Register of Mahalingapuram Rev: No. 8 of the Arealur Zemindari attached to Udayarpollam Taluq in the Trichinopoly District

The average assessment of the Village [illegible]
Nanjah Manal
Dry 3-8-3 2-9-4

1	2	3–5	6–7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15–19	21	22
1	Devadayam	Dry 54 1-82-13 2 ·42 18 ·-95-5 1 ·26 57 1-90-10 2 ·52 Total 4-68-12 6 ·20	6—6 2—8 4—15 13—13	For the support of Mahalingaiswarar situated within the Arealur Pagoda. It is worshipped daily —	Free	Permanent	Not known	None	Mahalingaiswarar Pagoda	In 1223 Mahalingaiswara Swamy In F. 1216 and 1223	In 1273 Mahalingaswamy	Arealur Mahalingaiswarar Pagoda Worshippers (1) Iyattoray Gurukkal (2) Muttusami Gurukkal (3) Panchanada Gurukkal Worshippers 1 Iyattoray Gurukkal 2 Muttusami Gurukkal 3 Panchanada Do.	To be confirmed free in one T.D.C. so long as the Pagoda exists — T.K. 21/12/64	T.D. No. 221 Confd. [illegible] 9/4/65 7 [illegible]

Register No. 6

Sheet No. 516

1	2	3–5	6–7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15–19	20–21	22
2	Devadayam	Dry 72 ·-89-9 1 ·18 73 ·-87-8 1 ·26 74 ·-57-13 ·76 Total 2-34-6 3 ·10	3—2 3—1 2—1 8—4	For the support of Kasi Visvanathaswamy Pagoda at Arealur. It is well kept up	Do.	Do.	Do.	Do.	Kasi Visvanathaswamy Pagoda	In 1264 / 1223 Arealur Kasi Visvanathaswamy	In 1273 Kasi Visvanathaswam	Arealur Kasi Visvanathaswamy Pagoda Worshippers Iyatthoray Gurkul Muttusami Gurkul Panchanada Gurkul —	The right to the management of this Pagoda is claimed by one Subbaraya Pandaram who styles himself as Stanikum — He can however show nothing in support of the right he claims — Neither during Govt. management of the Religious Institutions, nor after towards, he appears to have retained any interest in the ⊗	T.D. No. 222 Confd. — we cannot own the Pandaram. The Pujaris must establish their right of [illegible]

In Courts — the mortgage of the inam is illegal — the local authorities will look also [illegible] 9/4/65

[illegible]

1	2	3–5	6–7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15–19	20–21	22
3	Devadayam	Dry 70 1-81-4 2 ·40 71 ·-53-2 ·70 Total 2-34-6 3 ·10	6—6 1—13 8—3	For the support of Kasi Visvanathaswamy Nandavanam at Arealur. It is well maintained	Do.	Do.	Do.	Do.	Visvanathaswamy Nandavanam	In 1264 / 1223 Kasi Visvanathaswamy Nandavanam Manager Nallatambi in F. 1223	In 1273 Kasi Visvanathaswamy Nandavanam	Arealur Kasi Visvanathaswamy Pagoda Nandavanam Manager Somasundram Pillay	This Nandavanam is about No. 1½ situated near the Pagoda — It has 3 inams in the private Estate of Arealur in endowment of it in Arealur, Eruttakkarappatty, and Mahalingapuram — These inams are managed and claimed by one Somasundra Pillay. A Member of the Committee appointed under act XX of 1863, objects to their being Vide the other page	T.D. No. 223 Conf accordingly [illegible] 9/4/65 7 [illegible]

Appeal Petition No. 106 of 1865 from the Committee appointed under act XX of 1863, claiming the T.D. in their name. ⊗

1	2	3–5	6–7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15–19	20–21	22
4	Personal	Dry 21 1-15-10 1 53 23 ·-75-·· ·99 58 ·-98-7 1 ·31 59 1-78-11 2 ·37 Total 4-68-12 6 ·20	2—15 1—15 2—9 4—11 12—2	Bhattavritti	Do.	Hereditary	Not known	None	Not known	In 1264 / 1223 Narasimma Murti Acharri	In 1273 Ramachary (his son) In this Register of the Register in 1223	Arealur Rama Chariyar 62 Register in 1273 Own 1 Wife's sister 1 Married daughter 1	To be confirmed in one T.D.C. at Rat ⅛ R. 1-8 — agreed to — T.K. 21-12-64	T.D. No. 224 Confd [illegible] 9/4/65

1-4 [illegible]

