M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 18

(2) Date of repair 10-5-39

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 547	Press Mis.
45-46.	
Dated 29-11-	18 [illegible].

45-46 9/60

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
29th November 1865.

No. 45. Read the following letter from TEROOMAL ROW, late Sub-Magistrate of Calastry, to His Excellency the Governor in Council, Fort Saint George; dated Triplicane, 15th November 1865.

I beg to forward the accompanying memorial, in triplicate, for transmission to the Secretary of State for India, and humbly solicit that, should the Government be not pleased, on a re-consideration of my case, with reference to the grounds therein set forth, to grant me the full amount of the pension to which my long and faithful service of 32 years is entitled, they will be pleased to forward my memorial to its destination.

To the Right Honorable SIR CHARLES WOOD, Bart., K. C. B.,
Secretary of State for India.

The humble memorial of TEROOMAL ROW, late Sub-Magistrate of Calastry, in the District of North Arcot, Madras,

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That your poor memorialist begs to submit this appeal to the Government of Her Most Gracious Majesty, against the Proceedings of the local Government, declining the grant to him of the full amount of the pension to which he is entitled after a faithful service of 32 years.

2. That, in view to submit to your Lordship in Council, in a clear point of light, the untenableness of the grounds by which the Madras Government allowed themselves to be led in forming an unfavorable estimate of the character of the petitioner, he begs to enter hereunder on one side the Order of Government passed in regard to his pension, with his explanation opposite to the various statements and observations made in those orders to the prejudice of the memorialist.

Order, *dated 6th September* 1865, No. 342.

The papers above recorded relate to an application for pension made on behalf of Terumala Row, late Sub-Magistrate of Calastry, in the North Arcot District.

2. On examination of the applicant's list of service, it was noticed that, on the 5th August 1861, Terumala Row was degraded from the post of Tahsildar to a Sub-Magistrateship, involving a reduction of salary from Rupees 150 to Rupees 85 per mensem.

3. The Collector of North Arcot was, therefore, referred to, by Memorandum, as to the cause of such degradation, and was requested to forward copies of any orders issued on the occasion.

4. In compliance therewith, Mr. Robinson has forwarded, with his Official Memorandum of the 22nd July, copies of correspondence which passed between the Collector and the Board of Revenue in the year 1861, which brings to light circumstances gravely affecting Terumala Row's character.

5. Mr. Blair, the then Sub-Collector, writing 11th July 1861, remarked that Terumala Row had for some years failed to discharge his duties satisfactorily. Passing over

the minor faults—for which he was from time to time punished with fines—in October 1857, on the ground of his extreme and continued idleness and apathy, and of the commission of certain irregularities, he was degraded by Mr. Sullivan. His dismissal was also threatened.

Sir Charles Trevelyan, when on a visit to Vellore, received numerous complaints against Narrainasawmy, and unable to reconcile the fact of Narrainasawmy (born of a Peon), who had been a Peon just a few days ago, being in possession of immense wealth and influence, with the insignificant post occupied by him, ordered an investigation into his conduct, which resulted in his conviction and punishment (amidst the deafening cheers of the whole Vellore Town), with hard labor in irons for a period of 14 years.

Mr. Blair goes on to state that the remarks of Mr. Elliott show that his conduct continued as unsatisfactory as ever, and that Mr. Elliott recommended his being placed on the Pension List.

These words quoted from Mr. Blair's letter to the Collector (dated 11th July 1861, No. 85) would seem to imply that the memorialist was *often* fined, which was never the case. He was only fined on three occasions, and that not more than one or two Rupees at a time.

The notorious state of corruption prevailing in the Sub-Collectorate of North Arcot during the incumbency of Mr. Sullivan, which drew the serious attention of the late Governor Sir Charles Trevelyan, can easily account for the penalties to which the petitioner was subjected. One Narrainasawmy, the Head of Police of Vellore, enjoyed the entire confidence of Mr. Sullivan, and he was held in dread by all sections of the community, even from the Sheristadar; and whoever failed to please Narrainasawmy with largesses was sure to incur the displeasure of Mr. Sullivan. And it was under such a state of things that the petitioner was punished with fines and degraded. If your Lordship would be pleased to order an examination of the pleas under which the petitioner was occasionally fined and once degraded, it would be proved to your satisfaction that they were utterly unjust. The Memorialist here begs to submit that the fact of his having been allowed to retain charge of the important Taluq of Arcot, for a period of nearly 10 years, without his competency for the post being at all questioned, is a strong presumptive evidence for showing that the degradation was unmerited by the Memorialist.

