Scott. II.27—45,00—15-11-35.

1883.

Judicial (193) Department.

P. S. SERIES.

G.O. No. 1374

DATED 23. 5. 1883.

Confidential

[Despatch Abstract.]

Salem Riots

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

23rd May 1883, No. 1374, Judicial.

CONFIDENTIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st April 1883, Mis. No. 3344.

Read—the following petition from D. M. KANAGARATNAM PILLAI, late Head Accountant in the Salem Collector's Office, to the Honorable the President and Members of the Board of Revenue.

Most Respectfully Showeth,—That your Honorable Board's humble petitioner had been employed as Head Accountant in the Salem Collector's Office, from December 1879 up to 10th January 1883, on which date he was suddenly dismissed by the Acting Collector of Salem, on the ground that he had given false evidence in a Court of Justice (*vide* Collector's Takid, No. 59, dated 11th January 1883, enclosed).

The circumstances under which your petitioner was dismissed are as follow :—

2. In October last, your petitioner was cited as a witness by one Komaraswami Ayyen, who was charged by the Additional Sessions Judge of Salem, in Calendar, No. 1 of 1882, with the offence of leading the mob that destroyed the Shevapet Mosque on the 16th of August last, and with having taken a leading part in its destruction. He was then an Accountant in the Collector's Office, working under your petitioner in the Account Department. It was alleged on the side of the prosecution that he was present at the mosque at about 12-30 P.M. on that day, and the prisoner's contention was that he was in the Collector's Office till 3 P.M. He cited your petitioner and some other clerks in the office to prove his *alibi*. Your petitioner being asked to state on oath what he knew of the matter stated, what he then believed and what he still believes to be the truth, that he saw the prisoner in the office till nearly 1 P.M., and that he recollected having seen him a little later on in the day. As a Christian and an honest man, your petitioner had no alternative but to state what he thought was the truth, when asked to state with the Bible in his hand as to the presence of the prisoner in the office. The evidence of your petitioner was corroborated by the evidence of the other clerks examined for the defence, and one of them Strinivasa Ayyengar went even beyond the time given by your petitioner and stated that he saw the prisoner at 2-30 P.M. There were also others who could have deposed to the same facts, but they were not examined as the Counsel for the defence thought they had already established the *alibi* to the satisfaction of the Judge. The evidence of your petitioner and the other clerks was contradicted by one Ranganatha Row, a District Court Pleader. He, after the whole case was over, was put into the box as he was kept in readiness for the purpose by the Muhammadan referred to below, and deposed that he saw the prisoner leave the office at 12 A.M. The Additional Sessions Judge of Salem and two of the Judges of the High Court, who tried the case on appeal, believed his evidence and convicted the prisoner. One of the Judges, however, believed petitioner's evidence and was even pleased to characterize him as a more respectable witness than the Vakil. It is no doubt improper on your petitioner's part to comment on the judgments of the Additional Sessions Judge and High Court Judges. But as he has been harshly dealt with, when he is wholly innocent, he is compelled in defence to himself to state the points which would prove the absence of any motive on his part to utter a falsehood and thus remove the stain that has been thrown on his character. Your petitioner is a Protestant Christian by birth, and is a

graduate of the Madras University. He is a native of Jaffna. He has been staying at Salem only for a few years, and that only since he has been employed. It cannot be even for a moment supposed that the petitioner could expect to gain anything by uttering a falsehood on behalf of his own subordinate, while the fear of committing a sin before God and defeating the ends of justice, not to say of incurring the displeasure of all honest men, among whom are his own superiors, must be considered overwhelming motives on the other side. Your petitioner had all these things in his mind when he gave his evidence, and to say that he had risked all this simply to save a man who was not in any way connected with him, who belonged to a different race, religion and country, is to say what your petitioner respectfully submits, no body can believe. Ranganatha Row, the witness whose evidence was believed, was a Vakil for the prisoner, and was by when an affidavit was prepared to the effect that the prisoner was in the office till 3 P.M., which, if his evidence is true, he knew to be perfectly false. According to his admission he refused to defend the prisoner, not because he had set up a false case, but because his fees were not paid. He was escorted to and from Court the whole time the case was proceeding by a Muhammadan who had exerted his utmost in having the prisoners punished. He did not volunteer to give evidence till it became apparent that such evidence would create the liveliest sense of gratitude in the minds of the prosecutors and prevent the possibility of his sharing the doom of Vijayaragava Charri, the other Vakil, who defended the prisoners. Taking the part he at first did in the defence of the prisoners and having before him the fate of a co-Vakil (Vijayaragava Charri), who with Ranganatha Row took a prominent part in the defence of those charged with rioting, it is not at all singular that he should have thought of gaining the good will of the prosecutors by giving a story which agreed with the theory of the prosecution. His conduct in the beginning and his subsequent statement clearly stamp him as a person whose word cannot be relied upon. Your petitioner respectfully submits that his life should not be blasted merely because such a man has made a statement contrary to that of your petitioner.

3. The portions of the judgments of the Sessions Judge and the Judges of the High Court which bear on the subject, and which are appended hereto, would show that the Judges did not characterize your petitioner's evidence as false. They unanimously characterize him as respectable, but merely say that, in the confusion which prevailed in the office, your petitioner may have mistaken the exact time when the prisoner Komaraswami Ayyen left office. Your Honorable Board's humble petitioner respectfully submits that the statements in the judgments with reference to your petitioner's evidence are not such as to justify the act of the Collector in assuming that your petitioner was a perjurer and dismissing him and thus blasting his prospects for life.

4. Your petitioner also respectfully submits that he alone, among those who gave evidence in favor of the prisoner, was singled out for dismissal. One of the clerks who, as already stated, went beyond the time specified by your petitioner was merely transferred from the Collector's Office, and nothing has been done to the other.

If the Collector did really believe that petitioner's statement was false, much more so should have been Strinivasa Ayyengar's.

5. Further, your petitioner begs to state that no explanation was taken from him, nor was he given an opportunity of defending his conduct before orders were passed for his dismissal. This, your petitioner submits, is opposed to the orders of the Board and Government.

6. To prove the petitioner's good character, he begs to enclose testimonials from Messrs. Crole and Stokes, under whom he had served almost the whole of the time he was in the Revenue Department; and to whom the petitioner begs reference may be made, if necessary, before any final order be passed. These testimonials, the petitioner begs to submit, were given by the abovementioned gentlemen knowing full well all the particulars of his dismissal.

7. Your Honorable Board's humble petitioner humbly begs therefore that the order of the Acting Collector may be cancelled, and your petitioner restored to his post; for which act of justice and kindness your humble petitioner will ever pray.

Petition from M. GOVINDASAWMY CHETTI, lately an Accountant in the Collector's Office, Salem, to the Honorable the President and Members of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th April 1883.

Most Respectfully Showeth,—That your petitioner was lately an Accountant in the Collector's Cutcherry at Salem, and was, all on a sudden, dismissed from his post by the Acting Collector of Salem on the 11th January 1883 on the ground (as alleged in the order of dismissal, dated 11th January 1883, herewith enclosed) that he did not give information regarding the riots which occurred in Salem. That your petitioner was not called upon to give any explanation as to whether he had any information to give and whether he wilfully withheld it, and that your petitioner was condemned unheard. This procedure, your petitioner begs to submit, is opposed to the repeated orders of the Board and Government.

2. That your petitioner rose by degrees to his present position; that he was first employed as a Gumastah in the Ahtúr Taluk in 1872; that in 1876 he was transferred to the Huzur Office, and that since his transfer he was employed, up to June 1882, as a clerk under several Assistant Collectors; had to travel frequently from station to station without remaining at a particular place for any length of time; and that he has always acquitted himself to the entire satisfaction of his superiors, his character having been uniformly free from any blemish whatever as will be seen from the enclosed testimonials; that since June 1882, up to the date of his dismissal by the Acting Collector, he was working hard in the Account Department of the Collector's Office sometimes from 7 o'clock in the morning till 6, and at other times from 11 A.M. to 6 P.M.; and yet your petitioner regrets to state that his long and faithful services for twelve years came to nothing in consequence of his sudden dismissal from his post based on no ground at all, and without an opportunity given him to establish his innocence.

3. That your petitioner begs to assure the Honorable Board (which he is ready to prove if required) that he has no common cause with the alleged ringleaders, nor did he know anything of the alleged conspiracy; that he is in no way related to any of those who were charged with it, and that no reason can be assigned why your petitioner should feel himself interested in it; that your petitioner is perfectly at a loss to see why he should be suspected of any knowledge in the matter, and laments that the privilege of hearing first before dooming a person, which is accorded even to criminals of the darkest dye, was refused to him, and that he was thus punished on mere assumptions and conjectures.

