Regr. No. 5 Register of Inam Rev: No. 6 of the Udayarpollem Zamindari attached Udayarpollem Taluq in the Trichinopoly District

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22

The average assessment of the Village per Cawny Manal Chs. 2-4-3

1 Personal

Chs.	1	--92-3 1	22	2—2
	2	--35-15 ..	47	..—13
	3	--51-9 ..	68	1—3
	4	1-28-2 1	69	2—14
	6	--29-11 ..	39	..—10
	8	--39-1 ..	52	..—14
	11	--95-5 1	26	2—3
	12	--96-14 1	28	2—3
	13	--76-9 1	01	1—12
	14	--51-9 ..	68	1—3
	15	--53-2 ..	70	1—3
	16	--31-4 ..	41	..—11
	17	--89-1 1	18	2—..
	18	--32-13 ..	44	..—12
	19	--34-6 ..	45	..—13
Total		9-37-8 12	38	21—4

Bhattavritti — Free Hereditary — Not Known — None — Not Known

In 1223 Sashadri Aiyangar relation of an alienee in F 1216. Tastram Venkatachari Grantee

In 1281 (1) Audi Varaha Aiyangar (2) Sasha Aiyangar (3) Rangaiyangar (4) Kuppan Aiyangar (5) Rangaiyangar (6) Rangaiyangar Descendants of the alienee of the son of the party in 1216

Kumbaconum Tanjore Dt. —
(1) Kuppanaiyangar 20 — Vudayarpalayam
(2) Rangaiyangar 70 — Valakunchi
(3) Kuppanaiyangar 35 — Coorg
(4) Iyaviengar 60 — Periamurai
(5) Ramaiyangar 40 — Vudayarpalayam
(6) Sami Aiyangar 30

(1) brother's grandson (2) brother's son (3) brother's grandson (4) brother's son (5) brother's grandson (6) Adopted son — all but Register in 1223

(1) Mother — 1, wife — 1/2
(2) wife — 1, son — 1, married Daughters — 3/5
(3) Mother — 1, wife — 1, Unmarried Daughters — 2, brothers — 3, Do.'s wife — 1/8
(4) wife — 1, married Daughters — 4, Do.'s sons — 3, Do.'s unmarried Daughter — 1/9
(5) Mother — 1, wife — 1, son — 1, Daughters married 1, Unmarried 2/6
(6) Adoptive mother — 1, wife — 1/2

It appears from a simple Cadjan deed produced dated 6th Chittrai Vibhava Sera year 1730 (16 april 1808) that the son of the original Inamdar in F 1216 ~~gifted~~ sold for Rs. 35 a moiety of the inam to Ramayangar an ancestor of the present family & brother to the party in 1223 in addition to the other moiety which had been previously gifted by his father to the purchaser's father Bharatam Streenevasa Iyengar —

The recognised shares of the several members are No. 1 — 1, 2 — 1, 3 — 1, 4 — 1, 5 — 2, 6 — 2 = 8


The family of this purchaser & present holder has Inams in several Villages which are undivided and still held in common. Under a simple Cadjan Division Deed dated 12th Vyasi Subhakrutu (23rd May 1842) a 1/4 share in the several Inams which had remained in the possession of the family after deducting what had been gifted in common was assigned.

T.D. No. 234

Confirmed accordingly R.C. 10/4/65

~~1—4~~ 5

206



2 Personal

Chs.	14	--35-15 ..	27	..—11
	15	--40-10 ..	54	..—15
	5	--84-6 1	12	1—15
	6	--78-2 1	03	1—15
	7	--53-2 ..	70	1—3
	8	--56-4 ..	74	1—4
	9	1-17-3 1	55	2—10
Total		4-65-10 6	65	10—9

Do. — Do. — Do. — Do. — Do. — Do.

