

Educational (1897) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 2/5

Dated 10-4-97.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Furnishing, with remarks, to S Krishna-
Swami Aiyar of the College of Agriculture
copy of G.O. No 701 of '96 regarding the de-
tenture of one Subramanyam in the
Reformatory School.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
D.O. 437/97.							

Judicial (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.

From H. a. Sim Esqr. J.C.S.
 Ag Private Secretary to
 H. E. the Governor.

Order No. 215 of 10-4-97

The petn. will be furnished
 with a copy of G.O. no. 701 of 11th Nov. 96 and will be informed that Govt see no reason to reconsider that order.



Dated 22 March 1897

Received
 Registered
 Enclosures
 Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Transfers a petition of 22nd March 1897 from S. Krishnasawmy Iyer, College of Agriculture, Said apet, praying that his Cousin, Subrahmanyam, Pupil No 281, may be discharged from the Reformatory School & handed over to the charge of petitioner's family.

(By order)

To The petn. 940
 with copy of G.O. 701 of 11-11-96

Ag Private Secretary

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	701	Ed	11 11 96
	101	"	24 2 96
	409	Jud	22 2 95
	2416	"	5 10 94
	838	"	30 6 91
	2545	"	10 12 88

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

College of agriculture, Madras
Dated 22nd March 1897

To

His Excellency, the Right Honourable
the Governor in Council, Fort St. George,
Madras

May it please your Excellency.

The humble petition of S. Krishnasamy
Iyer, Salem St, now in the College
of agriculture, Madras, most respect-
fully sheweth:-

Petitioner regrets very much to trouble
His Excellency for the third time on the
Subject of the discharge of his cousin
Subramanyam, Pupil no 281, from the
Reformatory School. The facts of the
case and the special circumstances
under which the application for the
discharge of the boy was made, have
been clearly set forth in petition
dated 23.7.96, orders thereon have
not been communicated to the
Petitioner, who however understands
that the petition has been disposed of
adversely to the prayer of the Petitioner.
This is very unfortunate. The

To 701
11-11-96

The petitioner respectfully sets for the following reasons for renewing the application for his Excellency's benign reconsideration, trusting that the Pet. will not meet with an endorsement referring him to the original order of refusal.

Q The boy was living under the care of petitioner's father, Village Munsiff in Star Sakur, Salem D. and Someday in December 1893 was found missing ^{all} on a sudden from home to the sorrow and anxiety of the whole family. After searching place after place aimlessly, at last in the beginning of 1895, information as to the offence of theft committed by the boy at Trichinopoly and the consequent imprisonment in the Reformatory reached the family. It was most unfortunate that the boy should have miraculously reached Trichy and there having been charged with theft. Neither the Police nor the magistracy gave any information to the family of the desertion of the boy

at Trichy, in spite of the boy's having given information regarding his whereabouts &c as is seen from the ~~records~~ Police and magisterial records. It should have struck odd to any body that so ~~to~~ young a boy, who had left his home impudently, should be taken care of, and delivered to his relations. He ought not to have been classed as an offender (for reasons stated in paras 3 to 6 infra). The petitioner and his father were utterly in the dark as to all that occurred in Trichy and in their anxiety & sorrow they were seriously doubting the very existence of the boy and all sort of thought struck them with hopelessness.

3. The petitioner's family and the boy's family and pedigree are very respectable.
4. The boy has property worth 4000 Rs and is the registered kurnam of some village in Salem District.
5. The alleged habit of the boy's committing offence, as far as petitioner can think cannot be accounted for. It can be neither an inherited nor an acquired one. At best it can

only be childish mischief with the legal interpretation of theft given apparently by the Police.

6. The boy is very young, puny skeleton with the right arm broken and will be seen incapable of committing any offence, if His Excellency sends for him for personal inspection. He is of a very delicate constitution. He is quite incapable of judging and discriminating what is technically an "offence", from youthful presumption.

7. The boy's sacred thread marriage which is most important in a Brahmin community (twice born ceremony) and which gives significance to the whole life of a Brahmin has not yet been performed, and the age limit for its performance is fast closing. The boy without that ceremony taking place within the approaching age limit will practically be a Sudra, and will never be admitted to caste forever. For an adult Brahmin

Convict at least, there is the Prayaschitta (purifying ceremony) and the boy's case will be most lamentable as he will not be admitted to caste after ^{his} final discharge, and the effect of such excommunication will only make him mix with low class people, and lead him to bad ways & company forever instead of reforming his character which is the intention of Government.

8. The petitioner, his father, and the boy's widowed mother living with petitioner's family, bind themselves and are able to look after the education and good character of the boy and are thankful to Government for the benevolent care taken of the boy so long.

9. The District Magistrates of Salem and Erichinopoly have made enquiries in the matter and have recommended the handing over of the boy to the Petitioner.

10. The petitioner is fully aware of the objects of Government in the establishment of the Reformatory School and the benefits conferred on the unfortunate misguided youths in their after life.

and would not have troubled
Government with repeated requests
had not been for the facts
set forth in para 7 supra.
Is it ^{not} reasonable that the boy should
have been delivered to his family
and then watched whether he
similarly behaves, instead of rushing
to the conclusion that he committed
theft under what conditions? The
almighty God alone can judge
rightly. How ~~he~~ was his antecedents
before his severance from the family?
Was he committing theft? These
have to be taken into account.
If he was all right at home
how did he come to commit
theft within a short stay of his
in Trichinopoly. This must be
accounted for as due to extraneous
circumstances. Does he not
deserve the chance of a trial
of behaving well or ill, being
handed over to his family?
If Sir Thomas Lucy had condescended
to write the life of Shakespeare
we should have had dissertations
not on Hamlet or the Tempest
but on the wool trade and deer stealing

Petitioner begs to be excused for this
digression

11. The Petitioner prays that his Excellency
or his Honourable Colleague will be
graciously pleased to reconsider
the matter and order the discharge
of the boy from the Reformatory School
and thus save him from the fangs
of Caste Discipline. For which act
of mercy and justice, Petitioner
shall ever remain grateful.

Petitioner begs to remain
your Excellency's most humble
and loyal servant

S. Krishnaswamy Iyer.
Petitioner

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

12
10/4/97

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

.. .. A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.