4. The High Court having in the ringleaders' cases expressed the opinion that officials could not have been cognisant of the hatching of the conspiracy; and that the conspiracy was developed towards the end, *i.e.*, one or two days before the demolition of the musjid, and this also being the theory of the prosecution, your petitioner submits how impossible it was for him, holding a low ministerial office, to know anything of the conspiracy. This will also be clear from the circumstance that the Superintendent of Police, who was in charge of the ringleaders' cases, when called upon to explain the delay in bringing up the cases for investigation, "says that the conspiracy was kept most secret."

5. That your petitioner not belonging to the Executive Department, it was no part of his duty to keep a watch on the doings of other people; that his arduous duties kept him in office almost the whole day, and that your petitioner had neither the leisure nor the means to obtain any information, and that had the existence of such a conspiracy came to his knowledge, he would have, as in duty bound, intimated it to the authorities.

6. That to punish your petitioner in this way by assuming that he should have known of the conspiracy on no proof and without any explanation asked, especially when your petitioner had enough of work to attend to from morning to evening to task all his energies is, your petitioner begs most respectfully to submit, manifestly unjust.

7. That your petitioner begs to recapitulate that the order of dismissal is based on no proof, but on vague conjectures; that no opportunity was afforded to your petitioner to explain away the unfounded charge preferred against him; that the secrecy of the conspiracy was accepted even by the High Court, the highest tribunal of the Presidency; that there is no evidence to show that the officials had any knowledge of it, or had complicity in the alleged conspiracy; that the secrecy of it was the postulate on which the prosecution itself proceeded; that your petitioner, who had had twelve years' service uniformly good, free from every possible stain, would never dash away at one mad stroke all his brilliant prospects, but would have tried his very best to have secured the patronage and favor of the authorities by giving them timely information had he known of it, and pave the way for his promotion, and that your petitioner most humbly prays that, under the circumstances above detailed, his case may be graciously considered, and that the Honorable Board will be pleased to restore him to his post.

ENCLOSURES.

Copy of the Testimonials.

Govindasawmi Chetti has been employed as clerk in the Assistant Collector's Office from January 1877 to March 1879. I have much pleasure in certifying that he is an excellent clerk. There was great pressure of work of various kinds during the famine, much administrative work and correspondence, when he did very well. He is a good clerk for Magisterial work. He wants more smartness for punctual despatch of returns, answers to references, &c. He is remarkably free from the fault of often wanting leave on account of sickness, &c.

SALEM,
10*th April* 1879.

(Signed) W. H. WELSH,
Ag. Head. Asst. Collector.

SURAMANGALAM,
8*th January* 1880.

The bearer Govindasawmi Chetti served under me for a short time as Head Clerk on 40 rupees. He is an intelligent, painstaking, and hardworking young man; has a fair knowledge of English; is well up in the routine of both Revenue and Magisterial work; is always anxious to please his superior. I believe he is trustworthy. He gave me entire satisfaction.

(Signed) T. PATTAHBIRAM PILLAI,
Temporary Deputy Collector.

Petition from T. MUTHUSAWMI CHETTI, residing at Salem, to the Honorable the President and Members of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th April 1883.

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,—That petitioner was lately third shroff in the Collector's Office at Salem and had held the appointment for four years.

That his great grandfather, grandfather, and father had successively held the same appointment for upwards of seventy years.

That the family had uniformly borne a good character in the said service, and had discharged its duties to the satisfaction of successive Collectors of the District.

That, on the 11th January 1883, petitioner was informed by the Collector's Takid, No. 66, General (copy herewith filed), that his services were dispensed with on the ground (as therein appears) of his having failed to give information in respect of the riots in Salem of August 1882.

That petitioner deeply deploring the misfortune entailed on him by the said takid, begs to appeal to your Honorable Board for a gracious consideration of his case, and to urge as follows:—

(*a*) There was not any evidence of any character or any ground for suspicion in any degree that petitioner was possessed of any information to give to the authorities touching the conspiracy or the said riots to which it led.

(*b*) That petitioner had nothing in common with any of the communities who were interested in the litigation about the musjid that preceded the riots, and that he naturally had taken no interest in it.

(*c*) That petitioner belongs to the Komattee caste, a section as removed from the agitators concerned as Brahmins, and remarkable for its absolute non-interference with disputes of all kinds and characteristic timidity.

(*d*) That he is only a youngster of twenty-six years, and is entirely subordinate to elders in the family consisting of father and brothers, and is therefore, in the last degree, likely to be in communication with outsiders upon social or other subjects.

(*e*) That his official duties as shroff exacted his closest care and attention, and his early hours of attending and late hours of leaving the office scarcely allowed him any time for interference or concern in other matters and much less so considering his youthful inexperience and subordinate position in his family and considering the gravity of the matter touching which he has been now held accountable.

(*f*) That on the very day of the riots he attended office at 10 A.M., and did not leave it before 5 P.M.

(*g*) That the proceeding of the Collector above referred to, took for granted his knowledge in so grave a matter and condemned him, and in doing so denied him what has been so formally and ceremoniously conceded to the very offenders and ringleaders in the case who were charged and tried before a constitutional tribunal and were allowed to carry their case in appeal before the High Court.

(*h*) That his thorough ignorance of the conspiracy in question and his consequent utter inability to afford information to the authorities is not a simply professed fiction, will be patent to the Honorable Board if it looks at the expressed opinion of the High Court and the theory of the prosecution in the case that the officials could not have been aware of the conspiracy to destroy the musjid, it having been the work of one or two days, and at the explanation of the Superintendent of Police for delay in bringing ringleaders to justice that "the conspiracy was kept most secret."

(*i*) That the duty cast upon petitioner to give information such as he is charged with not having given, being one cast by law upon all the subjects of the State, and not one specially pertaining to his office, the petitioner respectfully submits that the most liberal, not to say indulgent, consideration should be accorded to him, and his liability or otherwise to look for and his means (which in the present case as shown above was *nil*) of obtaining information ought in justice to have been taken into account, and that his condemnation therefore upon mere suspicion, which at least he hopes was the foundation for the Collector's action, was hardly just or fair to him.

(*j*) That petitioner begs to impress on the Honorable Board that the said action of the Collector has not only by one stroke of his pen deprived him for good of Government service and destroyed all petitioner's youthful hopes and prospects, and consigned him to misery to the end of his life which may be many years hence, he not yet knowing, or being able to know, why this grave misfortune has befallen him, or in what conceivable manner he has deserved it, but has also deprived his family, which for three or four generations has enjoyed the appointment, of all hopes for the future to hold it.

That petitioner therefore humbly begs that the Honorable Board will graciously consider his youth, the services of his family for three generations, the dire consequences, including unmerited disgrace, of his dismissal, the wholly intangible and inconceivable nature of the offence he is charged with, the absolute absence of all inquiry which the worst and meanest criminal is considered entitled to, and the serious injury and injustice to him consequent upon the said circumstances, and pass orders directing his restoration to office; for which he will ever pray.

Petition from CHINGLEPUT MUTHUSAMI MUDALI, late Fourth English Clerk of the Collector's Office at Salem, to the Honorable the President and Members of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th April 1883.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,—That your humble petitioner was an English Clerk on Rs. 35 per mensem in the Collector's Office at Salem, and was dismissed from the service of Government on the 11th January 1883 by Mr. Macleane, the Acting Collector of Salem. The order, as translated from the Tamil Takid (original hereto annexed, marked A), dated 11th January 1883, No. 68, runs thus :—

"You are dismissed from service, because you have not given information regarding the riots of August 1882."

2. With reference to the above order, your humble petitioner begs to affirm most solemnly that he was completely ignorant of anything that transpired in connection with the riots of August, which your petitioner could have brought to the notice of the authorities. He submits, for the consideration of the Honorable Board, the following in support of his statement.

3. Your humble petitioner is a native of Chingleput; son of C. Arunagiri Mudaliar, Pensioned Recordkeeper of the Subordinate Court at Chittoor; he was employed as a clerk in the North Arcot Collector's Office from 1864 to 1866; he was sent for by Mr. J. F. Price, the then Sub-Collector of Salem, and was appointed as a clerk which post your petitioner held up to 1876, and he was afterwards transferred to the Huzur Office in the same capacity, and was then sent to the Námakal Deputy Collector's Office as Acting Head Clerk in 1878 and retransferred to Salem about the end of that year. Your petitioner has neither relations nor friends either in the town or in the district of Salem, nor does he hold any property in any part of the district.

4. Your petitioner respectfully submits that he is an official and a stranger whom the simple accident of his being a Government servant has thrown amidst the townsmen of Salem. It is in the nature of things highly improbable that he could have had any concern in a matter of such local interest as the right of procession, &c. Your petitioner denies most emphatically that he had any sympathy with those who were secretly concerned in the riots, and whose interest it would be to exclude from their confederacy every one from whom fear of disclosure was to be apprehended.