In 1216 & In 1223 Annasami Aiyangar

In 1281 Streenevasa Aiyangar a descendant of the grantee relation not clear because there are several Descendants of that name of different grades in the line —

Puducottah Madura &c.
(1) Sami Iyengar 58 Do.
(2) Annasami Iyengar 45 Do.
(3) Streenivasa Iyengar 45 Do.
(4) Ramasami Iyengar 32 Do.
(5) Sami Iyengar 58 Do.
(6) Rama Iyengar 54 Do.
(7) Ramanuja Iyengar 50 Do.
(8) Krishna Iyengar 45 Do.
(9) Chinnatorai Iyengar 35 Do.
(10) Sami Iyengar 59
(11) Appana Iyengar 70 — Needamangalam Tanjore Dt.
(12) Reghunatha Iyengar 27
(13) Streenivasa Iyengar 40
(14) Gopala Iyengar 45 — Streerengam Trichnopoly Dt.
(15) Tiruvengada Iyengar 30

(1) & (2) Grandsons to Grand son; (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) & (8) Sons to Grand sons; (9) Grand son to Grand son; (10) Son to Grand son; (11) Grand son; (12) Son to grand son; (13) (14) & (15) Sons to grandson — All to the Registree in (16) & (23)

(1) Wife — 1, Sons — 2, Do.'s Wives — 2, Grandson — 1/6
(2) Wife — 1, Son — 1/2
(3) Wife — 1, Sons — 2, Married Daughters 2/5
(4) Sons — 2, Married Daughter 1/3
(5) Wife — 1, Son — 1, Married Daughter 1/3
(6) Wife — 1, Son — 1/2
(7) Wife — 1, Son — 1/2
(8) Wife — 1, Married Daughter 1/2
(9) Wife — 1, Son — 1, brother's wife widow 1/3
(10) Brother — 1
(11) Wife — 1, Sons — 2/3
(12) Wife — 1
(13) Wife — 1, Son — 1/2
(14) Wife — 1
(15) Wife — 1

Notice No. 54 to Thiruvengadattayengar No. 15 in the statement filed by Samiengar who was exclusively registered in the Taluq Enquiry calling on him to prove his exclusive right in a week Sent — 18-1-65

The party in F 1223, & F 1216 had 3 sons each entitled to 1/3rd shares in the several inams of the family — No. 1 to 9 are descended from one son — No. 10 to 12 from the 2nd son — No. 13 to 15 from the 3rd son — It appears that in Novr. 1862, No. 13 to 15 claimed exclusive registration — Vide the statement given by them in the Taluq — This led me to issue the notice to No. 15 (No. 13 & 14 being absent from the Country) though the notice has not yet been received back, yet I see no sufficient reason to postpone the settlement of the case because No. 15 does not come forward — See the Taluq statement above referred to, No. 13 to 15 said they had no Documents whatever in support of their rights while they mentioned that No. 1 to 12 were in the enjoyment of money allowances at Puducottah Palace & Nedamangalam Pagoda —

On enquiry into the real state of enjoyment it is proved that it is quite unsettled — The descendants of each son doing their utmost to turn the inam to their account to the detriment of those of the others. The Carnam says No. 3 has given Cowle to Cultivators for some years as is admitted by No. 10 to 12 who again produce

Two Documents to show that they have similarly rented the inam in other years —
First A Cultivation Muchilika on simple Cadjan to No. 10 by one Parama Padayachee dated 19th Alpisi Parabhava for two years up to Sadharana relating to this Inam —
2d A Do. on stamp Paper dated 29th Chittri Rudhirodgari to N 10 & 12 by one Samiengar for this Inam and another at Edayar —
Hence it is clear that in the absence of any written instrument in the possession of No. 13 to 15 under which they can be supposed to have acquired exclusive right, the inam is the Common Property of the whole family & so I recommend that it may be confirmed in one T-D to No. 1 to 15 at 1/8 2 R or Rs. 1-4 — agreed to — T.R. 2/2/65

