

(1) Number of pages 24
(2) Date of repair 8.7.86
(3) Initials of the Referencer law

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Judicial DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.		Press-
B.P. No.	= 300	Mis.
Dated	21. 2. 1868	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

[Signature]

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,

21st February 1868.

No. 265. Read the following letter from the Acting Magistrate of the Kistna District, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Gudiwada, 22nd January 1868, No. 37.

I have the honor to submit, for the orders of Government, copy of Proceedings of this Court, held this day, on the conduct of the Taluq Subordinate Magistrate, 2nd Class, of Palnad Taluq, in this District, in the matter of an inquiry into a case of suspected murder. The Proceedings detail the whole matter from beginning to end, so that no notice of them is required in this letter.

No. 6 of 1868.

Proceedings of the Court of the District Magistrate, Kistna, dated Camp at Gudiwada, in Gudiwada Taluq, 22nd January 1868.

On the 17th December, two letters, Nos. 72 and 74, dated 5th and 9th December 1867, were received in this office from the Acting Deputy Magistrate, Mr. Plunkett. In the former, he brought to the notice of the Acting Magistrate the conduct of the Subordinate Magistrate, 2nd Class, of Palnad Taluq, in the matter of a certain murder which occurred on the night of the 15th September 1867, in Gathevaripully, a hamlet of Sankarapuram Siddha Bai, in the Dachapally Division of his Taluq. In the latter, he reported that the Order of Government investing him with Magisterial powers having been received since writing the former, he had withdrawn the case for

- (1). From Superintendent of Police, to Deputy Magistrate, No. 88, dated 8th November 1867.
- (2). From Deputy Magistrate, to Superintendent of Police, No. 62, dated 12th November 1867.
- (3). Letter of Chemical Examiner, Madras, No. 240, dated 12th November 1867, to Civil Surgeon, Guntour.
- (4). Police Report, dated 21st September 1867.
- (5). Urzecs from Sub-Magistrate, Nos. 164 and 165, dated 30th and 31st October 1867.
- (6). Order from the Deputy Magistrate, No. 140, dated 11th November 1867.
- Do. do. No. 133, dated 5th November 1867.
- (7). Urzecs from Sub-Magistrate, No. 175, dated 29th November 1867.
- (8). Order from the Acting Deputy Magistrate, No. 160, dated 4th December 1867.

inquiry in the Divisional Court. From these letters and their enclosures,* it appeared, that the report of the Village Magistrate, dated 16th September 1867, was received by the Subordinate Magistrate at Obbalesunipully, a village distant from the scene of the alleged murder about 14 miles, on the morning of the 17th, and that the Subordinate Magistrate thereon wrote a Yadast, No. 2, dated 17th September 1867, to the Taluq Sheristadar, Gollapoodi Hanumanta Row, directing him to proceed to the spot, hold an inquest, and enter upon the preliminary inquiry required by Law. Except a Police Occurrence Report, dated 21st September, no information regarding the offence, or the steps taken in it, was in the Divisional Office till the 2nd November, a month and a half after its occurrence: on that day two Urzecs, dated 30th and 31st October 1867, Nos. 164 and 165, were received from the Subordinate Magistrate. In reply to the former, the Deputy Magistrate, V. Venkataschellam, sent an Order, No. 140, dated 11th November 1867, in which he characterized the Subordinate Magistrate's conduct in so long delaying to report as discreditable. In the latter he reported that the Taluq Sheristadar, Gollapoodi Hanumanta Row, having learned that he had passed the modified Special Test Examination, had proceeded to Narsarowpeta, to pay his respects to the Deputy Collector, and that some of the witnesses summoned by him before leaving had arrived; he desired, therefore, with reference to an Order passed in 1864—that the Officer who had commenced an inquiry should, if possible, finish it—to be informed how he was to proceed, as the Sheristadar had not yet returned. The reply to this, No. 133, dated 5th November, was an order stopping the Sheristadar's pay for absence without leave, but taking no notice of the Sub-Magistrate's reference for instructions.

