Inam Register of the Sarva Inam Village of Pullayam Katte No 31 in the Tinnevelli Talug Tinnevelli Dt

Reg No: 6.

Sheet No 273.

[illegible Tamil text]

Poramboke Particulars

Items	Kotta	Markal	Padi
Nattam residence	16	0	$7\frac{1}{8}$
[illegible]appa Amman Temple	0	1	$3\frac{1}{4}$
[illegible] Mantapam	0	0	1
Pillayar temple	0	0	7
[illegible] temple	0	0	$2\frac{1}{2}$
[illegible]	1	2	$3\frac{3}{8}$
[illegible] springs	0	1	$3\frac{1}{8}$
Wells 15	0	2	5
High ground	15	12	$3\frac{3}{4}$
Pattat	3	20	$6\frac{7}{8}$
Channel water spread	2	14	$2\frac{1}{4}$
Bank	1	11	$7\frac{3}{4}$
Kalam	3	4	4
Road	3	13	$5\frac{1}{4}$
Lekka	1	2	$4\frac{1}{2}$
Pattavaral	1	5	$6\frac{1}{4}$
Palmyra planted	8	25	$7\frac{7}{8}$
Waste	5	19	0
Channel	0	5	3
Waste	0	9	$1\frac{7}{8}$
Total	62	6	$1\frac{3}{4}$

There is a Sarva Inam Village.

~~The whole Ayakat is wet with irrigation~~ ~~by the [illegible] channel~~

It appears to have been granted originally as waste land to be rendered fit for cultivation by the Inamdar. The Records show that the Inamdars did not avail themselves of the River irrigation till 1859, their cultivation previous to that date having been confined to an extent of 2 or 3 Kotas of land, ~~[illegible]~~ which was irrigated by certain wells & springs, formed at the cost of the Inamdar. In 1859, the Inamdars turned a ~~[illegible]~~ part of the Ayakat into wet, by the use of the River Irrigation. The fact of the recent cultivation was placed before the Collector Mr Levinge & that officer, on report, passed orders directing that the Rule of charging Tope lands brought under Kar cultivation, with the cess, should be applied to the lands of the village ~~made~~ turned wet by Circar irrigation, prescribing that for remaining irrigation, $\frac{1}{4}$ of the proper assessment, & for Pishanam irrigation to these lands, $\frac{1}{8}$ of the assessment should be charged. Since 1859, this course has been followed, & the irrigation charges have been collected. The Ayakat accounts does not describe the Ayakat as wet, but states ~~[illegible]~~ parts then cultivated as Nanji mel Punji, or wet turned into Dry. These the cultivation was stated to have been

Brinjal garden	10	13	$7\frac{1}{2}$
Cotton	2	20	2
[illegible] Chigal	2	16	$\frac{3}{4}$
Plantain trees		5	
Vellari or Cucumbers		7	$1\frac{3}{4}$
Total	16	16	2

It describes that the sources of irrigation were 5 springs, ~~[illegible]~~ and 15 wells. The Oozhan Jamabandi Kanakku of Fusli [illegible] shows the extent of cultivation to be only K 15 - 6 - Baris 3 - $2\frac{3}{4}$ & exhibits an Ayakat of 13 Kotas arable land which has been all along waste, or cultivated with Dry produce. It is evident therefore that the Inamdar never exercised rights of irrigation from channels up to [illegible] 69. ~~[illegible]~~ now ~~[illegible]~~ following the Survey, I have recorded the extent, but under what head the land should be ~~charged~~

& classed, whether as Dry, Garden, or wet. Mr Levinge imposed the cess of $\frac{1}{4}$ & $\frac{1}{8}$ for Circar irrigation, on the ~~ground~~ following ground stated in the wording of the Takid. "This is the village, in the [illegible] is made as Pillayan Kattle [illegible] the [illegible] Tiruthu Maniya Gramam, the Circar water was never used for the village for long time, & now that fresh land having been prepared for wet cultivation & Circar or water having been taken for irrigation, the case should be treated as Tope lands which are charged with Kar irrigation cess at $\frac{1}{4}$ of the assessment. The Takid applies to the Tope lands then under irrigation, & to all such future irrigations in the village. In the case changes either the water should be allowed free, or the lands should be classed as Dry or garden, & a Taal Jasti should be charged for wet irrigation. But as ordered by Mr Levinge, there seems to exist no similitude or analogy between the Tope lands & the lands of this village. In the Tope case we charge the difference between the garden irrigation & Paddy irrigation. But in the present case no irrigation right was exercised by the Inamdars. I therefore submit the question of assessment for consideration. XXA