Mr. Elliott was in charge for not more than 8 months—a time too short to enable him to form a correct opinion of the character of the petitioner; and when he came for the settlement of the Taluq (Poloor) under the petitioner, the latter exerted his best and got the Jummahbundy made within one week, although it used to occupy a month formerly, and Mr. Elliott then expressed himself pleased with the conduct of the petitioner; but ere a few days had elapsed, that gentleman chose to find fault with the memorialist. The reason of all this was, Mr. Elliott wanted to bestow the petitioner's post on one of his favorities, and desired the petitioner to retire on pension; and the latter refusing to do so, that Gentleman thought of injuring his character in the eyes of the Collector, and of thereby gaining his object. The statements made by Mr. Elliott are too vague and general, and do not specify any particular fault on the part of the memorialist.

Mr. Blair's "own opinion," he states, agrees with that of his two predecessors; and he says that Terumala Row is generally represented to be dishonest, oppressive, and unjust, and gives it as his own belief that these statements are correct.

Here, too, nothing is specified against the petitioner. Mr. Blair simply says:—"I have repeatedly had reason to be dissatisfied with the way in which he performs his business, and I would add that he is generally represented by the Ryots and other inhabitants of his Taluq as dishonest," &c. The fallacy of the arguments brought by Mr. Blair to show why he is dissatisfied with the petitioner must be clearly apparent to your Lordship. He is unable to point to any (there being none) circumstances directly bearing on the conduct of the petitioner, and all his conclusions are deduced from hearsay evidence; and the petitioner is only surprised that Mr. Blair has not added any more epithets. As a reason for complaints not having been proved against the petitioner that Gentleman says—"This I believe to be not in consequence of the charges being unfounded, but of the extreme difficulty, nay, almost the impossibility, of getting witnesses to come forward against a Tahsildar." This may be said of any official. That these statements of Mr. Blair are incorrect will be evident from the fact that there will be found no Ryot even at present to speak ill of the petitioner, now that the latter occupies no influential post to overawe anybody from giving evidence against him. Here the Memorialist begs to submit, why, if Mr. Blair was not satisfied with the petitioner, he should have allowed him to reap the benefit of the late increase of salary to Tahsildars—that is, allowed the pay to be increased from Rupees 72 to 150—and not have transferred him to some post of equal pay then and there. The true state of the facts are that, in order to provide for one Kistniah, a dismissed Tahsildar of Chittoor, but ordered by the Board of Revenue to be restored to his post, the Collector appointed him to the Taluq of Wandewash forming the Sub-Collector's range, in preference to the person that had just a few days before become the Tahsildar of that Taluq. As this arrangement was effected without consulting Mr. Blair, he strongly deprecated the measure, submitting that the dismissed Tahsildar may be appointed as Sub-Magistrate of Calastry or the petitioner or the Tahsildar of Vellore should be made to give room for him. On the Board desiring for explanation on the subject, Mr. Blair, intent upon upsetting the diversion made by the Collector, to the pre-

judice of the Wandewash Tahsildar, and support his own arrangements, began to speak ill of the Petitioner, who was helpless, and happened to be in bad odour with the Cutcherry officials. It is here submitted that the fact of the degradation of the Petitioner (who but a few months ago was allowed a large increase to his pay), just in view to get over the dilemma of re-instating Kistniah in his former post, must strike as anomalous. The Petitioner was not subjected to any fine during the incumbency of Mr. Blair, nay, not so much as even rebuked for any neglect, and the Petitioner feels therefore the more surprised at the expressions which Mr. Blair has thought fit to use, in order to injure the character of your poor and helpless Petitioner.