2. On the 8th November, the Superintendent of Police, then at Guntour, addressed a Memorandum, No. 86, to the Deputy Magistrate, calling his attention to the conduct of the Subordinate Magistrate in holding aloof from the case and directing his Sheristadar to take it up, when he might have been expected to inquire into it himself. He added that from his Inspector he had learned that, though the defendant and witnesses had been brought to Dachapally on 18th September, the case had not yet been disposed of, and that it was in consequence probable that the witnesses would, to save themselves trouble, retract their evidence. In reply, the Deputy Magistrate

Subordinate Magistrate to be informed of all

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
21st February 1863.*

(V. Venkatachellam) sent a Memorandum, No. 62, dated 12th November, stating that the case had been referred to the Taluq Sheristadar, who had held the inquiry after visiting the scene of the reported crime; that the vomit of the deceased had been forwarded* to the Civil Surgeon at Guntoor, whose report had not been received, and that, in consequence of the Carempoody Station Head Constable having, while the inquiry was going on, sent up two persons† who professed themselves acquainted with the cause of deceased's death, the Sheristadar examined them, and, on their evidence, summoned other witnesses, who appeared on the 29th October, while the Sheristadar was absent (without leave); that, as the case had been partly heard by the Taluq Sheristadar, the Subordinate Magistrate of the Taluq had not examined these witnesses, but that the Sheristadar having rejoined at Dachspally on the 2nd or 3rd November 1867, it was probable that the inquiry had been completed.

* This was done on 21st September 1867.

† No date given, report No. 27.

3. The inquiry of the Sheristadar was completed and sent to the Taluq Magistrate on the 21st November. The report of the Chemical Examiner, No. 210, dated 12th November 1867, had been received: this was to the effect that no traces of poison had been detected, and that no ill had happened to a dog on which experiments were made with the alcoholic extract of the vomit. The Chemical Examiner proceeded to say, however, that, notwithstanding these circumstances, the symptoms described by the Sub-Magistrate had undoubtedly a strong resemblance to aconitic poisoning.

4. The Taluq Subordinate Magistrate, on the 29th November, submitted the record to the Acting Deputy Magistrate, and requested instructions for its disposal under the circumstances reported. The Deputy Magistrate, on the 4th December, directed him to use his own discretion: this was, however, followed, on the 8th December, by an order withdrawing the inquiry to the Divisional Court. The record and parties were forwarded with Urzec, No. 198, dated 13th December, and the case was finally thrown out there, as communicated to the Subordinate Magistrate in an Order, No. 176, dated 21st December. These papers disclosed to the Acting Magistrate that—to say nothing of delay in the examination of witnesses, which might be explained in a way perhaps—a very grave irregularity had been committed by the Taluq Subordinate Magistrate. Till the 29th November 1867, by the *Fort Saint George Gazette* of which date the powers are conferred, the Taluq Sheristadar of Palnad, Gollapoodi Hanumanta Row, had no Magisterial powers whatever. The whole of his proceedings were, therefore, valueless, and would have led to the case being remanded by the Court as illegally committed, had it been sent there. The Subordinate Magistrate was, therefore, directed (No. 39, dated 30th December) to submit any explanation he might have to offer of his conduct, which—whether considering the delay in the examination of witnesses, or his deputing to an Officer having no Magisterial jurisdiction the preliminary inquiry into a serious charge of murder—was extraordinary. His reply, dated 9th January 1868, No. 1, was received the day before yesterday. It recounts the facts, accounts for the delay by the non-receipt of the Civil Surgeon's answer to the Taluq references, but is silent on the real issue on the matter of delay—the non-examination of witnesses as soon as they appeared, thus needlessly harassing them, and giving them cause, as the Superintendent of Police wrote, to retract their evidence, rather than be put to trouble by prolonged detention at the Sub-Magistrate's Court. His explanation of the reference to his Taluq Sheristadar cannot be accepted. It is that, in 1866, the Sheristadar disposed of a case, his sentence in which was reversed on appeal by the Deputy Magistrate; that the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th cases in the Taluq during the past year were disposed of by him; and that the Appellate Court in the one case, and the District Magistrate in reviewing the entries of trials held in the first quarter of 1867 by various officers, made no objection to the exercise by the Sheristadar of these powers. This may be true, but in the one case it is to be remembered that it is the Court, not the Officer presiding in it, that the

‡ Except by saying that the Sheristadar who had no Magisterial authority had commenced the case and should, according to existing orders, finish it.