5. The Collector has either dismissed or degraded and sent to taluk stations all the Sudra native officials with the exception of a few. He seems to labor under the idea that the native officials were aware of the criminal conspiracy of the rioters. This view was not accepted by any of the Judges of the High Court, and the Chief Justice observes in one place that it fails to account for the ignorance of the Muhammadans. Your petitioner here begs to submit that the Muhammadans are scattered all over the town of Salem and its suburbs, and that the Muhammadan element in the Salem Police Force is very considerable; it is highly improbable that if the design to destroy the mosque was a matter of such public notoriety as to reach the ears of the native officials, the whole of the Muhammadan population of the town and so many Muhammadan Policemen could have been unaware of it. The Superintendent of Police, in his letter to the District Magistrate, dated 7th September 1882, states that the plot was kept most secret, and the High Court also viewed the matter in the same light, and observed "that the design, if formed, was not divulged until the latest moment at which it became necessary to do so;" and again in another part of the judgment, "If, as I have observed in the previous case, and, in fact, the true interpretation of at least one of the assessors in this case, the conspiracy was confined to fewer persons and was not divulged before the 14th August, it would not be requisite to explain the ignorance in which the authorities remained of the contemplated design by impugning the administration of the district, nor by imputing complicity in the designs of the conspirators to the native officials on whom the Magistracy rely for information."

6. Your humble petitioner begs leave to bring to the special notice of the Honorable Board the following conversation which took place between himself and the Collector, Mr. Macleane, between the hours of 6 and 7 P.M. on the 11th January 1883, which date the order of dismissal bears. Your petitioner and two other officials were sent for from the Cutcherry by the Collector to his private residence :—

Collector's Question.—I hear you are related to Venkatachellam Mudali, Local Fund Overseer, that has been convicted. Is it so ?

Petitioner's reply.—I am not related to him.

Collector.—But I am told that you are related to him.

Petitioner.—No, sir ; Venkatachellam Mudali is not related to me. I am a native of Chingleput having come here simply to earn my bread. I hear Venkatachellam Mudali is a native of Dharmapuri, where he has his parents, brothers, &c. I can substantiate the fact of my not being a relative by referring to his own parents and brothers, and also to my nearest relations at Madras and Chingleput.

Collector.—Are you not Venkatachallam's casteman ?

Petitioner.—I belong to the Mudaliar caste and so does Venkatachellam ; but there are many sub-divisions of that sect, and so I cannot say whether I belong to the same sub-division with Venkatachellam or not.

Collector.—Are you not a friend of Venkatachellam ?

Petitioner.—I and Venkatachellam are simple acquaintances, not friends.

Collector.—But you and Venkatachellam lived in one and the same street ?

Petitioner.—No, sir. I live in Appu Chetti Street near the Town School, and Venkatachellam in Kandakara Street.

Collector.—Now, sir, I hear you attended the Komatti Mattam Meeting. What say you to that ?

Petitioner.—The meeting at Komatti Mattam is stated to have been held on the 11th August (office day) between the hours of 10 A.M. and 6 P.M. It was impossible I could have attended the meeting. I signed the Attendance Register before 11 A.M., and was kept working under the orders of the Treasury Deputy Collector till a very late hour in the evening as usual. The nature of my work is such that I cannot leave my seat without the knowledge of the Deputy Collector. On the day of the meeting I attended the office at the usual hour, and was not absent from it even for a short time. This statement the Deputy Collector will testify to. I am not a native of Salem, I have no relations, nor have I contracted friendships with Salem people to such an extent as to enable me to know any secret designs which they might have had with regard to the Salem riots. I also beg to state that if your honor makes inquiries from the Cutcherry subordinates your honor will be perfectly satisfied that I almost made the Collector's Office my home, working there from the morning till a late hour in the evening, as the Sheristadar entrusted me with special work, besides my regular routine work in the office. I may also mention that my house is almost surrounded by Muhammadan houses. The Mussalmans have had ample opportunity of watching my movements, and that if they had really any complaint against me, they would have preferred it at once. They are not unfriendly to me as far as I am aware.

Collector.—You do not possess a good character. Do you ?

Petitioner.—As to my character and conduct I beg to refer your honor to the respectable Muhammadans of the place and to J. F. Price, Esq., the present Collector of Chingleput, to Muhammad Alí Sáhib Bahádur, the Assistant Conservator of Forests, South Arcot, who knew me ever since I came to this district, and to Mr. Mullaly, the Head Assistant Collector of Salem, under whom I served for the last three years.

7. In spite of all that your petitioner urged on behalf of his innocence, the Collector, at the close of the abovesaid conversation, dismissed him at the spot, and to your petitioner's utter surprise and sorrow the order of dismissal had been prepared before he (Collector) had sent for him (petitioner). From the above conversation your petitioner is led to believe that the Collector removed him from the service under the mistaken idea that your petitioner is a relation of Venkatachellam, one of the ringleaders convicted. It can be clearly seen from what is stated in this humble appeal that your petitioner is in no way related to the prisoner Venkatachellam, he (petitioner) being a native of Chingleput. Your petitioner further begs to state that he can prove that he is in no way related to Venkatachellam as the Collector seems to think if a formal inquiry is held.

8. Your humble petitioner submits that it was not fair to remove him from the service of Government for the simple reason that he was a resident of Shevapet. Your petitioner can cite a few instances in which public servants, who live close to the centres where meetings were said to have been held, and who are natives of Shevapet having real and personal property, and whom the Collector did not suspect had any knowledge of the riots. If they had no information, it was not at all possible for your petitioner to have previously known anything of the riots in question.

9. Your humble petitioner begs to enclose a true sketch map of Shevapet showing his residence and other places referred to. It can be easily seen from the map that his residence is far off from the places where the meetings were said to have been held, and, as your petitioner stated above, your petitioner's house is almost surrounded by Muhammadan houses.

10. Your humble petitioner had been a servant of Government nearly eighteen years, and was never, on any single occasion, found fault with; and, in proof of his statement, he begs to submit his service register and testimonials for the consideration of the Honorable Board. He had entitled himself to one-third pension, and was steadily rising in the service with the earnest hope of retiring soon from it on half pension.

11. In summing up, your humble petitioner respectfully invites the attention of the Honorable Board to the following points:—

I. That your petitioner is a perfect stranger to the town of Salem, and has no property, relation or interest of any kind in the Salem District.
II. That his heavy office work deterred him from mixing with the natives of the town, or contracting friendly intimacy with them.
III. That at the time, when the Collector supposed him to have been present at the meeting at Komatti Mattam, your petitioner was engaged in doing work at the office till a late hour in the evening.
IV. That native officials of Shevapet, living close to the places where meetings are said to have been held, were not suspected of criminal knowledge and have not been visited with any kind of punishment.
V. That the general supposition that native officials were privy to the criminal intention of the Hindu faction is ill-founded.
VI. That the Collector made no inquiry to satisfy himself as to the accuracy of the statements made by the petitioner in explanation of the charges made by the Collector.
VII. That your petitioner had everything to lose and nothing to gain by withholding information, which he was bound to disclose to his superiors.

Under these circumstances, he very earnestly prays that the Honorable Members of the Board will be graciously pleased to give his case due and careful consideration, and direct his restoration to his post with full pay for the period during which he has been unjustly kept out of employ.

12. Your humble petitioner further begs to submit that, should the Collector assign any other reasons than that stated in the order of dismissal, he (petitioner) may be allowed an opportunity to explain himself before his case is finally disposed of; and your petitioner shall ever pray.

From C. D. MACLEANE, Esq., Acting Collector and District Magistrate of Salem, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Salem, 16th April 1883, No. 37.

I have the honor to forward the petition of C. Viapuri Mudali. His case is recorded in G.O., dated 10th February 1883, No. 353, Judicial. With regard to G.O., dated 15th September 1879, No. 1401, Public, referred to in paragraph 3 of the petition, the case was considered to fall under the definition of a dismissal "in consequence of facts or inferences elicited at a Judicial trial." Petitioner being my own clerk was under my observation, and his case was subject of consideration during the whole pendency of the trials.

ENCLOSURE.

Petition from C. VIAPURI MUDALI, late English Accountant on Rs. 15 per mensem of the Salem Collector's Office, to the Honorable the President and Members of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th April 1883.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,—That your petitioner begs most respectfully to lay his hard case before the Honorable Members of the Board of Revenue for their favorable consideration and orders.

2. That your petitioner begs to state that he received an Order, No. 57, General, dated 11th January 1883, from the Collector, Mr. Macleane, dismissing him from service inasmuch as he had not given information to the authorities regarding the riots which took place in August 1882. Copy of the order is herewith submitted. On receiving the order your petitioner in his petition of the 5th February 1883 requested the Collector to inform him of the grounds to suspect want of fidelity to Government on his part, so that he may be enabled to explain his conduct satisfactorily to him (Collector), and thus establish his innocence or to restore him to his appointment But having received no reply he ventures to submit this appeal to the Honorable Members of the Board.