Mr. Robinson has used harsh language to the discredit of the petitioner, because he wanted to provide for Kistniah. If, as he stated in his letter to the Revenue Board, (dated 17th July 1861, No. 161,) "enough has come to my ear and personal observation to satisfy me that he is not only an untrustworthy, but a miserably incompetent and inactive public officer," how is this to be reconciled with the remark recently made by Mr. Robinson himself at the close of his letter to the Civil Paymaster, viz., "the character and conduct of the applicant have, as far as I can learn, been generally good during his tenure of office." This fact shows beyond a doubt that Mr. Robinson has been forming judgment of the petitioner at the instigation of his subordinate officers, but not as founded on any record. Had the petitioner continued in his post for sometime longer, under an unbiased Sub-Collector, he feels assured that Mr. Robinson would have recorded a good opinion of him on some future occasion. The very strong language used to injure the character of the petitioner, and that without the least proof of his guilt, in his (Collector's) eagerness to provide a place for Kistniah, cannot, the Petitioner trusts, but be viewed as most unjust by your Lordship in Council.

Mr. Robinson, in sending on Mr. Blair's letter to the Board, and supporting his proposal to degrade Terumala Row, remarks that his own means of judging are necessarily more limited than those of the local officers, but he declares himself satisfied that Terumala Row is not only untrustworthy, but a miserably incompetent and inactive public officer.

6. How Mr. Robinson can reconcile such a statement, made so lately as July 1861, with the remark at the close of his letter to the Civil Paymaster—"the character and conduct of the applicant have, as far as I can learn, been generally good during his tenure of office," the Government are quite at a loss to comprehend, and they cannot but remark that the recommendation of the grant of the highest pension which Government could possibly bestow on a man of most exemplary character to such a "miserably incompetent" and "untrustworthy" officer as Mr. Robinson has stated the applicant to be, is not a course which is likely to advance the interests of the public service.

7. The Government decline to grant the applicant the pension recommended for him, viz., Rupees 49, but sanction the grant to him of a pension of Rupees 25 per mensem, with effect from 1st August 1835.

3. That the Petitioner has been 32 years in the service of the State, of which he (Petitioner) held the responsible post of Tahsildar for a period not less than 21 years. He performed the duties of Tahsildar, in North Arcot District, under Collectors, viz., Messrs. Ogilvie, Goldingham Babington, Lovell, Bourdillon, and Binning, and those able officers were not in any wise dissatisfied with the conduct of the Petitioner, as will be evident from the Records. But Mr. Sullivan, during the short period he was Sub-Collector, often took occasion to find fault with the Petitioner, at the instigation of his notorious favorite Narrainasawmy (as already stated in this Memorial),

and Mr. Elliott and Mr. Blair, although the Petitioner did not serve for more than 8 months under the former and 10 months under the latter, endorsed the opinion of Mr. Sullivan, the one official in order to benefit a favorite, and the other to upset an arrangement made by the Collector without consulting his wishes.

4. That, setting aside the faults noticed in the Petitioner by Mr. Sullivan, under circumstances already stated, the Memorialist is at a loss to understand how, and in what particular instances, Messrs. Elliott and Blair had reason to be dissatisfied with his conduct, and what particular proceeding of the petitioner had come under their cognizance to elicit such wanton and unjust remarks on a helpless and faithful servant like your poor Memorialist. There is nothing to show in the records, and vague expressions could be interpreted to mean anything and everything.

5. That, in order to show to your Lordship that the opinion submitted by Messrs. Sullivan, Elliott, and Blair, regarding the petitioner, were either owing to prejudice or to the very short time they have had to enable them to form a just estimate of his character, the Memorialist begs to refer your Lordship to the letter of the Deputy Collector to the Collector, Mr. Fraser, dated 22nd May 1862 (No. 22), in which that official says, "I have reason to believe, from the conversation I had with him on more than one or two occasions, on Revenue and Police matters, that he is possessed of good experience, and that he is well fitted for a respectable post. He was in fact a Tahsildar of several Taluqs upwards of 21 years, and as far as I have had opportunity of knowing him, since his employment in my division, I can safely testify to his good conduct and usefulness for public duty," and also to the Collector's two letters to the Board of Revenue dated 12th May 1862, 14th February 1863 (Nos. 84 and 18), in which Mr. Fraser states "my inquiries regarding Teroomala Row's conduct, and his performance of his duties subsequent to his degradation and prior to Mr. Robinson's departure, show that they have been satisfactorily conducted."

