Regr. No. 47 Inám Register of Tangare Salattar Patti No. 24 in the Tangare Taluk Tinnavalli District

Déva dáyam

Wet

D No. 878 to 891 | No. 4871 to 4894 | 18-6¼ 2-18-3 | 29.67 4.66 | 212-8-10 71-4-11

Trees

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

In this Ks 2-8-½ being cultivated 1 crop which is assessed at ¼ amounting to Rupees —— 25-4-3

Taladi 16-13-5

Tope Inám for the support of Álvár at Álvár Tirunagari the temple is in good order. Service of Mantapappadi is kept up

In F 1242 Ayakat Tamba Pillai Tope Ks 18-5-6¾ Not entered as Inám but as other Aiyan Topes

In F 1217 Jamabandi Wet converted into Dry land, under Déva Álvár Vadayátti mantapappadi Tambapillaiyar Tope Tiruvengadam Pillai in possession Ks. 2-18-3 Tope Trees 459. Palmyra 1901

In F 1255 Under Déva Álvár Tiru Vijóti Vadayatti Manta pappadi Tiruvengadam Pillai possession Tope trees 590 Garden Ks 18-[illegible] In F 1254 Under Déva [illegible] Tamba Pillai Tope Vaiyási Tirumal Vadayattimantapa ppadi Mínáksinda Pillai Sáminátha Pillai Tiruvengadam Pillai in possession Tope trees 65[illegible] Palmyra 50[illegible] Ks -6-

Álvár Tirunagari Álvár Swámi

For Vadayátti Mantapa padi

Trustee for the time being

This is a Tope Inám. It is not found as Inám in the Survey. It was then reckoned among other Aiyan Tope. The extent and detail of each Tope are given in the Survey and so the extent of this Tope was given as 18-5-6¾. In F 1227 Kaifiyat [illegible] Jamabandi of Ináms, the Inám was stated as [illegible]-18-3. In F 1238 & 54 only trees are entered as Inám. In F 1254 however the extent 2-3 of 2-18-3 stated in F 1227 was put down as Inám. The Inámdar claims the whole [illegible] Kotas — the Survey extent of a large Tope in the name of Tamba Pillaiyar. [illegible] produces no documents or orders of any kind to [illegible] whole 18 Kotas as Inám. Even in regard to trees [illegible] account of F 1254 describes many parts of the Tree Tope as recent deductions in [illegible]. So I see no reason to record the whole 18 Kotas as Inám. The extent of land Tope Inám recorded in F 1217 & 54 is now taken as Inám. This extent was waste for some years, and recently [illegible] of 2-8-½ of land was brought into [illegible] cultivation by circar irrigation; and ¼ Tírva [illegible] charged on it as Tírva Jásti, the original land having been measured as Garden. As regards trees, we [illegible]

I don't clearly understand what the Depy. Collector means. Is not the whole extent of 18-5 occupied by trees and if it is occupied by trees with the fruit trees and what [illegible] 2[illegible]

* To be confirmed. K. M. P. 2-18-3 of garden wet Tax Free. Title Deed in the name of the Deity for Vadáyat Mantapappadi

(Sd) A. Naráyana Ráu
Dy. Collr.
(Copy) 14-12 64
S.C.

Note as [illegible] The claim of the Inamdar is a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] made because [illegible] [illegible] the Tope [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] account is [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible] [illegible] determining the actual [illegible] & the Acct. of [illegible] 54 Agree to this [illegible] Topes [illegible]

[illegible]

Regr. No. 21 Inám Regr. of Srivaikuntapuram No. 58 in the Tengare Division of the Tengare Taluk Tinnavalli District

Perumal Alvár Náru Nattam

Wet

D No. 471 — 20-2¼ 1.58 — 8-14-10 — 8¼ [illegible] crop

Land Inám Pattam for subsist ence

Sanmadi

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

This Inám appears as Kule of K. M. P. 2-19-5 in the name of Chitragupta Pillai. Now the Inám is enjoyed in 3 shares as recognized in F 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 2d crop must go to Government. But the Karnams have been issuing Patta for the 2d Crop also on Pattam tenure. The reason the Karnam gives for this step is that assessment for the second crop per seed Kota is R. A. P. 5-4-11 but that the Pattam at 2 Kotas is 5-15-2 & that he charged the Pattiyam Tírva because it was larger than the 2d crop assessment. This is bad logic. When we dismiss right of Pattam to a 2d Crop, we must yield to the Inámdar the right of full assessment to it whether the sum be larger or smaller than the Pattam. I therefore confirm one crop as Inám and leave the 2d crop to be charged at the usual [illegible]

Mistake

Note The Rent [illegible] Revenue appear [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible]

To be confirmed

1 Crop Pattam Inám — 5-13-1
Quit Rent 1/8 — -6-
Total Combined Quit Rent 6 —

Agreed to

(Sd) A. Náráyana Ráu
Dy. Collr.
(Copy)
18-10 64

True [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]