Reg. No. 32

Register of Vanjeeni Nandavanams attached to Udayarpalayam Zamindari Taluq, Trichinopoly District

Nandavanam assessed at the Village Jamabandi

Grand Total

Dry 2-7-11
Wet " "
Garden " "

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	Devadanam	Dry 15-3 1-87-8 Wet 2 18		For the Subsistence of Subramaniaswamy Pagoda at Vanjeeni Attached to Subramaniaswamy Pagoda	Free	Nirmal Inam	Sist Person	Nirmal	Subramaniaswamy Pagoda	1216 Fasli Subramaniaswamy Pagoda	1216 Fasli Subramaniaswamy Pagoda	Vanjeeni — Subramaniaswamy Sahamy Pagoda Hereditary (1) Vaithyadar Gumkhal (2) Dandapani Gumkhal (3) Muthusami Gumkhal	To be continued Inam so long as the Pagoda exists — J.R. 22/12/64									

Register No. 32.

Sheet No. 48H

| 2 | Devadanam | Dry 15th — 18th — 1st 17th — 18th — 1st Total — 4-2-R 1 Th | 1 — 8 | For the Subsistence of Vanjeeni Hosiers Hereditary Archaka | Wet | Wet | Wet | Wet | Ainam Pagoda | 1216 Fasli Ainam | 1216 Fasli Ainam | Vanjeeni Ainamdar Pagoda Hereditary Archaka Kutta Pudayachar | The right to the Mirasdari of this Pagoda and its Inam is claimed by three parties — 1st By one Kutta Pudayachi 2nd By one Appa Pudayachi 3rd By one Vedamalay Pudayachi The Inam — It seems that the right to inquisition formed the subject of a suit between the 1st and 2nd parties and was adjudged by the District Moonsiff of Attoor in favour of the 1st Party. Decree in his Suit in O.S. No. 229 of 1830 which is produced. The 2nd Party is attempting in 1853 to disturb this right. The then Head of this Village on the production of the above Decree and on an Endorsement of the Moonsiff on a Petition from the 1st Party of the 2nd Party | | | | | | | | | |

| 3 | Devadanam | Dry 14-3 — 3-98 | 7 — 8 | For the Subsistence of Byravaswamy Swamy Pagoda at Udayarpalayam Hereditary Archaka | Wet | Wet | Wet | Wet | Byravaswamy Swamy Pagoda | 1216 Fasli Byravaswamy Swamy Pagoda | 1216 Fasli Byravaswamy Swamy Pagoda | Udayarpalayam Byravaswamy Swamy Pagoda Manager Kaveri Kalyana Ranga Appa Kalakka Sola Udayar | To be continued Inam so long as the Pagoda exists — J.R. 11/2/65 | | | | | | | | | |

| 4 | Dharmadayam | Dry No field mentioned being Tamp Nos in the present Register | | | Wet | Wet | Wet | Wet | Inam Nanda-vanam | Fasli 1228 and onwards | Vanjeeni (1) Aniecka Pillay Mudali Nandavanam — (2) Shivayalinga Mudali Nandavanam - (3) Dharma Nandavanam - (4) Zamindar Rani Sri Kalliana Rangappa Kalakka Sola Udayar — Managers for Nandavanam No 1 - Chellam Lina Mudali, Muthusami Muraidasu Pillai Mudali, Muthu = Raya Mudali — For Nandavanam No 2 Ramalinga Mudaliar For Do No (3) Shanmukham & Kamakshi Pandaram | The 1st 3 Nandavanams exist and are in good Condition though there is no fresh Number given for them in the Karnams Abyal The 4th Nandavanam is no Existence as the Karnam says - probably because the Zamin Resumed it — The 1st 3 Nandavanams to be continued on 3 Kisparate Q-Cowle Kists - so long as they exist — J.R. 7-2-65 - Totter No 82 Sent to No 4 - J-2-65 The Do No 4 to be continued on 17-2-25 to 1/2 R 1 - Compulsory J.R. 11/2/65 | | | | | | | | | |