3. It is needless to say that he was taken by surprise for he was in possession of no information whatever, nor had he the means of knowing anything of the riots, as will be seen from the circumstances that he shall presently relate. It is very unlucky for him that he was not asked anything in the matter before he was dismissed, nor was he afforded any opportunity to explain himself as required by the orders of the Government of India to which the attention of the Local Governments has frequently been called by the Supreme Government. In the absence of the above information from the Collector, and of the alleged charges against your petitioner for his summary dismissal by the Collector, he is at a great disadvantage to convince the Board of his innocence.

4. That your petitioner begs permission to submit that he had no opportunities of receiving any information whatever regarding the riots He was a friend of none of those who have been convicted as ringleaders, nor was he acquainted with any of them. They all belong to the highest circle of the local community, and your petitioner being an insignificant official of no permanent interest in the locality, being a native of Coimbatore, had neither access to their company nor was he ever ambitious of getting it. He begs also to state that he was a young man of twenty-three with a year's service, of secluded habits, and was put up in one of the out-of-the-way lanes. Such habits were the outcome of the training he received from his father who mostly kept him indoors strictly confining him to his studies for the Special Tests.

5. That your petitioner had no sympathy for the agitators on behalf of Mariamman for he was trained to avoid idol worship, his father being of Bramo persuasion.

6. That if he had been dismissed for the simple reason that he was a resident of that place there are a hundred others who can similarly be suspected. There is the Head Compositor, the two other shroffs and some other Clerks of the Collector's own establishment, the District Registrar, the Schoolmasters, Clerks of the District Court and many other officials, most of whom are permanent residents and live in the main streets of the town of Shevapet and near the quarters where the meetings are said to have been held.

7. That your petitioner begs also to submit, for the Board's consideration, that, while the conspiracy said to have been hatched up escaped the sharp eyes of the Police, the Muhammadans, the Municipal officials, and the other executive officials who are always expected to visit every creek and corner of the town, it is not in the least likely that one of your petitioner's age and position should know anything of the lamentable riots. Moreover he is a stranger to Salem having no property (real or personal) or relations there to connect him with the plots and prejudices of the people. He has been in Salem but nearly two years, and had made no friends. There was no importance attached to his age, position or reputation which could have induced the rioters to take him into their confidence, nor had he any motive to thrust himself into their plots. While those officers of Government whose duty it was to detect such plots, and while the Muhammadan community against whom the plots were made were ignorant of them, it was not possible for your petitioner to have known anything about them. He had no position of any kind among the local communities. He was an officer just admitted into the service and was expecting promotion by hard and honest work. It would have been the height of folly on his part to have shown the slightest sympathy with the rioters and thus risk his prospects. On the other hand, if he had known anything of the conspiracy of these rioters he would have at once reported it to his official superiors, and thus made himself worthy of the District Magistrate's favor.

8. That your petitioner further begs to add, for the information of the Board, that he belongs to a respectable family, and that his forefathers and relatives were and are holding high offices under Government and have proved loyal to the salt they have eaten of Government. The certificate of Mr. J. Honner, Superintendent of Post Offices at Bangalore, is based upon this; copy of which is also submitted.

9. That it is impossible for your honor's petitioner to have had a knowledge of the conspiracy said to have been incubated and hatched up by the Salem people for which the Collector summarily dismissed your petitioner may be seen from the following facts:—

(1) That the Superintendent of Police at Salem in his letter of the 7th September 1882 to the Collector of Salem, published in the *Madras Mail* of the 23rd September 1882, states that the meetings were so secretly held that it was wholly impossible for the officials to have known anything of the alleged conspiracy.

(2) That the High Court in their judgment expressed that it was not possible for the official community to have known anything of the riots.

10. Consequently your humble petitioner craves the Honorable Members to restore him to his former place cancelling the order of the Collector dismissing him from service.

11. That your petitioner further begs that if the Collector assigns any remarks regarding any point which is not set forth in the order of dismissal, he (petitioner) may be allowed an opportunity to explain such before his case is finally disposed of.

And for this act of justice and charity your petitioner shall ever pray.

Resolution—dated 21st April 1883, Mis. No. 3344.

These petitions of appeal from five out of the six Cutcherry servants dismissed by the Collector of Salem, and referred to in paragraphs 1 and 6 of his letter to Government, dated 26th January 1883, No. 252, upon which G.O., dated 10th February 1883, No. 353, Judicial, was passed, will be submitted to Government for orders.

2. As the Government have passed orders direct, without reference to the Board, in the case of the other parties implicated in the riots, the Board presume that the Government will prefer itself to dispose of these appeals also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. A. DAVIES,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue (Petition) Department,
with five petitions, and their enclosures.

No. 865.

Forwarded to the District Magistrate of Salem for any observations he may desire to offer on each petition.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

Ootacamund,
30th April 1883.

From C. D. MACLEANE, Esq., Acting Collector and District Magistrate of Salem, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Salem, 10th May 1883, No. 42.

Replying to reference, No. 865, dated 30th April 1883, I have the honor to report on the five petitions therewith forwarded.

2. Petitioners were dismissed from office for withholding information regarding the Salem riots of August 16th and 17th, 1882. In one instance this minor charge was covered by the more serious one of giving false evidence.

3. The general case against the Collector's Cutcherry servants is described in paragraphs 2 to 5 of letter in G.O., dated 10th February 1883 No. 353, Judicial. I would, however, draw attention to the distinction between a charge in the terms of

paragraph 3 and in the terms of paragraph 4 of that letter. The former means withholding information before the event and is in a greater or less degree, as the case may be, equivalent to conspiracy. As I am aware of the difficulties under this part of the subject, I have been very cautious in charging any official under this head. The latter head of charge means that when called on to aid justice by giving information after the event the persons charged have not done so. There is little difficulty in bringing this charge home to a number of persons and the only question is, Who is the most blameworthy?

4. On the morning of the 18th August I went with the District Judge, the Head Assistant Collector and others (page 32 of the pamphlet) to the mosque and the surrounding ruined houses, and the first persons mentioned by the Muhammadans who were congregated there, were Komaraswami, the Cutcherry Accountant, Venketachellam, the Local Fund Overseer, and Manikum Mudali, the Native Surgeon. The Muhammadans specially denounced Komaraswami who they said brought men from Gogai and was the first to mount the mosque. This was the earliest complaint I received in person. Later in the day I gave out publicly in the Cutcherry that it was the duty of those who knew anything to come forward and assist the authorities, and I warned them at the same time that if it was found afterwards that any one was possessed of information and had concealed it severe notice would be taken of the circumstance. I repeated this warning several times to the higher native officials, and told them to instruct their subordinates in turn. It is impossible that any one can plead ignorance of the call thus made on the office.

5. As the Government are aware the authorities were isolated and detection was at fault. It was evident from the nature of some of the names which had transpired that there must be some knowledge available in the office. I go so far as to say that there could scarcely be any one in this large office who had not some information which he might have contributed. But no Cutcherry servant from that day to this has done anything to assist the authorities, and no information whatever has come out of the office.

6. These being the circumstances in the first week after the riots, it was decided to await the issue of the trials, and meanwhile ascertain in different ways who among the Cutcherry servants had had the best means at their disposal for assisting Government and therefore who were the most blameworthy. The three sources of information are mentioned at paragraph 11 of my letter above mentioned. The results are reported in that letter.

7. Kanagarathnam Pillai.—The two brothers Komaraswami Ayyen (Cutcherry Clerk) and Gurunada Ayyen (Jail Clerk) were seen at the mosque, the former leading the Gogai men, on the 16th August. These are not Brahmins in spite of the name "Ayyen." Five witnesses saw Komaraswami mount the mosque and clap his hands (pamphlet, pages 13, 15, and 18, appendix). Four other witnesses saw him at the mosque (pamphlet, pages 12, 16, 19, and 20, appendix). The time was fixed at 12-30 noon (pamphlet, pages 12, 15, and 20, appendix). It came out at the end of the trial (pamphlet, page 60, appendix, Court witness) that, as early as 31st August, while Komaraswami was in Jail awaiting the commencement of proceedings before the Committing Magistrate, he had given the name of Kanagarathnam Pillai to his Counsel as his first witness for an *alibi.*

8. Before the Sessions Kanagarathnam Pillai deposed as follows (pamphlet, page 53, appendix): "I remember the Judge, Mr. Wilkinson, coming there (Cutcherry) after 2 p.m. He came to send off a telegram. I think I saw eighth prisoner (Komaraswami) *a little while before that.*" (Cross-examined). "I do not think eighth prisoner could have gone away and come back without my knowing it." "I think I told eighth prisoner to compare the contingent accounts." "I can positively swear that I saw eighth prisoner up to nearly 1 p.m., and I have a strong recollection that I saw him afterwards." (By the Court). "Eighth prisoner used to live with his brother in Gogai. I have been to his house on business."