§ Order, No. 3, dated 13th April 1867.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
21st February 1863.*

appellate authority regards; that the presumption of law is that all things connected with its administration are legally done; and that, unless the attention of the Appellate Court is specially drawn to the fact, it would be very apt not to notice who was the sitting Magistrate in the Court whose decision was appealed against. In the latter case it would be by the veriest accident that—under the general rule that Taluq Sheristadars are invested with Magisterial powers, the Magistrate directing, as was done in the case referred to, that the return was for the Taluq Court, and should not, therefore, exhibit two files, one of the Taluq Sub-Magistrate and one of the Sheristadar—the District Magistrate in the multitude of his other duties should notice that the particular Taluq whose returns were commented upon had a Sheristadar who was not a Magistrate.

5. I must from all the circumstances hold that the Subordinate Magistrate of Palnad, Kunchee Annajeo Row, has seriously failed in his duty. He left the inquiry into a grave charge of murder to an Officer who, to his knowledge, had no power to take it up; he never for a month and a half reported its occurrence to the Divisional Office. He alone had the power to inquire, and, knowing this, when witnesses appeared in obedience to the summons of his Sheristadar, who had absented himself from duty without leave, instead of examining them himself, he made a reference to the Divisional Office, which could be proper only on the supposition that his theretofore proceedings were so. The delay in examining witnesses may not improbably have led to the breaking down of the case. It is clear from the Chemical Examiner's report that the mere non-detection of any actual poison in the analyzed vomit of the deceased was not sufficient to rebut the very strong suspicions of aconitic poisoning that were inferable from the Subordinate Magistrate's report. I feel bound to submit this conduct to the notice of Government. The Subordinate Magistrate and Tahsildar has hitherto borne an excellent character, and I should be loath to ruin his prospects; but his present conduct is inexcusable, and I cannot recommend a less punishment than reduction to the lowest grade of Tahsildar: he is now of the third.

6. It is to be regretted that the late Deputy Magistrate V. Venkatachellam, while censuring the Subordinate Magistrate's dilatoriness in reporting, did not at the same time notice the serious irregularity which had occurred, and was then continuing, in the reference to the Taluq Sheristadar.

(Signed) W. WILSON,
Acting Magistrate.

No. 266. ORDER THEREON, 21st February 1863, No. 300.

The Government resolve to refer the Proceedings above recorded to the Advocate General, with a view to obtaining an opinion as to the legality of an Officer in the position of a Sub-Magistrate referring a criminal case to his own subordinate, the Sheristadar of his office, supposing that Officer to be invested with Magisterial powers.

2. It is observed that Section 273 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides for such a reference by the Magistrate of a District or a Magistrate of a division of a District; and that Section 18, defining the division of a District, does not appear applicable to an Officer in the position of a Sub-Magistrate in charge of a Taluq. In the present instance, the fact that the Sheristadar was not vested with Magisterial powers was overlooked.

(True Extract).

Chief Secretary.

To the Government Solicitor.

Exd. J. H. Burns.

26/3/37
Judicial Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from the
Acting Magistrate of the
Kistna District.

Here enter 22 January 1868 No. 37.

Order.

N.
In the letter above
recorded the Acting Magistrate
of the Kistna District reports
the gross negligence of the
Sub Magistrate of Palnad,
Kunchu Annaji Rao, in
connection with a case of
murder reported to him
on the 16th September 1867.
2 From the Ag Magis-
trates letter it is shown
that no report of this oc-
-currence or the steps taken
in enquiring into it was
made by the Sub Magis-
trate to the Deputy Magistrate
until

until the 2nd November. It then
appeared that the Sub-
Magistrate had left the
enquiry into this grave
charge to his Sheristadar,
who had no magisterial
powers - that the Sheristadar
while the enquiry was
going on absented him-
self without leave, and
that the Sub-Magistrate
allowed the witnesses con-
cerned in the case to
remain during the Sheris-
tadar's absence without
examining them himself,
and that it is probably
owing to this delay that
the case, which was
eventually withdrawn to the
Divisional Court, broke down.

3 Mr. Wilson recom-
mends that Kuncher Amraj
Row be reduced to the
lowest grade of Tahsildar,
he

to be paid in respect
to a Tahsildar's salary

103
he now being in the 3rd grade.
The Acting Magistrate in
making this recommendation
has had in view the
excellent previous character
borne by the Tahsildar.
The Governor in Council
is willing to admit the
plea of former good
service advanced on behalf
of Kuncher Amraj Row,
and in accordance with
the recommendation of
the District Magistrate
directs that he be re-
duced to the 3rd Class of
Tahsildars.