No. 15 has since appeared, and admitted that the inam is the Common Property of all — No. 1 to 15 — T.R. 13/2/65

T.D. No. 235

Confirmed

P. Chentsalrao Asst. 10/4/65

1—4

206

Register No. 5 Sheet No. 455

No. 7. 9207 C
செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட
66 மாதம் வருடம் 83.
செப்பனிட்டு முடிந்த
66 மாதம் வருடம் 83.
ஆவணக் காப்பகம்

Copy of the Tangam Rev: No 6 of the Udayarpalayam Zamindari attached to Udayarpalayam Talug Trichinopoly Dt — Continued

Remarks on Accl (Continued) — * to each of the Shares of the Viswa and their descendants being 19 Kavunis for each in 17 Villages — It seems to have been declared between the 4 Heads of each — Branch of the family marked I, II, III, & IV — and in consequence in Four Deeds — The deeds now produced are two of them intended to remain with Nos 4 & 6 and Nos 1/4 Share for each of their branches I & IV — It is presumed that the two other Deeds which are not forthcoming are to the same effect and give the same Shares for each of the other Branches II & III — The present Mode of Enjoyment however is different under a temporary and Verbal Arrangement of the family made for the sake of convenience — Viz that the 1/4 Share is enjoyed by each of the Four Branches in some Villages only — As some one Branch only enjoys the whole Claim or more than 1/4 in it, in lieu of its 1/4 Share in other Villages which it has ceded to the other Branches — It appears that before these Deviations from the terms of the Deed had occurred, a division each branch had been enjoying its 1/4 in the several Claims, an Arrangement was made between Nos 3 and 5 under which a 1/4 in Six Villages was left to be enjoyed by Nos 4 & 6 — Nos 3 reserving the 1/4 in the remaining 11 Villages which 1/4 appears to have been further ceded by him and the Families Arrangement as to other Members —

This Claim is enjoyed by 1/4 by No 1 & 2, 1/4 by No 4, and 1/2 by No 6 — as the results of the changes above referred to — this Village having been one of the six above mentioned —

No 1 & 5 are absent — The parties present are No 2, No 3 the wife of No 4 Ramalakkamal and No 6 — Of these latter, Nos 2, 3 and 6 refuse to join in the Sowcar with that in consequence of the unsettled nature of the present Enjoyment whereby the amount of all the cost answered, one Adaiman more — and that the best thing his Caste, all of the family Shares should be confirmed in due Share in the name of all the Members Nos 1 to 6 leaving it to make a proper distribution under written Deeds on future occasions —

No 2 of whole however claims to get the whole 1/4 Share of No 3 & 4 in the Six Villages, confirmed to her exclusively, unless No 3 should equip her a Marich in certain Dry lands — which she has in Revenue Attach in Madanakuchi — These Dry lands were originally a Bavarde Shares enfranchised & enjoyed by No 3 when some 7 or 8 years ago it was fully — assessed by Collector and registered in his name —

The non-production of these Dry lands in the Division Deed shows that they were out the limits of Property common to the whole family — but the only acquisition of the Members of the Branch from which No 3 and 5 are descended — No 3 & 5 wife says (but without any proof) that it was acquired by her father in law marked II — No 3 however declares that Karuppa Chetty acquired by his father, it is his exclusive right under the law — The dispute was decided by Collector in 1858 in favor of No 3 as per Collectors Endorsement dated the 4th May 1858 upon his Petition No 50 which is produced —

The non-production of any written instrument in support of No 2 & 3's wife's claim does not justify the Course of any confirming the several Shares as per the present and settled Order of Enjoyment — I have therefore advised her to recover the one half of the Dry lands of Nos 3 by a Civil Action and recommend that the Shares may be confirmed to all the members of the family in their several Shares as per the Division Deed — Vaisakha D. R. 1st 1865 Nos 1 — 6 — Agreed to — T. D. Love — 26/4/65 —

Nos 1 & 5 absent