9. The Cutcherry is a mile from the mosque, and Gogai is beyond again. This *alibi* was upset by the last witness called in the trial a Court witness (pamphlet, page 60, appendix), who deposed that he saw the two brothers leave the Cutcherry in a cart at 12 noon along with other clerks. The hour as to the brother was corroborated by separate evidence. Circumstances also came out in the cross-examination which confirmed the credibility of the testimony, and it was accepted by the Courts.

10. Komaraswami Ayyen was committed and convicted, and his conviction was affirmed by the High Court on appeal.

11. The Courts commenting on the defence evidence of Kanagarathnam and two others said that they must have been "altogether mistaken as to the hour." My information enables me to say that Kanagarathnam was not mistaken, but intentionally misrepresented from a motive. Kanagarathnam was a widower, and has had no wife for eighteen months. He at the time in question had in his keeping Minatchi Ammal, Komaraswami's widowed sister, living in the same house with Komaraswami. As to the two Clerks P. Muthuswami Mudali and S. Strinivassa Charri they were his subordinates and acted on his prompting.

12. *Points raised in the Appeal Petition.*—(*a.*) That the witness who disproved the *alibi* was kept in readiness by a Muhammadan. This may have been so, but he certainly gave evidence with considerable unwillingness. (*b.*) That Komaraswami belonged to a different race, religion, and country to himself. This difference does not prevent a connection of a private nature. Kanagarathnam was in April 1882 publicly posted in the town of Salem for having committed adultery with Boyee Ammal, wife of Elayathambi Pillai, a Schoolmaster on leave at Jaffna, a man of a different religion. A half sister of the same Komaraswami is now living in adultery with a goldsmith, who is of a different caste. (*c.*) That the witness above named deposed with a view to avoiding the fate of another Vakil Vijayaraghava Charri. The latter was put on trial for conspiracy and taking part in the riots, not for defending prisoners. This witness was at no time suspected, nor is there any parallel between the two cases. (*d.*) That this witness was not a credible witness. The Courts have accepted his evidence. I happened to be in Court myself that day, and his manner appeared to me emienently that of a man telling the truth. (*e.*) That his own character is good. There is nothing against his official character, but I have described his private motives. (*f.*) That the other Clerks who gave similar evidence were either less punished or not punished at all. They were his subordinates and were led by him. Strinivassa Ayyengar was transferred to Paramathi. (*g.*) That the only object he had was to tell the truth. The Temporary Deputy Collector called him out of the office during the trial and asked him what he knew about the matter, but he would not tell. He declined also to give information to Mr. Stevenson. This is not the conduct of a man anxious only for the truth. (*h.*) That no written statement was taken from him relative to his dismissal. I would refer for this to paragraph 1 of Resolution in G.O., dated 15th September 1879, No. 1401, Public.

13. There is not a shadow of doubt in my own mind that this petitioner set himself against the authorities in their endeavour to ascertain the truth, and that he gave false evidence in Court to screen his acquaintance and subordinate in the office, Komaraswami. But, even if he explain away his evidence about the hour by saying it was *bonâ fide*, he will not avoid falling under my paragraph 3 above (*ad finem*). The intimacy of Kanagarathnam with Komaraswami's sister can be proved.

14. *Govindaswami Chetti.*—This petitioner, an Accountant on Rs. 15, was in the habit of giving information from the records to Sundrum Chetti. This can be proved. He would have been dismissed at the time, but it was thought better to take him with the others and dismiss him on the general ground, which was notorious, that he had information after the riots which he kept back. He was intimate with Komaraswami as well as with Sundrum. His name was given by the Muhammadans to the Temporary Deputy Collector on the 24th August 1882, immediately on the arrival of the latter, as having been present at the destruction of the mosque. It was stated that he was at the Komatti Mattam meeting, which was the first conference between Sundrum and the silk weavers of Salem. In the view of the meetings, I do not wish to go beyond what is expressed in the following extract from Mr. Justice Innes' Judgment in Criminal Appeals, Nos. 331, 332, 334, 335, 345, and 346 of 1882 :—

> "The meetings of which we have evidence, with exception of the first and last, appear to me to have had for their object in a great measure to ascertain the temper of the people and their readiness to fall in with the plan of the conspirators and to accustom them to the idea of the destruction of the mosque, which may have been determined on by the conspirators or some of them some days before the date of the first meeting."

15. Petitioner was dismissed specifically, because it was impossible but that he had information after the riots which he could have given to the authorities.

16. *C. Muthuswami Chetti.*—This petitioner was frequently seen with Sundrum between the two riots. He was particularly interested in getting off four Komatties who had been committed to the sessions for the July riots. His name was given to the Temporary Deputy Collector on the 24th August by several respectable Muhammadans as having been present at the mosque. He lives close to the Komatti Mattam, and was said to have attended the meeting held there.

17. *Points raised in the Appeal Petition.*—(*a.*) His youth. A large proportion of the persons who have fostered this disturbance are young men. (*b.*) That he did not leave office till 5 P.M. He can easily have been absent in the confusion which prevailed. (*c.*) That he has been dealt with less formally than the conspirators. There is no comparison between removal from Government employment and criminal prosecution.

18. Petitioner was dismissed for the same reasons as in the case of the last petitioner.

19. C. Muthuswami Mudali.—There is direct evidence that this petitioner was at the Komatti Mattam meeting, and less direct evidence that he was in the riots. His intimacy with the Local Fund Overseer, Venkatachellam, was notorious. The Acting Sheristdar being called on by me some months ago to give his opinion as to the private character of all the officials in the English Correspondence Department recorded only one adverse remark which was against Muthuswami Mudali ; he described him as "apparently quiet ; but is supposed to be inwardly mischievous." It came to my knowledge at one time that he was setting up the Press Establishment against the Superintendent. In 1874 he was degraded from the post of Head Clerk in the Sub-Collector's Office on Rs. 50 after three years' incumbency, to a Revenue Inspectorship on Rs. 30, for communicating confidential papers.

20. *Points raised in the Appeal Petition.*—(*a.*) That he was a stranger to Salem. He has been in the district for eighteen yeers. (*b.*) That he served as a clerk in Sub-Division till 1876. He has omitted to mention the reduction. His connection with Hosúr ceased in 1874. (*c.*) That he had no sympathy with those engaged in the riots. His intimacy with Venketachellam's brother Manikia Mudali of Darampuri for eighteen years and with Venketachellam lately can be proved. As a leading Sudra of Shevapet he had every opportunity of at any rate knowing all that had happened. (*d.*) That all Sudras were punished except a few. Twenty-four Sudras (including six native Christians) still remain in the office, four of these have been promoted. One has been newly introduced. The six dismissed Cutcherry servants have been replaced by six graduates of the University. (*e.*) Paragraph 6.—I do not recognise myself in this conversation. I never supposed petitioner was a relative of Venketachellam. (*f.*) That he was at office at the time of the Komatti Mattam meeting. As petitioner's work alternates between the main building and the Press Office, he could easily have absented himself without check. He occupied a somewhat independent position in the office. (*g.*) That the order of dismissal was prepared before this conversation. This was not so. Where within a day or two, Takids bear the date of taking effect and not that of despatch. Takids in this matter took effect from date of receipt of High Court Judgments, but were prepared the following day or day after. (*h.*) That no inquiry was held. I inquired for five months, and in petitioner's case I questioned him several times.

21. Petitioner having produced a Service Register I would point out that column 8 with testimonials is of no practical value, as, till a recent date, officials could insert and omit what testimonials they pleased.

22. Petitioner was dismissed because his intimacy with Venketachellam was notorious, and from this and other circumstances it was certain that he had information regarding Shevapet affairs which he did not give. Further, there were several other things against him as above mentioned.

23. Viapuri Mudali.—This petitioner is also a Shevapet Sudra, a son-in-law of the last named, and a relation of Venketachellam. I had evidence that he was at the Komatti Mattam meeting. Also that he left his house (in Chinna Muthu Street where a drum was beaten and the mob gathered) and joined the riots. The evidence not being strong enough for the Court, I left him for departmental treatment, and dismissed him on the same ground as in the case of his father-in-law.

24. I have gone through each petition as directed in the reference. I would remark, finally, that there has been a combination in the Collector's Cutcherry to defeat justice, and that none of the present petitioners deserve the clemency of Government.

Enclosure,

MEMORANDUM.

(The numbers refer to the Salem Nominal List of December 6th, 1882, herewith submitted.)

4 *D. M. Kanagarathnum Pillai.*—English Head Accountant on Rs. 85. Dismissed by Takid, No 59, General, dated 11th January 1883, for having given false evidence—see 6th witness, page 53 of evidence in additional Sessions Calendar Case, No. 1 of 1882. (The complete pampplet of printed records will be hereafter submitted.) He swore that the Clerk Komaraswami Ayyen, eighth prisoner, was in the Cutcherry at an hour when it is impossible he could have been there according to the finding of Courts. Komaraswami Ayyen relied on this person's oath to get him off. Komaraswami Ayyen was the first person to mount the mosque. Apart from the question of false evidence Kanagarathnam could have given information regarding Komaraswami Ayyen after the riots. He is known to have been at this time going three nights a week to spend the night with Komaraswami Ayyen's widowed sister. Kanagarathnam bears a bad character in the town.