4 It is observed that
T. Venkatachellam, the
late Deputy Magistrate,
although he censured the
Sub-Magistrate for the
delay that had occurred
in the case reported, and
fined the Sheristadar
for being absent without
leave.

In their order of the 20th Decr. 1867 the Government had decided to censure this officer for negligence in the performance of his ministerial duties. In the present case V. Vermetcheff has

[illegible]

Adell
I would leave the
papers to the judges
of the High Court
and ask them to favor
just. with this Union
as the foundation of the

6 The Agt Magistrate
will therefore report the
arrangement which he
may propose to make
for the Division of which
T. Venkatachellum has
had ^{the} magisterial charge
~~and~~ which will now
be withdrawn from
him.

+ but brighter &
 & more beautiful.
 This is possible in
 act of war in which
 the Govt. should show
 more the help of the
 people of the whole country

to the Magistrate of the Krishna
District

Judicial Department. 5-1
20/6

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from the
Acting Magistrate of Madras S.
(dated 22 January 1860 No 57)
Order thereon 21st Feby. 1860 No 300.

The Govt. resolve to refer
the Proceedings above recorded to
the Advocate General with a view
to obtaining an opinion as to the
legality of an officer in the position
of a Sub-Magistrate performing a
Criminal Case to his own subor-
dinate, the Sheristadar of his
office, supposing that officer to
be invested with Magisterial
powers.

WOL

It is observed that Sec 73
of the Code of Criminal Procedure
provides for such a reference by
the Magistrate of a District, or a
Magistrate of a division of a District, and
that sub. 18 defining the division
of a district does not appear
applicable to an officer in the
position

position of a Sub-Magistrate
in charge of a Subj. In the
present instance the fact that
the Sheristadar was sub-vested
with Magisterial powers was
overlooked

16/10

The Govt. Solicitor *W. P. P.*

265. 246.

Dated 21 February 1868.

ST. 4532.

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT.

No. 300.

Dist. 1868. Department.

Send out
Mr. F. C. ...

No. 37

Hindia District Magistrate
Circuit Court at Gudwada
in Gudwada Taluk
22nd January 1868.

From, W. V. Wilson Esquire,
Sitting Magistrate of the H. D.
To, The Honorable R. L. Ellis Esq. B.
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort Saint George.

Sir,
I have the honor to submit for the orders
of Government copy of Proceedings of this Court held
this day on the conduct of the Taluk's Subordinate Ma-
gistrate 2nd class of Palnad Taluk in this District
in the matter of an enquiry into a case of suspected murder.
The Proceedings detail the whole matter from beginning
to end, so that no notice of them is required in this letter.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
W. V. Wilson

Sitting Magistrate.

2056
265

Submitting Copy of
Proceedings held on 11th
Concluded at 10 o'clock
with the presence of
of Talukdar Sahib.

1868
Judicial Department
Honn. Secy. of C.S.
The Acting Magistrate
of Kistna District
The Chief Secretary
to Government
First class postage
October 22 January
Received 3 Feb
1868
Jr 37
Enclosure 1
Jr 263

To be kept.
Proceedings of the Court of the District Magistrate,
Kistna, Camp at Gudwada, in Gudwada Taluk, dated 22nd
January 1868.

On the 17th December two letters Nos. 72 & 74 dated 5th
and 7th December 1867 were received in this office from the Acting
Deputy Magistrate Mr. Huntell. In the former he brought to
the notice of the Acting Magistrate the conduct of the Subordinate
Magistrate 2nd class of Palnad Taluk in the matter of a certain murder
which occurred on the night of the 15th September 1867 in Gatharipally
a hamlet of Santarapuram Taluk in the Dachsally Division
of his Taluk. In the latter he reported that the order of Government
investing him with Magisterial powers having been received since writing
the former he had withdrawn the case for enquiry in the Divisional Court.