6. That Your Lordship's Memorialist begs to submit that under this noble and just British Government no man is made to suffer for any faults which have not had a fair trial, and much less, on hearsay evidence. In many instances the benefit of the doubt is allowed to the guilty party; but in the case of the petitioner it will be perceived that Mr. Sullivan fines and degrades him for some supposed faults, without so much as affording him an opportunity of explaining himself, and Mr. Elliott, without being able to cite any instances in which he has had occasion to find fault with the Memorialist, simply makes a statement of what had transpired in regard to the Petitioner during the time of Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Blair merely echoes the very words of Mr. Elliott, without alluding to a single circumstance that had come under his personal observation, and, adding some hearsay evidence to support his assertions, has injured the character of the Petitioner in the eyes of the higher authorities, and Mr. Robinson, the Collector, only endorses the opinion of his Sub-Collector, without ascertaining whether such opinion was well founded; and to crown the Petitioner's misfortune, the Madras Government have been only pleased to be led by the statements of the above Officers. The Petitioner begs to add that a person can become no criminal because one officer has chosen to say so, and two others merely repeated his sentiments, one after the other. No person can be said to be convicted of any crime on mere presumptive evidence. There must be proof recorded to make a person amenable to the slightest punishment; and your Lordship will perceive that no proof has been recorded against your humble Memorialist, and he has been merely made to suffer most unjustly.

7. That, referring more particularly to the fact of the Petitioner having been fined and degraded by Mr. Sullivan, which is the only stigma standing in the Records attached to his character, the Memorialist begs to submit that of the numerous individuals every day pensioned, your Lordship will perceive that nine-tenths cannot be said to have borne a perfect character in its literal sense. It cannot be stated that they were not so much as rebuked or slightly punished in the whole career of their service, this is almost impossible, from the very nature of things. In how many instances does the caprice of the head of an Office inflict unjust punish-

ments on servants placed in their power! Considering all the above circumstances, the Petitioner humbly trusts that his claims to pension, on a moiety of his salary, will be admitted with every propriety and justice.

8. That, in conclusion, the Petitioner most humbly and earnestly craves that your Lordship in Council will be pleased to bestow a liberal consideration on all the facts stated in this Memorial, and—directing your special notice to the circumstance of *the Memorialist having served under no less than six able Collectors (before he was placed under Mr. Sullivan), without any one of them having reason to pass any unfavorable remarks regarding his conduct; that Mr. Sullivan allowed himself to be led by unprincipled subordinates; that all that has been said against the Memorialist by Messrs. Elliott, Blair and Robinson were founded on mere hearsay evidence, and not on any proof recorded; and of the favorable reports recorded of the Petitioner by Mr. Frazer; and, more especially, that your Lordship was recently pleased to grant a pension in the case of one Mr. King, late of the Madras Medical Store Establishment, who was convicted of having embezzled Government property and underwent a sentence of rigorous imprisonment*—be graciously pleased to order the grant to the Memorialist of a pension of Rupees 43½, equal to a moiety of his average salary for the last five years, to which he is justly entitled.

9. That for this act of impartial justice your Lordship's humble Memorialist shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

MADRAS,
15th November 1865.

No. 46. ORDER THEREON, 29th November 1865, No. 549.

Ordered that the Memorial be forwarded to the Secretary of State, and the memorialist be informed of its despatch.

(True Extract),

Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. H. Burns.

2/72

TO

THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR CHARLES WOOD BART, K. C. B.,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

The humble Memorial of TEROOMAL ROW,
late Sub-Magistrate of Kalastry, in the District of North Arcot.