23. *C. Muthuswami Mudali.*—Fourth English Clerk on Rs. 35. Dismissed by Takid, No. 68, General, dated 11th January 1883, for not giving information. An intimate friend of Venketachellam Mudali, Local Fund Overseer, convicted as ringleader. He was at the Komatti Mattam meeting, and also at the riots. It is impossible but that he had information which he could have given.

48. *M. Govindaswami Chetti.*—Seventh English Accountant on Rs 20. Dismissed by Takid, No. 69, General, for not giving information. An intimate friend of Sundrum Chetti's. He was at the Komatti Mattam and was privy to the whole affair.

64. *C. Viapuri Mudali.*—English Accountant on Rs. 15. Dismissed by Takid, No. 67, General, for not giving information. A relative of the Local Fund Overseer Venketachellam, and also of No. 23, Muthuswami Mudali. He was at the Komatti Mattam meeting, and also at the mosque. He was privy to the whole affair.

69. *T. Muthuswami Chetti.*—Shroff on Rs. 15. Dismissed by Takid, No. 66, General. He was at the last-named meeting and also at the riots.

Rajagopaul Naidu.—Second Clerk, Local Fund Engineer's Office, on Rs. 20. Dismissed by Takid, No. 36, Local Funds, for not giving information. Was aware of the conspiracy. Was present when a Muhammadan was shot in Gogai and gave no information.

Balakistna Ayyer.—Salem Taluk Gumastah on Rs. 15. Dismissed by Takid, No. 1169-98, dated 31st August 1882. Pleader Vijayaraghava Charri was in the habit of obtaining official information from my Cutcherry for the purpose of communications made to the *Madras Times* and *Hindu* newspapers. At the above date most unscrupulous use was made of it. I found that Balakistna Ayyer was the go-between. Had he been in employ I should have suspended him, but as he had taken leave without pay and had no intention of reverting to the service, I could only punish by dismissal.

(Signed) C. D. MACLEANE,
Acting Collector and Magistrate.

26th January 1883.

Order—dated 23rd May 1883, No. 1374, Judicial.

It is observed that, on the 26th January last, the District Magistrate of Salem reported as follows :—"The criminal trials connected with the Salem riots being now brought to a conclusion by the delivery of judgment in the High Court on the principal appeal cases, I have dismissed six Cutcherry servants, and punished, by reduction or transfer, fourteen others, and three cases regarding Government officials remain for the orders of Government." If to the six Cutcherry servants dismissed at the juncture described, the case of another clerk dismissed in August last, the month in which the mosque was destroyed by rioters, be added, the total "dismissed" comes to seven.

Procs., 10th February 1883, No. 353.

2. In an appendix to this report of the 26th January, the District Magistrate described the circumstances incriminating the dismissed officials; but no appeal from any of them being at that time before Government, the Order of Government disposing of the Magistrate's report was limited to the cases of the three superior officials which had been reserved for their judgment.

3. Five of the seven men dismissed by the local authority having subsequently preferred appeals, the petitions were sent to the Magistrate for any remarks he might desire to offer on each. To his reply will now be appended the memorandum attached to his Report of the 26th January, but not then brought on record.

4. Having carefully perused this memorandum, the five petitions now before them, and the District Magistrate's further report, His Excellency the Governor in Council is satisfied that the petitioners were very properly dismissed, and directs that their memorials be rejected accordingly.

(True Extract.)

C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary,

To the District Magistrate of Salem.
" Revenue Department.
" Board of Revenue.

Exd. J. Wright.

Gobt. of {1883} Madras.

JUDICIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 23rd May 1883, No. 1374.

MAY.

Salem Riots.

Rejecting memorials from five Cutcherry servants, appealing against their dismissal from office by the Collector of Salem, for withholding information regarding the Salem riots.

Read—the follg papers:—

Procs. of the Bd of Rev. D/21 apl 83, Mis. No. 3344.

Read—the follg petition from

To

COURT FEE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
TWO RUPEES

REG. No. 1118 OF 1883
Stamps Recd

(Judl. No —— d/ —— 83

The Honorable the President &
Members of the Board of Revenue.

The humble petition
of D. M. Kanagaratnam Pillai
late Head Accountant in the
Salem Collectors office;

Most respectfully Showeth,—

That your honorable Board's humble petitioner had been employed as Head Accountant in the Salem Collector's Office, from December 1879 up to 11th January 1883, on which date he was suddenly dismissed by the acting Collector of Salem, on the ground that he had given false evidence in a Court of Justice; (vide Collectors Jagid No. 59 dated 11th January 1883 enclosed).

The circumstances under which your petitioner was dismissed are as follows.

2. In October last, your petitioner was cited as a witness by one Kommaraswami Ayyen, who was charged by the additional Sessions Judge of Salem in Calendar No 1 of 1882 with the offence of leading the mob that destroyed the Shevapet Mosque on

5th of August last and with having taken a leading part in its destruction. He was then an accountant in the Collector's office working under your petitioner in the Account Department. It was alleged on the side of the prosecution that he was present at the Mosque at about 12.30 P.M. on that day and the prisoner's contention was that he was in the Collector's office till 3 P.M. He cited your petitioner and some other Clerks in the office to prove his alibi. Your petitioner being asked to state on oath what he knew of the matter stated what he then believed and what he still believes to be the truth that he saw the prisoner in the office till nearly 1 P.M. and that he recollected having seen him a little later on in the day. As a Christian and an honest man, your petitioner had no alternative but to state what he thought was the truth, when asked to state with the Bible in his hand as to the presence of the prisoner in the office. The evidence of your petitioner was corroborated by the evidence of the other clerks examined for the defence and one of them Strinivasa Iyengar went even beyond the time given by your petitioner and stated that he saw the prisoner at 2.30 P.M.

There were also others who could have deposed to the same facts but they were not examined as the counsel for the defence thought they had already established the alibi to the satisfaction of the judge. The evidence of your petitioner and the other Clerks was contradicted by one Ranganatha Row a District Court pleader. He, after the whole case was over, was put into the box as he was kept in readiness for (a) the purpose by the Mahomeddan referred to below and deposed that he saw the prisoner leave the office at 12 A.M. The additional Sessions judge of Salem and two of the Judges of the High Court, who tried the case on appeal, believed his evidence and convicted the prisoner. One of the Judges however believed petitioner's evidence and was even pleased to characterize him ~~as a more respectable~~ as a more respectable witness than the Vakil. It is no doubt improper on your petitioners part to comment on the judgments of the additional Sessions judge and High Court judges. But as he has been harshly dealt with, when he is wholly innocent, he is compelled in defence to himself to state the points which would prove the absence of any motive on his part to utter a falsehood and thus remove the stain that has been thrown on his character. Your petitioner is a Protestant Christian by birth and is a graduate of the Madras University. He is a native of Jaffna. He has been staying at Salem only for a few years, and that, only since he has been employed. It cannot be, even for a moment, supposed that the petitioner could expect to gain anything by uttering a falsehood on behalf of his own subordinate while the fear of committing a sin before God and defeating the ends of justice, not to say of incurring the displeasure of all honest men, among whom are his own superiors, must be considered overwhelming motives on the other side. Your petitioner had all these things in his mind when he gave his evidence and to say that he had risked all this simply to save a man who was not in any way connected with him, who belonged to a different race, religion and country, is to say what your petitioner respectfully submits, no body can believe. (b)

Runganatha Row the witness whose evidence was believed was a Vakeel for the prisoner and was by when an affidav was prepared to the effect that the prisoner was in the office till 3 P. M. which if his evidence is true he knew to be perfectly false. According to his admission he refused to defend the prisoner, not because he had set up a false case, but because his fees were not paid. He was escorted to and from Court the whole time the case was proceeding by a Mahomeddan who had exerted his utmost in having the prisoners punished. He did not volunteer to give evidence till it became apparent that such evidence would create the liveliest sense of gratitude in the mind of the prosecutors and prevent the possibility of his sharing the doom of Vigiaragavachari the other Vakeel who defended the prisoners. (c) Taking the part he at first did in the defenc of the prisoners and having before h the fate of a Co-Vakil (Vigiaragavachar who with Runganatha Row took a prominent part in the defence of those charged with rioting, it is not at all singular that he should have thought of gaining the good-will of the prosecutors by giving a story which agreed with the theory of the prosecution. His conduct in the beginning and his subsequent statement clearly stamp him as a person whose word cannot be relied upon. (d) Your petitioner respectfully submits that his life should not be blasted merely because such a man has made a statement contrary to that of your petitioner.