XXA In my opinion, the extent of land cultivated as Garden, of Brinjals, or Plantains, or Cucumber should be classed as Garden at ~~[illegible]~~ $5\frac{1}{4}$ Rs per Acre; the lands cultivated ~~[illegible]~~ with Cotton ~~[illegible]~~ & the waste should be treated as Dry; & the lands mentioned in the survey as Lekka Tiruthu Chigal as K - 15 - $\frac{3}{4}$ should be treated as wet. I have treated them as Garden, & wet were raised there by means of wells & springs. I have accordingly revised the Ayakat. The Inamdar has not attempted to show that he derived any right to the River irrigation by virtue of the [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ garden. ~~[illegible]~~ I am not therefore for allowing water free of the Inamdars [illegible]

This classification is approved, but ~~this settlement~~ ~~[illegible]~~ must not be understood as conferring any right to river irrigation free of tax. Confirmed on present tenure. [illegible initials]

28/7/65

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Cree Devadayam			Acres or Ayakat			Object for 1203 the performance					No Sannad. The Inam appears in the Ayakat Object of 1212 as Pillayankattle Tiruthu Inam or Inam for having improved the lands. It appears also in the Inamkhata list of Sarva Inam villages prepared in Fusli 1215 & in the Amlam Jamabandi Acct of Fusli 1252	In Fusli 1212 Ayakat object. Pillayambalam in Pekasam Pillayan Katte Tiruttu Maniya Gramam Kudi Yruppu & Alugu	In the Inamdaru [illegible] Sarva Inam villages prepared in Fusli 1215 Pillayar Katte Kudi [illegible] Paliyar [illegible] Pandaram 27 8 [illegible] 27 0	Tinnevelly	Nelliappar Vedy & Kantimati Amman Goddess	Trustees Muthaya Pillayan 22 2 Nelliappa Pillayan 87 & his 3 brothers					

Total Ayakat Acres 181 - 5 - $2\frac{1}{2}$ 131.63

Deduct Poramboke 62 - 6 - $1\frac{3}{4}$ 100.93

Remaining 18 - 20 - $\frac{3}{4}$ 30.70

No Sundry Inams.

Shrine & Kattle & Arulagama [illegible] to the [illegible] of Nelliappar at Tinnevelly. Some Devadayam of the kind are [illegible]

The particulars of the Ayakat are detailed as below in the Ayakat [illegible] the tract.

Ayakat 81 - 5 - $2\frac{1}{2}$

Deduct Poramboke & [illegible] 23 - 6 - $\frac{1}{8}$

Revised Ayakat in conformity to my proposals described at the head of the Register

Ayakat	81 - 5 - $2\frac{1}{2}$	131.63
Deduct Poramboke	62 - 6 - $1\frac{3}{4}$	100.93
Survey	18 - 20 - $\frac{3}{4}$	30.70

Particulars as proposed

Wet	2 - 16 - $\frac{3}{8}$	4.48	31 - 5	at 7 Rs per Acre. Irrigation being from
Garden	11 - 5 - 1	18.20	95 - 4	at $5\frac{1}{4}$ Rs wells & springs & being garden land at the Survey
Dry	4 - 19 - $7\frac{3}{8}$	8.02	4	at $\frac{1}{2}$ Rs per Acre.
	18 - 20 - $\frac{3}{4}$	30.70	130.14	

As explained in the Remarks at the head of this Register, the survey accounts describe the Ayakat as partly wet turned Dry & Garden & the remaining classed in Poramboke. In 1859 Mr Levinge directed that a cess of $\frac{1}{4}$th should be charged on the village lands which are irrigated by Circar channels & I have now proposed that the Ayakat should be framed in accordance with the particulars of the survey, & that each description of land should be treated accordingly & its cultivation then as either wet, Dry or Garden. I have revised the Ayakat & fixed the assessment accordingly. The Revenue authorities might charge the $\frac{1}{4}$ & $\frac{1}{8}$ cess ~~[illegible]~~ prescribed by Mr Levinge, or a Taal Jasti might be duly charged. At all events my present proposal does not come in the way of Mr Levinge's order ~~[illegible]~~ being carried out.

The Ayakat ~~[illegible]~~ is Rs 130 - 14.

Only a small portion of the land - say 1 Kota & odd has been cultivated wet recently & charged with $\frac{1}{4}$ assessment.

Whole Cauf Taxfree

TD in the name of the Deities for the [illegible] Kattle & Arulagama [illegible] &c

6/1/65 [signature] Tinnevelly [signature]

IDC

TD No 381

[illegible] 7