Reg. No. 47 Inám Register of Tangare Talaittar Patti No. 24 in the Tangare Division Tinnavelli District

Déva Káyam — Ked

Fo No. 878	No. 2871	18-5-6¼	27-6-7
Fo 891	Fo 4894	2-18-3	4-6-6

Trees

Mangre	20	4-4-—
Tamarind	214	56-12-—
Palmyra	1635	51-2-8
		324-9-6

In this Fo 2-8-½ being cultivated 1 crop which is assessed at ¼ amounting to Rupees —— 26-4-3

Talaiári 16-13-5

Tax Free. Title Deed in the name of the Deity for Vadáyat Mantapapattari

(Copy)

14-12 66

Fo be confirmed

	R	M	P
	2	18	3

of gardrn wet

by A. Náráyana Ráu
Sy. Colla.
8-6.

Fo 1212 — Ayakat Tamba Pillai Fo Fo 18-5-6¼ — Not entered as Inám but as other Ayan Fo Fo 1217 — Tamabanie Ked converted into Dry land, under Déva Álvár Vadayátti mantapapattari Tambapillaiyar Fo Fo 1217 Feruvengedam Pillai in Fo Fo 1238 Under Déva Álvár Tirue Vejóei Vadayatti Mantapa Pattari Feruven -gidam Pillai Fo Fo 1238 Under Déva Álvár Tirue Vejóei Vadayátti Mantapa -pattari Feruvengadam Pillai in Possession. Fo trees 590 Gardn. Rs. 18-5-6¼ Fo Fo 1254 Under Déva Álvár Tamba Pillai Fo Vaiyási Tirimál Vadayattimantapa -pattari Mináxinádapillai Sáminátha Pillai Feruvéngadam Pillai in Possession. Fo trees 65 Palmyra 500 Rs. —6—

Álvár Tirunagari

Álvár-Sámi

For Vadayátti Mantapa -pari

Trustee for the time being

This is a Fo Inám. It is not found as Inám in the Survey. It was unrecognised among other Ayan Fo. The extent and detail of each Fo are given in the Survey and so the extent of this Fo was given as 1-6¼ Fo Fo 1238 & 54 only trees are entered as Inám. Fo Fo 1254 however the extent as of 2-18-3 stated in Fo 1217 was put down as Inám. Fo Śrándar claims the whole Fo Rs. 18 — the Survey extent of a large Fo in the name of Tamba Pillaiyar. He produced no documents or orders of any kind to recognise the whole 18 Rs as Inám. Even in regard to trees on account of Fo 1254 described many parts of the Fo Fo as recent deductions on Inám. So I see no reason to record the whole 18 Rs as Inám. The extent of land Fo Inám recorded in Fo 1217 & 54 is now taken as Inám. This extent was cultivated for some years, and recently 2-8-½ of land was brought under cultivation by circar irrigation; and ¼ Fiva was charged on it as Fiva Játi, the original land having been measured as Garden. As regards trees, we [illegible]

Reg. No. 21 Inám Reg. of Srutakapparam No. 58 in the Tangare Division of the Tangare Táluk Tinnavelli District

Personal Ked — Alai Nára Nattam — Fo No. 471 — 20-4¼-1-58 — 8½ mm. 1 crop

Land Inám Pattam for subsist ence — 8-14-10

To be confirmed

1 Crop Pattam Jodi —— 5-13-1

Quit Rent ⅛ —— —6—

Total Combined Quit Rent 6 —— Agreed to

(Copy) 18-10-64

by A. Náráyana Ráu
Sy. Colla.

Sanmadi

1	Chitragupta Pillai	40	Grandson	Wife—1, Son—1
2	Sivan Pillai	30	Do.	Wife—1, Daughter—2

This Inám appears as Kudi of 2-19-5 in the name of A. Chitragupta Pillai. Now the Inám is enjoyed in 3 shares as recognised in Fo 1254. This and the next case make up the whole Inám.

The Inám has been all along one crop Inám as noted in the several accounts. The 2nd crop must go to Government. But the Karnams have been issuing Patta for the 2nd crop also on Pattam tenure. The reason the Karnam gives for this step is that assessment for the second crop per seed Kota is 5-4-11 but that the Pattam at 2 Kotas is 5-15-2 & that he charged the Pattiyam Fiva because it was larger than the 2nd crop assessment. This is bad logic. When we dismiss right of Pattam to a 2nd Crop, we must yield to the Śrándar the right of full assessment be it whether the sum be larger or smaller than the Pattam. I therefore confirm one crop as Inám and leave the 2nd crop to be charged at the usual assess-