3. The portions of the judgments of the Sessions Judge and the Judges of the High Court which bear on the subject and which are appended hereto would show that the Judges did not characterize your petitioner's evidence as false. They unanimously characterize him as respectable but merely say that in the confusion which prevailed in the office your petitioner may have mistaken the exact time when the prisoner Comaraswami Ayyan left office. Your honorable Board's humble petitioner respectfully submits that the statements in the judgments with reference to your petitioner's evidence are not such as to justify the act of

the Collector in assuming that your petition was a perjurer and dismissing him and thu blasting his prospects for life.

4. Your petitioner also respectfully submit that he alone among those who gave evidence in favour of the prisoner was singled out for dismissal. One of the clerks who, as already stated, went beyond the time specified by your petitioner was (f) merely transferred from the Collector's office and nothing has been done to the other. If the Collector did really believe that petitioner's statement was false much more so should have been Srinivasa Iyengar's.

5. Further your petitioner begs to state that no explanation was taken (h) from him, nor was he given an opportunity of defending his conduct, before orders were passed for his dismissal. This, your petitioner submits, is opposed to the orders of the Board and Government

6. To prove the petitioners good (e) character he begs to enclose testimon

from Messrs Crole and Stokes, under whom he had served almost the whole of the time he was in the Revenue Department; And to whom the petitioner begs reference may be made if necessary before any final order be passed. These testimonials, the petitioner begs to submit, were given by the above mentioned gentlemen knowing full well all the particulars ?? of his dismissal.

7 Your honorable Board's humble petitioner humbly begs therefore that the order of the acting Collector may be cancelled and your petitioner restored to his post.

For which act of justice and kindness your humble petitioner will ever pray.

D.M.Kanagaretnam
Kurumba Street
Salem.

COURT FEE
TWO RUPEES

PETN REG No 1131 OF 1883
Stamps Recd

TO

THE HONORABLE
THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS
OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.

The Humble Petition of M. Govindasamy Chetti
lately an Accountant in the Collector's Office,
Salem.

Most Respectfully Showeth,

1. That your Petitioner was lately an Accountant in the Collector's Cutcherry at Salem and was all on a sudden dismissed from his post by the Acting Collector of Salem on the 11th January 1883 on the ground (as alleged in the order of dismissal dated 11th January 1883 herewith enclosed) that he did not give information regarding the riots which occurred in Salem. That your Petitioner was not called upon to give any explanation as to whether he had any information to give and whether he wilfully withheld it and that your Petitioner was condemned unheard. This Procedure, your Petitioner begs to submit is opposed to the repeated orders of the Board and Government.

2. That your Petitioner rose by degrees to his present position: that he was first employed as a Gumasta in the Atur Taluq in 1872; that in 1876 he was transferred to the Hazure office and that since his transfer he was employed up to June 1882 as a clerk under several Assistant Collectors; had to travel frequently from Station to Station without remaining at a particular place for any length of time; and that he has always acquitted himself to the entire satisfaction of his superiors, his character having been uniformly free from any blemish whatever, as will be seen from the enclosed testimonials; that since June 1882 up to the date of his dismissal by the Acting Collector he was working hard in the Account Department of the Collector's Office sometimes from 7 o'clock in the morning till 6 and at other times from 11 A. M. to 6 P. M. and yet your Petitioner regrets to state that his long and faithful services for 12 years came to nothing in consequence of his sudden dismissal from his post based on no ground at all and without an opportunity given him to establish his innocence.

3. That your Petitioner begs to assure the Honorable Board (which he is ready to prove if required) that he has no common cause with the alleged ringleaders, nor did he know any thing of the alleged conspiracy; that he is in no way related to any of those who were charged with it and that no reason can be assigned why your Petitioner should feel himself interested in it; that your Petitioner is perfectly at a loss to see why he should be suspected of any knowledge in the matter and laments

that the previlege of hearing first before dooming a person which is accorded even to criminals of the darkest dye was refused to him and that he was thus punished on mere assumptions and conjectures.

4. The High Court having in the ring-leader's cases expressed the opinion that officials could not have been cognisant of the hatching of the conspiracy; and that the conspiracy was developed towards the end, *i. e.*, one or two days before the demolition of the musjid, and this also being the theory of the Prosecution your Petitioner submits how impossible it was for him holding a low ministerial office to know anything of the conspiracy. This will also be clear from the circumstance that the Superintendant of Police who was in charge of the ring-leaders cases when called upon to explain the delay in bringing up the cases for investigation "says that the conspiracy was kept most secret."

5. That your Petitioner not belonging to the Executive Department, it was no part of his duty to keep a watch on the doings of other people; that his arduous duties kept him in office almost the whole day and that your Petitioner had neither the leisure nor the means to obtain any information and that had the existance of such a conspiracy came to his knowledge, he would have as in duty bound intimated it to the authorities.

6. That to punish your Petitioner in this way by assuming that he should have known of the conspiracy on no proof and without any explanation asked, especially when your Petitioner had enough of work to attend to from morning to evening to task all his energies is, your Petitioner begs most respectfully to submit, manifestly unjust.

7. That your Petitioner begs to recapitulate that the order of dismissal is based on no proof, but on vague conjectures; that no opportunity was offorded to your Petitioner to explain away the unfounded charge preferred against him, that the secrecy of the conspiracy was accepted even by the High Court the Highest Tribunal of the Presidency; that there is no evidence to show that the officials had any knowledge of it or had complecity in the alleged conspiracy; that the secrecy of it was the postulate on which the prosecution itself proceeded, that your Petitioner who had had twelve years service uniformly good free from every possible stain would never dash away at one mad stroke all his brilliant prospects, but would have tried his very best to have secured the patronage and favor of the authorities by giving them timely information had he known of it, and pave the way for his promotion and that your Petitioner most humbly prays that under the circumstances above detailed his case may be graciously considered and that the Honorable Board will be pleased to restore him to his post.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

7th April 1883

M. Govindasamy Chetti

ENCLOSURES.

Copy of the Testimonials.

Govindasamy Chetti has been employed as clerk in the Assistant Collector's Office from January 1877 to March 1879. I have much pleasure in certifying that he an excellant clerk. There was great pressure of work of various kinds during the famine, much administrative work and correspondence when he did very well. He is a good clerk for Magisterial work. He wants more smartness for punctual despatch of returns, answers to references, &c. He is remarkably free from the fault of often wanting leave on account of sickness, &c.

SALEM,
10th April 1879.

(Signed) W. H. WELSH,
Ag. Hd. Asst. Collector.

SURAMANGALEM,
8th January 1880.

The bearer Govindasamy Chetti served under me for a short time as Head Clerk on 40 Rupees. He is an intelligent painstaking and hardworking youngman, has a fair knowledge of English, is well up in the routine of both Revenue and Magisterial work, is always anxious to please his superior. I believe he is trustworthy. He gave me entire satisfaction.

(Signed) T. PATTAHBIRAM PILLAY,
Temporary Dy. Collector.

No 48 in Salem
Nomt List 6/12/82

A Petn

COURT FEE RUPEES

REG No. 1148 OF 1883

To

The Honorable the President and
Members of the Board of Revenue

The humble petition of S.
Moothoosawmy Chetty res. di
Salem.

4 Respectfully Sheweth,

That Petitioner was lately 3rd Shroff in Collector's Office at Salem and had held the appointment for

That his great grandfather, grandfat father had successively held the same appointment for upwa d 70. years.

That the family had uniformly borne character in the said Service and had discharged its d the satisfaction of successive Collectors of the District.

That on the 11th January 1883 Petition informed by the Collectors Takeed. No. 66/Gent. (Copy herewith) his services were dispensed with on the ground (as therein of his having failed to give information in respect of the riots of August 1882.

That Petitioner deeply deploring the entailed on him by the said Takeed, begs to appeal to your -ble Board for a gracious consideration of his case and to racteristic timidity.

(a)

That he is only a youngster of 26 years and is entirely
inate to the elders in the family consisting of father and
and is therefore in the last degree likely to be in Commu-
n with outsiders upon social or other subjects.

That his Official duties as Shroff exacted his closest
nd attention and his early hours of attending and late
of leaving, the Office scarcely allowed him any time for
rence or concern in other matters and much less so
tering his youthful inexperience and subordinate position
family and considering the gravity of the matter touching
he has been now held accountable.

That on the very day of the riots he attended Office, at
. and did not leave it before 5 P.M.

(b)

That the proceeding of the Collector above referred to, took
nted his knowledge in so grave a matter and condemned
nd in doing so denied him what has been so formally
eremoniously conceded to the very Offenders and ringleaders
Case who were charged and tried before a Constitutional
al. and were allowed to carry their case in Appeal before
High Court.

(c)

That his thorough ignorance of the Conspiracy in question
his consequent utter inability to afford information to the
rities is not a simply professed fiction, will be patent to the
able Board if it looks at the expressed opinion of the High
nd the theory of the prosecution in the Case that the Officials
not have been aware of the Conspiracy to destroy the musjid it
been the work of one or two days, and at the explanation
uperintendent of Police for delay in bringing ringleaders
ce that "the Conspiracy was kept most secret."