MADRAS.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That your poor Memorialist begs to submit this appeal to the Government of Her Most Gracious Majesty, against the proceedings of the Local Government declining the grant to him of the full amount of the pension to which he is entitled after a faithful service of 32 years.

2. That in view to submit to your Lordship in Council, in a clear point of light, the untenableness of the grounds by which the Madras Government allowed themselves to be led in forming an unfavourable estimate of the character of the Petitioner, he begs to enter hereunder on one side the Order of Government passed in regard to his pension, with his explanation opposite to the various statements and observations made in those orders to the prejudice of the Memorialist.

ORDER, *dated 6th September* 1865—*No.* 342.

The papers above recorded relate to an application for pension made on behalf of Terumala Row, late Sub-Magistrate of Calastry in the North Arcot District.

2. On examination of the applicant's list of service, it was noticed that on the 5th August 1861, Terumala Row was degraded from the post of Tahsildar to a Sub-Magistrateship, involving a reduction of salary from Rupees 150 to rupees 85 per mensem.

3. The Collector of North Arcot was, therefore, referred to, by Memo-

randum, as to the cause of such degradation, and was requested to forward copies of any orders issued on the occasion.

4. In compliance therewith, Mr. Robinson has forwarded, with his Official Memorandum of the 22nd July, copies of correspondence which passed between the Collector and the Board of Revenue in the year 1861, which brings to light circumstances gravely affecting Terumala Row's character.

5. Mr. Blair, the then Sub-Collector, writing 11th July 1861, remarked that Terumala Row had for some years failed to discharge his duties satisfactorily. Passing over the minor faults for which he was from time to time punished with fines, in October 1857, on the ground of his extreme and continued idleness and apathy, and of the commission of certain irregularities, he was degraded by Mr. Sullivan. His dismissal was also threatened.

These words quoted from Mr. Blair's letter to the Collector (dated 11th July 1861, No. 85) would seem to imply that the Memorialist was *often* fined, which was never the case. He was only fined on three occasions and that not more than one or two rupees at a time.

The notorious state of corruption prevailing in the Sub-Collectorate of North Arcot during the incumbency of Mr. Sullivan, which drew the serious attention of the late Governor Sir Charles Trevelyan, can easily account for the penalties to which the Petitioner was subjected. One Narrainasawmy the Head of Police of Vellore, enjoyed the entire confidence of Mr. Sullivan, and he was held in dread by all sections of the community, even from the Sheristadar; and whoever failed to please Narrainasawmy with largesses, was sure to incur the displeasure of Mr. Sullivan. And it was under such a state of things that the Petitioner was punished with fines and degraded. If your Lordship would be pleased to order an examination of the pleas under which the Petitioner was occasionally fined and once degraded, it would be proved to your satisfaction that they were utterly unjust.

Sir Charles Trevelyan, when on a visit to Vellore, received numerous complaints against Narrainasawmy, and unable to reconcile the fact of Narrainasawmy (born of a peon) who had been a peon just a few days ago, being in possession of immense wealth and influence, with the insignificant post occupied by him, ordered an investigation into his conduct, which resulted in his conviction and punishment (amidst the deafening cheers of the whole Vellore Town) with hard labour in irons for a period of 14 years.

92

Mr. Blair goes on to state that the remarks of Mr. Elliott show that his conduct continued as unsatisfactory as ever, and that Mr. Elliott recommended his being placed on the Pension List.

The Memorialist here begs to submit that the fact of his having been allowed to retain charge of the important Taluq of Arcot, for a period of nearly 10 years, without his competency for the post being at all questioned, is a strong presumptive evidence for shewing that the degradation was unmerited by the Memorialist.

Mr. Elliott was in charge for not more than 8 months—a time too short to enable him to form a correct opinion of the character of the Petitioner; and when he came for the settlement of the Taluq (Poloor) under the Petitioner, the latter exerted his best and got the Jamabundy made within one week, although it used to occupy a month formerly, and Mr. Elliott then expressed himself pleased with the conduct of the Petitioner, but ere a few days had elapsed, that Gentleman chose to find fault with the Memorialist. The reason of all this was, Mr. Elliott wanted to bestow the Petitioner's post on one of his favorites, and desired the Petitioner to retire on pension; and the latter refusing to do so, that Gentleman thought of injuring his character in the eyes of the Collector and of thereby gaining his object. The statements made by Mr. Elliott are too vague and general, and do not specify any particular fault on the part of the Memorialist.

