

Register of Inams in the Village of Vadimalabanchi in the Taluk of Parali in the Taluk Sahy Kurnool Dt.

[illegible]

The Act completed is the same Dr. Moore's copy.

[illegible]

See Cash Book dated 25th 49.
John R. M. M. M.

Register
No. 4.

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

C. V. Diana Gray
daygun

Shaw
hunts

2 shells 1-54

5+4

Not the
last post Tax Pt Not No Vienna
of Rem fpa known Lamm's Inam
at Gpl.
Lampatta
It appears at Gpl.
in Lamm's Lampatta
dry
2 shells
to see

The Green is destroyed
The Lamm is
gone from
lay hands on

The Preserved

July 1st

3/7/68 Father's

719

John C. Jones

Inam in Case 5th Dadamala Kuerhi - R₁
 " Pullala Kottay - R₂

Furin April

Wm. B. 92

It should be settled by Civil Courts -
I enclose accordingly.

W. W. Main
15/7/67

The Indian Paper is 6th March 1867 & is upon appeal from
 from the Court in Vol 16 in the two Cases N^o 124 of 1866.

Tolo claims that the two Leases have been in the possession
 of the Poygar & his son & of his son 12 years ago should be
 restored to him, & complains of his having been prevented by
 Poygar from cultivating them. He denies his being in the possession
 of any other Land in lieu of them. His son is not a ^{free} ^{born} ^{Indian} ^{Land}
 Land ^{which} ^{was} ^{the} ^{original} ^{Lease} - He complains
 that the Poygar in preventing him from cultivating the several
 Land told him that the Land were not the original Leases which
 Peto should ascertain in reference to the charge with the
 Leases and that the Commune would not permit him to the Land.

The Poygar & Peto both admit the title of the original
 Leases as pointed out by Peto - Peto he says that the Dalakabaketa
 Leases is made for payment of 20 years - & that he has no objection
 to Peto now occupying it on the basis of the Leases - who says
 the Dalakabaketa Leases the Poygar has also an objection
 to Peto holding on the basis of the Leases.

The Commune says that the Leases are not the original Leases
 but are the Leases of the Commune. The Commune says that the Leases are not
 the original Leases as he has no objection with him. He is not
 prepared to admit that the Leases pointed out by Peto are original
 Leases. He has been because in his former account they appear as
 Leases - He further adds that Peto is in the enjoyment of Leases
 6 ⁵⁹/₁₄ of Land which on his subsequent Leases and that the 3 Leases
 confirmed to him by the Dalakabaketa form part of them.

Neither the Poygar nor the Peto has mentioned any thing
 in the Tabular Statement regarding the subsequent Leases -
 The Commune's objection is inconsistent - Peto and Poygar & the
 are agreed as to the identity of the original Leases. The former
 has no objection to Peto occupying the Leases in Dalakabaketa
 while the other Leases, who not clear whether the original Leases
 is made in the Leases or on the basis of the Leases. Peto should
 be told that the Leases or the Leases. The Leases have been
 given to him the original Leases according to their nature
 & he can do nothing more for him or that the original Leases with
 the Dalakabaketa Leases are the same.

[illegible][illegible]