From these letters and their inclosures it appeared that the report of the
Village Magistrate dated 11th September 1867 was received by the Sub-
ordinate Magistrate at Obhalanipally a village distant from the
scene of the alleged murder about 114 miles on the morning of the 17th
that the Subordinate Magistrate therein wrote a report No. 22 dated
17th September 1867 to the Taluk Magistrate Gopalaswami Hanumantha
Rao directing him to proceed to the spot, hold an inquest, and enquire
upon the preliminary enquiry required by Law. Except a Police occur-
rence report dated 21st September, no information regarding this offence
on the spot taken in it was in the Divisional office till the 22nd November
a month and a half after its occurrence: on that day two orders dated
30th and 31st October 1867 Nos. 12 & 16 were received from the Subor-
dinate Magistrate: in reply to the former the Deputy Magistrate
V. Venkateshchallan sent an order No. 240 dated 11th November 1867 in
which he characterized the Subordinate Magistrate's conduct in so

- (1) From Superintendent of Police to Deputy Mag. No. 26 dated 13 November 1867.
- (2) From Deputy Magistrate to Deputy Superintendent of Police No. 22 dated 17 September 1867.
- (3) Order of Criminal Examiner Madras No. 240 dated 12 November 1867 to Civil Surgeon Guntoor.
- (4) Police Report dated 21st September 1867.
- (5) A Report from Subordinate Magistrate to Taluk Magistrate dated 17th September 1867.
- (6) Order from the Deputy Magistrate No. 12 dated 30th October 1867.
- (7) A Report from Subordinate Magistrate to Taluk Magistrate dated 22nd November 1867.
- (8) Order from the Acting Deputy Magistrate No. 16 dated 31st October 1867.

long delaying to report as discreditable in the latter
his reported ... that the Taluk Shriestadar Gollapudy
Mannamto Rao having learned that he had passed the Modified
Special Test examination had proceeded to Mursarowpeta to pay his
respects to the Deputy Collector and that some of the witnesses sum-
moned by him before having had arrived, he desired with reference
to an order passed in 1866 that the officer who had commenced an
inquiry should if possible finish it, to be informed how he was to
proceed as the Shriestadar had not yet returned. The reply to this
No. 123 dated 5: 11 November was an order stopping the Shriestadar's
pay for absence without leave, but taking no notice of the Sub-
Magistrate's reference for instructions.

On the 8: 11 November the Superintendent of Police then
at Guntur addressed a Memo No. 86 ... to the
Deputy Magistrate calling his attention to the conduct of the Subor-
dinate Magistrate in holding aloof from the case and directing his
Shriestadar to take it up when he might have been expected to inquire
into it himself. He added that from his Inspector he had learned
that though the Defendant and witnesses had been brought to Pacha-
pally on 18: September the case had not been disposed of, and that
it was in consequence probable that the witnesses would to some extent
reluctantly retract their evidence. In reply the Deputy Magistrate
(V. Venkateshlu) sent a Memo No. 62 dated 13: 11 November
stating that the case had been referred to the Taluk Shriestadar who
had held the inquiry after visiting the scene of the reported crime;
that the report of the deceased had been forwarded to the Civil Surgeon
at Guntur, whose report had not been received; and that in consequence
of the Campesado Station Head Constable having while the inquiry
was going on sent up two persons who professed themselves acquainted
with the cause of deceased's death, the Shriestadar examined them, and
on their evidence summoned other witnesses who appeared on the 29:

this was done on 21: 11
September 1867.

No date given for report
1867.

Police state the Shriestadar was absent (without leave) i.e.
he can have been partly bound by the Taluk Shriestadar the
Subordinate Magistrate of the Taluk had not examined the
witnesses, but that the Shriestadar having rejoined at Pacha-
pally on the 23 or 24 November 1867 it was probable that the inquiry had
been completed.

The inquiry of the Shriestadar was completed and sent to
the Taluk Magistrate in the 31: 11 November the report of the
Chemical Examiner No. 200 dated 13: 11 November 1867 had been received.
This was to the effect that no traces of poison had been detected, and
that no ill had happened to a dog in which experiments were made
with the alcoholic extract of the vomit. The Chemical Examiner
proceeded to say however that notwithstanding these circumstances
the symptoms described by the Sub Magistrate had undoubtedly
a strong resemblance to a scorbutic poisoning.

The Taluk Subordinate Magistrate on the 29: 11 November
submitted the record to the Acting Deputy Magistrate and regular
instructions for its disposal under the circumstances reported. The Deputy
Magistrate on the 4: December directed him to use his own discretion
in this; this was however followed on the 8: December by an order withdra-
wing the inquiry to the Divisional Court; the record and parties were
forwarded with order No. 198 dated 13: December and the case was
finally thrown out there as communicated to a Subordinate Magistrate
in an Order No. 176 dated 21: December. These papers disclosed
to the Acting Magistrate that to say nothing of delay in the examination
of witnesses which might be explained in a way perhaps, a very grave
irregularity had been committed by the Taluk Subordinate Mag-
istrate. Till the 29: 11 November 1867, by the Fort Saint George Gazette
of which date the powers are conferred, the Taluk Shriestadar of Pacha-
pally Mannamto Rao had no Magistrate's powers whatever.