Mr. Blair's "own opinion," he states, agrees with that of his two predecessors; and he says that Terumala Row is generally represented to be dishonest, oppressive, and unjust, and gives it as his own belief that these statements are correct.

Here too, nothing is specified against the Petitioner Mr. Blair simply says. "I have repeatedly had reason to be dissatisfied with the way in which he performs his business, and I would add that he is generally represented by the Ryots and other inhabitants of his Taluq as dishonest," &c. The fallacy of the arguments brought by Mr. Blair to shew why he is dissatisfied with the Petitioner, must be clearly apparent to your Lordship. He is unable to point to any (there being

none) circumstances directly bearing on the conduct of the Petitioner, and all his conclusions are deduced from hearsay evidence ; and the Petitioner is only surprised that Mr. Blair has not added any more epithets. As a reason for complaints not having been proved against the Petitioner, that Gentleman says " This I believe to be not in consequence of the charges being unfounded, but of the extreme difficulty, nay, almost the impossibility of getting witnesses to come forward against a Tahsildar." This may be said of any Official. That these statements of Mr. Blair are incorrect, will be evident from the fact that there will be found no ryot even at present to speak ill of the Petitioner now that the latter occupies no influencial post to overawe anybody from giving evidence against him. Here the Memorialist begs to submit, why, if Mr. Blair was not satisfied with the Petitioner, he should have allowed him to reap the benefit of the late increase of salary to Tahsildars ; that is, allowed the pay to be increased from Rupees 72 to 150, and not have transferred him to some post of equal pay then and there. The true state of the facts are, that in order to provide for one Kistniah, a dismissed Tahsildar of Chittoor but ordered by the Board of Revenue to be restored to his post, the Collector appointed him to the Taluq of Wandewash forming the Sub Collector's range, in preference to the person that had just a few days before become the Tahsildar of that Taluq. As this arrangement was effected without consulting Mr. Blair, he strongly deprecated the measure, submitting that the dismissed Tahsildar may be appointed as Sub Magistrate of Kalahastre or the Petitioner or the Tahsildar of Vellore should be made to give room for him. On the Board desiring for explanation on the subject, Mr. Blair, intent upon upsetting

the diversion made by the Collector to the prejudice of the Wandewash Tahsildar and support his own arrangements, began to speak ill of the Petitioner, who was helpless and happened to be in bad odour with the Cutcherry officials. It is here submitted that the fact of the degradation of the Petitioner (who but a few months ago was allowed a large increase to his pay), just in view to get over the dilemma of re-instating Kistniah in his former post, must strike as anomalous. The Petitioner was not subjected to any fine during the incumbency of Mr. Blair, nay, not so much as even rebuked for any neglect, and the Petitioner feels therefore the more surprise at the expressions which Mr. Blair has thought fit to use, in order to injure the character of your poor and helpless Petitioner.

Mr. Robinson, in sending on Mr. Blair's letter to the Board, and supporting his proposal to degrade Terumala Row, remarks that his own means of judging are necessarily more limited than those of the local Officers, but he declares himself satisfied that Terumala Row is not only untrustworthy, but a miserably incompetent and inactive public officer.

6. How Mr. Robinson can reconcile such a statement, made so lately as July 1861, with the remark at the close of his letter to the Civil Paymaster " the character and conduct of the applicant have, as far as I can learn, been generally good during his tenure of office" the Government are quite at a loss to comprehend, and they cannot but remark that the recommendation of the grant of the highest pension which Government could possibly bestow on a man of most exemplary character to such a " miserably incompetent" and " untrustworthy" officer as Mr. Robinson has stated the applicant to be, is not a course which is likely to advance the interests of the public service.