(1) 1 — — 1 32 — 8
(2) — 75 — 1 99 — 1 — 16
(3) — 8 4 — 1 55 — 8
(4) — 82 13 1 09 — 1 — 1
2-7-11 3 65 — 6 — 15

Nirmal Inam — Nanda-vanam Surfaces

Confd No 4/5/65

Confd No 4/5/65

Confd No 4/5/65

Nandavanam in green colour as shown in No 4/5/65 or No 4/5/65

Some Mogh had their appear the Bunkle Tolter or gardens

February 1853 (produced) and on ascertaining the continued enjoyment of the 1st Party under it, sent an order dated 22nd February 1853 (produced) to the Village authorities prohibiting the 2nd Party from disturbing the existing right and enjoyment. The second Party having again in 1853 disturbed the enjoyment of the 1st Party and forcibly seized the Pagoda utensils in the possession, the said Second Party from committing any more trespass on the Merasi Property of the 1st Party and enjoining them to restore the Pagoda utensils to the Merasi holder in possession. The Second party being a Monigar of the Village) made a public resistance of this order and this resistance formed the subject of the Head of Police's report dated 9th July 1858 No 87 upon which the Magistrate observed that as the 2nd party himself admitted in his depositions that he was acting as the formers agent under the orders of the 1st Party in holding possession of the Pagoda utensils there was no question of right for decision, and therefore caused them utensils to be restored to the first Party and warned the 2nd Party on pain of public punishment against causing any further interference with the recognised rights and enjoyment of the 1st Party. Vide Magistrate's Order 14th July 1858 No 41. The 2nd Party having again disturbed in 1859 the state things maintained in the above Magisterial order, and taken forcible possession of some of the Pagoda Articles. The 1st Party complained to the Magistrate in March 1859. The Head of Police was directed to enquire into the complaint but did not do so till three weeks after he had received the Magistrate's second Indorsement order dated 26th May 1859. The enquiry of the Head of Police commenced on the 18th June when the crime charged against the Defendants was sufficiently proved through the Defendants denied — one of them Defendant Padamalay who is the 3rd Party deposed that he had been in charge of the Pagoda worship and of the Pagoda's Articles under an order of the Zamindar 5 or 6 months since, the order having been passed as a temporary arrangement made by the Zamindar pending the settlement of the dispute between the 1st and 2nd Parties. The Head of Police then made a reference to the Zamindar who in reply stated that he was not aware of any order passed by the Magistrate in 1858 in the matter and that had he been so, he would not have interfered in the matter but made a report to the Head of Police. Vide Zamindar's Hearing on 18th of June 1859. The Zamindar further deposed that he was the manager of all the religious institutions in his Estate — and he found from the report made to him by the Villagers that the worship of the Pagoda was interrupted in consequence of the dispute between the 1st and Second Parties regarding the Merasi right of its Poojo — In ignorance of the existence of any judicial decree or Magisterial order bearing on the dispute, he advised them to attest to arbitration or Punchayet for the settlement of it and as they gave a Muchilika agreeing to a Punchayet settlement. The Punchayet passed a decree from which the 1st Party dissenting in reply stated that he was not aware of any order passed by the Magistrate in 1858 furnishing at the same time two Papers A purporting to be an agreement given by the 1st and 2nd Parties agreeing to a Punchayet Settlement dated 1st August 1858 and the other to be a Punchayet decree dated 3rd Idem which latter decides the Merasi right to this Pagoda in 3 shares giving 2 to the 1st and 1 to the 2nd Party — The Head of Police reported this to the Magistrate in August 3rd July 1859 No 64 considering the charge proved before him against the Defendants not reliable — and expressing it as his opinion that it was the fault of the 1st Party to have applied to the Zamindar for an arbitration and that the 1st and 2nd Parties must be made to abide by the Punchayet decree if the Peace of the locality were to be preserved — the Second Party had dissented from it again — The Magistrate appears to have superficially disposed of the matter by ruling that as peace should be preserved at any rate, Padamalay must continue in charge of the Pagoda till the 1st and 2nd Parties get the matter at issue between them judicially settled. Vide Magistrate's order 14th July 1859 No 65. The Magistrate in passing the above order was