Where?
When?
From whom?

Where?
When?

The whole of his proceedings were therefore useless, and would have led to the case being remanded by the Court as illegally committed had it been sent there. The Subordinate Magistrate was therefore directed (No. 59, dated 20th December) to submit any explanation he might have to offer of his conduct which whether considering the delay in the examination of witnesses or his departing to an officer having no Magisterial jurisdiction the preliminary inquiry into a grave charge of murder was extraordinary. His reply dated 9th January 1868 No. 1 was received the day before yesterday. It recounts the facts, accounts for the delay by the non receipt of the Civil Surgeon's answer to the Saluk reference but is silent on the real issue of the matter of delay - the non-examination of witnesses as soon as they appeared; thus needlessly harassing them; and giving them cause as the Superintendent of Police wrote to retract their evidence rather than be put to trouble by prolonged detention at the Sub Magistrate's Court. His explanation of the reference to his Saluk Sheristadar cannot be accepted. It is that in 1866 the Sheristadar disposed of a case his sentence in which was reversed on appeal by the Deputy Magistrate; and that the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th cases in the Saluk during the past year were disposed of by him; and that the appellate Court in the one case and the District Magistrate in reviewing the merits of trials held in the first quarter of 1867 by various officers made no objection to the exercise by the Sheristadar of these powers. This may be true but in the one case it is to be remembered that it is the Court not the officer presiding in it that the appellate authority regards that the presumption of law is that all things connected with its administration are legally done, and that unless the attention of the appellate Court is specially drawn to the fact it would be very apt not to notice who was the sitting Magistrate in the Court whose decision was appealed in the latter case it would be by the very accident that

* Except by saying that the Sheristadar who had no Magisterial authority had commenced the case and should according to existing orders finish it.

* Order No. 9 dated 13th April 1867

that under the general rule that Saluk Sheristadars are invested with a Magisterial powers the Magistrate in directing as was done in the case referred to, that the return was for the Saluk Court, and should not therefore exhibit two files one of the Saluk Sub Magistrate and one of the Sheristadar, the District Magistrate in the multitude of his other duties should notice that the particular Saluk whose return was commented upon had a Sheristadar who was not a Magistrate.

I must from all the circumstances hold that the Subordinate Magistrate of Palnad, Kanchu's Amajee Row, has seriously failed in his duty: he left the inquiry into a grave charge of murder to an officer who to his knowledge had no power to take it up - he never for a month and a half reported its occurrence to the Divisional officer: he alone had the power to inquire, and knowing this when witnesses appeared in obedience to the summons of his Sheristadar, who had absented himself from duty without leave, instead of examining them himself he made a reference to the Divisional officer, which could be proper only on the supposition that his theretofore proceedings were so the delay in examining witnesses may not improbably have led to the breaking down of the case: it is clear from the Chemical Examiner's report that the mere non-detection of any actual poison in the analysed contents of the deceased was not sufficient to rebut the very strong suspicion of aconite poisoning that were inferrible from the Subordinate Magistrate's report. I feel bound to submit this conduct to the notice of Government: the Subordinate Magistrate and Sheristadar has hitherto borne an excellent character and should be loath to ruin his prospects; but his present conduct is irretrievable and I cannot recommend a less punishment than reduction to the lowest grade of Jaidars: he is none of the 5%.

It is to be regretted that the late Deputy Magistrate

It is the same man who was in the Saluk Court. He is the same man who was in the Saluk Court.

He is the same man who was in the Saluk Court. He is the same man who was in the Saluk Court.

Ratio from 200 to 150 a fine 3rd 5th

V. Venkatachellam while continuing the Subordinate to a Ma-
gistrate's Office in reporting did not at the same time
notice the serious irregularity which had occurred and was then
continuing in the reference to the Taluk Sheristadar.

x This was the deputy
Magistrate in the
Nizam's prisoners case

W. H. S.

Soling Magistrate

Enclosure 1

Two letters from the
Acting Surgeon-in-Chief of India
Dated 1st & 2nd January
1848 No 37-

Proceedings of the Court
of the District Surgeon-in-Chief
of India

Jan 21 1848 No 100

Jan 21 1848 No 100