Mr. Robinson has used harsh language to the discredit of the Petitioner because he wanted to provide for Kistniah. If as he stated in his letter to the Revenue Board (dated 17th July 1861, No. 161,) " enough has come to my ear and personal observation to satisfy me that he is not only an untrustworthy, but a miserably incompetent and inactive public officer," how is this to be reconciled with the remark recently made by Mr. Robinson himself at the close of his letter to the Civil Paymaster, Viz. " the character and conduct of the applicant have, as far as I can learn, been generally good during his tenure of office." This fact shews beyond a doubt that Mr. Robinson has been forming judgment of the Petitioner at the instigation of his subordinate officers, but not as founded on any record. Had the Petitioner continued in his post for sometime longer, under an unbiased Sub-Collector, he feels assured that Mr. Robinson would have recorded a good opinion of him on some future occasion. The very strong language used to in-

7. The Government decline to grant the applicant the pension recommended for him, Viz., Rupees 49, but sanction the grant to him of a pension of Rupees 25 per mensem, with effect from 1st August 1865.

jure the character of the Petitioner, and that, without the least proof of his guilt, in his (Collector's) eagerness to provide a place for Kistniah, cannot, the Petitioner trusts, but be viewed as most unjust by your Lordship in Council.

3. That the Petitioner has been 32 years in the service of the State, of which he (Petitioner) held the responsible post of Tahsildar for a period not less than 21 years. He performed the duties of Tahsildar, in North Arcot district under Collectors, Viz., Messrs. Ogilvie, Goldingham, Babington, Lovell, Bourdillon, and Binning, and those able officers were not in any wise dissatisfied with the conduct of the Petitioner as will be evident from the Records. But Mr. Sullivan, during the short period he was Sub-Collector, often took occasion to find fault with the Petitioner at the instigation of his notorious favorite Narrainsawmy (as already stated in this Memorial), and Mr. Elliott and Mr. Blair, although the Petitioner did not serve for more than 8 months under the former and 10 months under the latter, endorsed the opinion of Mr. Sullivan, the one official in order to benefit a favorite, and the other to upset an arrangement made by the Collector without consulting his wishes.

4. That setting aside the faults noticed in the Petitioner by Mr. Sullivan, under circumstances already stated, the Memorialist is at a loss to understand, how and in what particular instances Messrs. Elliott and Blair had reason to be dissatisfied with his conduct, and what particular proceedings of the Petitioner had come under their cognizance to elicit such wanton and unjust remarks on a helpless and faithful servant like your poor Memorialist. There is nothing to shew in the Records, and vague expressions could be interpreted to mean anything and everything.

5. That in order to shew to your Lordship that the opinion submitted by Messrs. Sullivan, Elliott and Blair regarding the Petitioner were either owing to prejudice or to the very short time they have had to enable them to form a just estimate of his character, the Memorialist begs to refer your Lordship to the letter of the Deputy Collector to the Collector, Mr. Fraser, dated 22nd May 1862 (No. 22) in which that official says. "I have reason to believe from the conversation I had with him on more than one or two occasions on Revenue and Police matters, that he is possessed of good experience and that he is well fitted for a respectable post. He was in fact a Tahasildar of several Taluqs upwards 21 years, and as far as I have had opportunity of knowing him since his employment in my division I can safely, testify to his good conduct and usefulness for public duty," and also to the Collector's two letters to the Board of Revenue dated 12th May 1862, 14th February 1863 (Nos. 84 and 18) in which Mr. Fraser states "my enquiries regarding Teroomala Row's conduct and his performance of his duties subsequent to his degradation and prior to Mr. Robinson's departure, show, that they have been satisfactorily conducted."

