has interfered - and what are the respective rights of the parties.
Nor is it necessary for me to decide on this point while neither party app^r
is still well maintained, I have thought it proper to make the above
confirmation of the main. T-L 30/5/64