Remarks on Case (2).
⊗ Pagoda or in its endowments that is recorded in any Public account or other Papers — The founder of the Pagoda was one Chittambala Chetty unconnected with the Pandaram and the grantor of the inams was the Zemindar's family — During Govt. management of Devastanams, Govt. did not extend its management to this Pagoda as being small institutions [illegible] managed by the Worshippers — The Worshippers in charge of the Pagoda were unable to manage the inams of the institutions situated in 5 or 6 Villages themselves, and confined themselves to the customary religious observances, — and the Pandaram (a forefather of his family) was selected by them (or the Villagers or Kurnum) for the management as being a fit person, possessing as he did, every recommendation thro' his display of [illegible] & religious zeal — [illegible] he has improved finally into a presumptive right of management over the Pagoda, which the worshippers have not been able to remove being the weaker party — The Pandaram & his fraternity appear to have mortgaged the inam of the Pagoda for [illegible] in Arealur for private gain in evident breach of the religious Trust — Govt. can not recognise such alienations of religious Property constituted by Regn: VII of 1817 — nor can the Courts of justice — under these circumstances, I have rejected the Pandaram's claim of the Stanikumship — and am of opinion that the Worshippers [illegible] in charge of the Pagoda are the proper Trustees for the inams as is generally the case in regard to minor Devastanams — With these sentiments, I recommend that the inam may be confirmed, in one T.D., to the Worshippers of the Pagoda for the time being — leaving them assisted by the Committee appointed under Act XX of 1863 — to get the illegal mortgage of the inam quashed thro' the Courts — I am given to understand that the Pandaram has mortgaged this Inam also for money received for his private purposes to the Curnum of the Village Varadaraja Pillay who is in enjoyment of the land — But this mortgage is of course denied by the mortgager & mortgagee simply from fear of legal punishment — & they have concealed the mortgage deed connected with this transaction — The mortgage deed for the Arealur inam is now in possession of the Committee

T.K. 21/12/64

Since passing the above Decision the [illegible]

[illegible]

Register of Elumbalingapuram Rao No 8 of the above Zemindary attached to the Nundagarpeal Cayeem Taluq Trichinopoly Dt Contd

from Case 2 Contd

Having required into present state of things had struck me — The Nadachippers are bound by the Elumbalingapuram right has been reduced above — Without therefore making them the Managers — and without naming any one as Manager, I beg to recommend that the inam may be confirmed to the Sudachippers for the time being of the institution, having the Nadachippers, the Committee, to take steps under the law for securing due Management in the proper way — The Tickets to remain to the Nadachippers are committed —

T.V.C
25/7/65

Remarks on Case 3 Continued

confirmed to him as the Manager on the ground of his having neglected the Mandavanam Duties and misappropriated the rents realized from the inam. There is an Office addressed time by the Tahsildar Shiristadar 24th December 1864 in which he reports on the condition of Mandavanam at the desire of the above Manager. He states that it is an neglected state not properly hedged. He says that but a small portion of the Mandavanam ground about 1/8 of a Manay is occupied by flower trees at random. He therefore suggests the expediency as well as the practicability of the Mandavanam being improved under proper Management with the rents of the inam as reported in several Villages which he says are all under cultivation. The Manager shews a Map of the Mandavanam marking the space occupied by the flower trees which I see is more than 1/2 of the Mandavanam area. I am informed that he has taken very active steps for the improvement of the Mandavanam and the work of digging planting &c is in rapid Progress. Under these circumstances I have advised the Members of the Committee to proceed against the present Manager in the manner prescribed by the Laws for securing the just interests of the Pagoda as involved in its Mandavanam.

There is another objection urged by the Zamindar by Vakeel. He claims the Management of the Mandavanam for himself on the strength of a stone inscription stated to exist in the Mandavanam ground dated 4th Fyz Sarvari in which the word "Paria Nayaki Ayi Dharmam" is engraved a swing out that he is the great grand son of Paria Nayaki and asserting that the present Manager is but an agent of himself. But it does not appear that the Zamindar has ever exercised any sort of control over the Mandavanam affairs or held the present manager in subordination to his orders in respect to them during the last 12 years or ever taken any account from him of the receipts and Disbursements on account of the Mandavanam. It is true however that the father of the present Mandavanam Manager was a servant in the Zamindar's Court and it was probable that at that time that his family acquired the right of Management over the Inam. I have advised the Zamindar to oust him by legal means as I must respect the existing state of things against which I cannot make him the Manager.

To be confirmed in me T.D. free so long as the Mandavanam exists

T. Krishna Rao
6/2/185

Remarks on Case No. 3. Continued

The Tahsildar's report therein 14th May 1866 No 174 reporting that the T.D was given by the Tahsildar to Manager Somasundrasiliay. The petition endorsed as follows.

Mahalingapuram (Case 3)
Erattakaranpatti (Case 4)
Arealur (Case 5)

The Mandavanam Inams in question are in the charge of the Manager Thiru of Somasundrasiliay from a great length of time. It does not appear that the Mandavanam duties have been certainly neglected by him. Under these circumstances, the T.D was properly given to him, by the Department; and this circumstance does not affect the rights of the Pagoda, nor of the Committee to ensure the due preservation of the Mandavanam. If the Committee are dissatisfied they must proceed against the present Manager of the Mandavanam, in the manner prescribed by the Laws.

[illegible]
Asst
7/66

Jean Copied

தாலுக்கா
வெப்பிலடிதீர்வாள் எடுத்துக்
கொள்ளப்பட்ட
ஜூலை மாதம் ஏடம் 83
வெப்பிலடி முத்த
ஜூலை மாதம் ஏடம் 83
தாலுக்கா
கையொப்பம்.