6. That Your Lordship's Memorialist begs to submit that under this noble and just British Government no man is made to suffer for any faults which have not had a fair trial, and much less, on heresay evidence. In many instances he benifit of the doubt is allowed to the guilty party. But in the case of the Petitioner it will be perceived, that Mr. Sullivan fines and degrades him for some supposed faults, without so much as affording him an opportunity of explaining himself, and Mr. Elliott, without

being able to cite any instances in which he has had occasion to find fault with the Memorialist, simply makes a statement of what had transpired in regard to the Petitioner during the time of Mr. Sullivan; Mr. Blair merely echoes the very words of Mr. Elliott without alluding to a single circumstance that had come under his personal observation and adding some heresay evidence to support his assertions, has injured the character of the Petitioner in the eyes of the higher Authorities, and Mr. Robinson, the Collector, only endorses the opinion of his Sub-Collector, without ascertaining whether such opinion was well founded. And to crown the Petitioner's misfortune, the Madras Government have been only pleased to be led by the statements of the above Officers. The Petitioner begs to add that a person can become no criminal because one officer has chosen to say so, and two others merely repeated his sentiments, one after the other. No person can be said to be convicted of any crime on mere presumtive evidence. There must be proof recorded to make a person amenable to the slightest punishment; and your Lordship will perceive that no proof has been recorded against your humble Memorialist, and he has been merely made to suffer most unjustly.

7. That referring more particularly to the fact of the Petitioner having been fined and degraded by Mr. Sullivan, which is the only stigma standing in the Records attached to his character, the Memorialist begs to submit, that of the numerous individuals every day pensioned, your Lordship will perceive that nine-tenths cannot be said to have borne a perfect character in its literal sense. It cannot be stated that they were not so much as rebuked or slightly punished in the whole career of their service. This is almost impossible from the very nature of things. In how many instances does the caprice of the head of an Office inflict unjust punishments on servants placed in their power. Considering all the above circumstances, the Petitioner humbly trusts that his claims to pension, on a moiety of his salary, will be admitted with every propriety and justice.

8. That in conclusion, the Petitioner most humbly and earnestly craves that, your Lordship in Council, will be pleased to bestow a liberal consideration on all the facts stated in this Memorial, and directing your special notice to the circumstance, of *the Memorialist having served under no less than six able Collectors (before he was placed under Mr. Sullivan) without any one of them having reason to pass any unfavorable remarks regarding his conduct; that Mr. Sullivan allowed himself to be led by unprincipled subordinates; that all that has been said against the Memorialist by Messrs. Elliott, Blair and Robinson, were founded on mere hearsay evidence and not on any proof recorded; and of the favorable reports recorded of the Petitioner by Mr. Frazer; and more especially, that your Lordship was recently pleased to grant a pension in the case of one Mr. King, late of the Madras Medical Store Establishment, who was convicted of having embezzled Government property and underwent a sentence of rigorous imprisonment,* be graciously pleased to order the grant to the Memorialist, of a pension of Rupees 49½ equal to a moiety of his average salary for the last 5 years, to which he is justly entittled.

9. That for this act of impartial justice your Lordship's humble Memorialist, shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Madras
15 November,
1865.

3
R6224/65
Encl
15/11/65

15 L

Her Excellency the Governor in Council
Fort Saint George.

Sir

I beg to forward the accompanying memorial in triplicate for transmission to the Secretary of State for India and humbly solicit that should the Government be not pleased on a reconsideration of my case with reference to the grounds therein set forth, to grant me the full amount of the pension to which my long and faithful services of years is entitled, they will be pleased to forward my memorial to its destination.

I have the honor to be
Honored Sir
Your most obedt. Humble Servt

Great Doors 21 1859.
November 1865

/signed/ Veroomal Row
Sale sub Magistrate
of Calahasty

Financial Letter to Govt. dated 11th Dec. 1865
No 1875
Encl. 11 Docrs

In No. 26224/65

dist[t]

69

29th November 1865 No. 549.

Ordered that the Memorial be forwarded to the Secretary of State, and the Memorialist be informed of its despatch.

5-8 Feb 66
No 18

1865 Dept.
No. 2622 of 1865.
Fort St. Geo. Pro. of Nov 2
From Sirumal Row, the late Sub Magistrate of Calahastry in the District of North Arcot residing in Triplicane, Madras.
Dated 15th November 1865.
Rec'd 17
With 3 enclosures.
No. 57
Prays to forward the accompanying Memorial to the Secy. of State for India in Council

The usual intimation
To Sirumal Row

45-45