certainly kept uninformed of the fact that the matter had already been judicially settled in favour of the 1st party and that he had thereby maintained him in his long enjoyment just a year ago when disturbed by the other. Upon a careful perusal of the Records of the Head of Police and of the Zamindar's Officers. The Head of Police took no cognizance of the Magisterial Complaint of the aggrieved party for 2 months and 3 weeks and when enquiring (under pressure from the Magistrate) he found the crime committed by the defendants proved by evidence, threw it as unworthy of credit giving the matter the shape of a Civil case under the cognizance of the Zamindar or a Punchayet — Of course the 1st party declares that he never proposed nor agreed to any Punchayet before the Zamindar and does not own the signature in the agreement of the 1st August 1858 as his own. It is also quite different from what I see in his statement filed in my office. Indeed it is preposterous to suppose that the first party who held up to 3rd January 1859 unmolested enjoyment of his Merasi right under the Court Decree of 1830 supported by the repeated orders of the Magisterial authorities, would have ever proposed such an arbitration to the detriment of his existing recognised right. Though he might have done so in the absence of strong title in his favour. It does not appear that the Head of Police cross questioned the 1st Party when he received the communication from the Zamindar as he ought to have done as to whether he dictated the agreement or not — The plain inference that I can make from the papers before me, is that the Zamindar's officers through whose influence he succeeded in establishing it that unless the rightful owner is to share with him the Merasi emoluments they shall go appropriate part of them as a shares repeatedly baffled by the Magistrate's orders upholding the 1st Party's right to enjoyment judicially recognised. has recourse to the Zamindar's officers through whose influence he succeeded in establishing it that unless the rightful owner is to share with him the Merasi emoluments they shall go to a third Padamalay — There are several irregularities in the way in which the Punchayet decree is got up — The agreement of the 1st August 1858 is not witnessed by the Pakattan of the Village as required by clause 2 Section IV Reg V of 1816. Besides, it is not signed by me of ——— the Panchayet's Vardhachalachetty. The 2nd party states that the Chetty died after pronouncing and before recording the Decree — The 2nd party also states before me that the Punchayet sat for 8 days — whereas the Decree being dated 8th August 1859 makes the interval between the agreement and the Decree no more than 4 days — All this vitiates the very truth of the Punchayet Decree having been got up by party or its being true — though we overlook the fact that no regular Proceedings were held by the Punchayet in consonance with the Regulation — Even supposing that the Punchayet Decree as it is was fairly passed at the true desire of the two parties — it was highly illegal under the law, as no such Decrees are allowable in cases of questions already decided by Courts. Vide Vote on Proc of S. Dt. 24th October 1856 on No. P. 98 10 in Morris Cod. Page 261, which declares that "A Punchayet is wholly incompetent to enquire into the merits of a case already decided by a Decree of Court" — As to the Zamindar's claim as Manager of the Pagoda in his Estate it is certainly unfounded as he has never claimed any of the Pagoda Inams in it excepting a few which he actually manages and I have confirmed. Hundreds of the Inams to the several Worshippers without any objection from him. The plea then is that he is the Manager for this Pagoda — Where is such a right recorded? and Where did it lie so long still 1859 when the 1st Party held the Pagoda charge and inam unmolested under Court Decree? Certainly. The Zamindar's pretensions are worthless and intended merely to protract and maintain the enjoyment of Padamalay whom he put in the exercise of an extra judicial authority in the charge of the Pagoda and who, I learn, is one of his Defendants —

Under all the circumstances, I have rejected the claim of the 2nd party as unfounded, desiring them to establish it legally if they choose — and also of the third party as based on a temporary enjoyment obtained by fraudulent means, and recommend in accordance with the right of the 1st Party judicially recognised long maintained by the Magistrate that the Inam may be confirmed in favour of S. D. to the Pagoda Worshipper the 1st Party —

J. Ruthnaswamy Pillai
6/12/65

Approved
14/12/65 [illegible]

Compared