That the duty cast upon Petitioner to give information such
s charged with not having given, being one cast by law upon
bjects of the State, and not one specially pertaining to his
Petitione

ought in justice to have been taken into account
his condemnation therefore upon mere suspicion w
least he hopes was the foundation for the Collector's
hardly just or fair to him.

(f) That Petitioner begs to impress on the honorable
that the said action of the Collector has not only by one
of his pen deprived him for good of Government Service an
destroyed all Petitioners youthful hopes and prospects, an
signed him to misery to the end of his life which m
many years hence, he not yet knowing or being able to k
why this grave misfortune has befallen him or in wh
ceivable manner he has deserved it, but has also depriv
family which for 3 or 4 gen is has enjoyed the ap
ment, of all hopes for the future ~ hold it

That Petitioner therefore humbly begs that
Honorable Board will graciously consider his youth, t
vices of his family for 3 generations, the dire consequen
including unmerited disgrace, of his dismissal, the wh
tangible and inconceivable nature of the offence he is
with, the absolute absence of all enquiry which the wor
meanest Criminal is considered entitled to, and the
injury and injustice to him consequent upon the said
stances, and pass Orders directing his restoration to Of

For which he will ever pr

T. Muthusawmy
Salem

Madras }
8th April 1883. }

No. 66/genl

சேலம் ஜில்லா கலெக்டர் சி. டி. மக்லீன் துரையவர்கள் [illegible]
[illegible]
தாக்கீது யென்னவென்றால் —

ஆகஸ்டு 1882ம் [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
1883ம் ஜனவரி [illegible] 11 [illegible]

True Copy

(Signed) C. D. Maclean
Collector.

B. PETN REG No. 1150 OF 1883

TWO RUPEES

Stamp Paid

8 apl 83

To

THE HONORABLE THE PRESIDENT AND
MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
MADRAS.

Enclosures (three).

The Humble Petition of CHINGLEPUT MUTHUSAMI MUDALI, *late 4th English Clerk of the Collector's Office at Salem,*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,—

That your humble petitioner was an English Clerk on Rupees 35 per mensem in the Collector's Office at Salem, and was dismissed from the service of Government on the 11th January 1883 by Mr. Macleane, the Ag. Collector of Salem. The order as translated from the Tamil Takid, (original hereto annexed marked A) dated 11th January 1883 No. 68, runs thus:—

"You are dismissed from service, because you have not given information regarding the riots of August 1882."

2. With reference to the above order, your humble petitioner begs to affirm most solemnly that he was completely ignorant of any thing that transpired in connection with the riots of August, which your petitioner could have brought to the notice of the authorities. He submits for the consideration of the Honorable Board the following in support of his statement.

3. Your humble petitioner is a native of Chingleput; son of C. Arunagiri Mudaliar, Pensioned Record Keeper of the Subordinate Court at Chittur; he was employed as a Clerk in the North Arcot Collector's Office from 1864 to 1866; he was sent for by Mr. J. F. Price, the then Sub-Collector of Salem and was appointed as a Clerk which post your petitioner held up to 1876 (a) and he was afterwards transferred to the Huzur Office in the same capacity and was then sent to the Namakal Deputy Collector's Office as Acting Head Clerk in 1878 and retransferred to Salem about the end of that year. Your petitioner has neither relations nor friends either in the town or in the District of Salem nor does he hold any property in any part of the District.

4. Your petitioner respectfully submits that he is an official and a stranger (a) whom the simple accident of his being a Government servant has thrown amidst the Townsmen of Salem. It is in the nature of things highly improbable that he could have had any concern in a matter of such local interest as the right of procession, &c. Your petitioner denies most emphatically that he had any sympathy (c) with those who were secretly concerned in the riots, and whose interest it would be to exclude from their confederacy every one from whom fear of disclosure was to be apprehended.

5. The Collector has either dismissed or degraded and sent to Taluk Stations all the Sudra native officials with the exception of a few. He seems to labour under the idea that the native officials were aware of the (d) criminal conspiracy of the rioters. This view was not accepted by any of the Judges of the High Court and the Chief Justice observes in one place that it fails to account for the ignorance

dans. Your petitioner here begs to submit that the Mahomedans are ver the Town of Salem and its suburbs and that the Mahomedan ele- Salem Police Force is very considerable; it is highly improbable that n to destroy the Mosque was a matter of such public notoriety, as to reach e ears of the native officials, the whole of the Mahomedan population of the Town and so many Mahomedan Policemen could have been unaware of it. The Superintendent of Police, in his letter to the District Magistrate dated 7th September 1882, states that the plot was kept most secret, and the High Court also viewed the matter in the same light and observed "that the design, if formed, was not divulged until the latest moment at which it became necessary to do so" and again in another part of the Judgment, "If as I have observed in the previous case, and in "fact the true interpretation of at least one of the Assessors in this case, the con- "spiracy was confined to fewer persons and was not divulged before the 14th August "it would not be requisite to explain the ignorance in which the authorities remained "of the contemplated design by impugning the administration of the District nor "by imputing complicity in the designs of the conspirators to the native officials "on whom the Magistracy rely for information."

(e) 6. Your humble petitioner begs leave to bring to the special notice of the Honorable Board the following conversation which took place between himself and the Collector Mr. Macleane between the hours of 6 and 7 P. M. on the 11th January 1883 which date the order of dismissal bears. Your Petitioner and two other officials were sent for from the Katcheri by the Collector to his private residence.

Collector's Question.—I hear you are related to Venkatachellam Mudali Local Fund Overseer, that has been convicted. Is it so?

Petitioner's Reply.—I am not related to him.

Collector.—But I am told that you are related to him.

Petitioner.—No Sir; Venkatachellam Mudali is not related to me. I am a native of Chingleput, having come here simply to earn my bread. I hear Venkatachallam Mudali is a native of Dharmapuri where he has his parents, brothers, &c. I can substantiate the fact of my not being a relative by referring to his own parents and brothers and also to my nearest relations at Madras and Chingleput.

Collector.—Are you not Venkatachallam's caste man?

Petitioner.—I belong to the Mudaliar Caste and so does Venkatachellam; but there are many sub-divisions of that sect and so I cannot say whether I belong to the same sub-division with Venkatachellam or not.

Collector.—Are ouy not a friend of Venkatachellam?

Petitioner.—I and Venkatachellam are simple acquaintances—not friends.

Collector.—But you and Venkatachellam lived in one and the same street?

Petitioner.—No Sir. I live in Appu Chetti Street near the Town School and Venkatachellam in Kandakara Street.

Collector.—Now Sir, I hear you attended the Komati Mattam meeting. What say you to that?

Petitioner.—The meeting at Komati Mattam is stated to have been held on the 11th August (office day) between the hours of 10 A. M. and 6 P. M. It was impossible, I could have attended the meeting. I signed the Attendance Register before 11 A. M. and was kept working under the orders of the Treasury Deputy Collector till a very late hour in the evening as usual. The nature of my work is such that I cannot leave my seat without the knowledge of the Deputy Collector. On the day of the meeting I attended the office at the usual hour and was not absent from it even for a short time. This statement the Deputy Collector will testify to. I am not a native of Salem, I have no relations nor have I contracted friendships with Salem people to such an extent as to enable me to know any secret designs which they might have had with regard to the Salem riots. I also beg to state that if your honor makes enquiries from the Katcheri subordinates your honor will be perfectly satisfied that I almost made the Collector's Office my home, working there from the morning till a late hour in the evening, as the Sheristadar entrusted me with special work, besides my regular routine work in the office. I may also mention that my house is almost surrounded by Mahomedan houses. The Mussalmans have had ample opportunity of watching my movements and that if they had really any complaint against me, they would have preferred it at once. They are not unfriendly to me as far as I am aware. (f)

Collector.—You don't possess a good character. Do you?

Petitioner.—As to my character and conduct I beg to refer your honor to the respectable Mahomedans of the place and to J. F. Price Esq., the present Collector of Chingleput, to Mahomed Ali Saib Bahadur, the Assistant Conservator of Forests, South Arcot, who knew me ever since I came to this District and to Mr. Mullaly, the Head Assistant Collector of Salem under whom I served for the last three years.

7. In spite of all that your Petitioner urged on behalf of his innocence, the Collector at the close of the above said conversation, dismissed him at the spot and to your petitioner's utter surprise and sorrow the order of dismissal had been prepared before he (Collector) had sent for him (Petitioner). From the above conversation your petitioner is led to believe that the Collector removed him from the service, under the mistaken idea that your petitioner is a relation of Venkatachellam, one of the ring-leaders convicted. It can be clearly seen from what is stated in this humble appeal that your petitioner is in no way related to the prisoner Venkatachellam, he (Petitioner) being a native of Chingleput. Your petitioner further begs to state that he can prove that he is in no way related to Venkatachellam as the Collector seems to think if a formal enquiry is held. (g)

8. Your humble petitioner submits that it was not fair to remove him from the service of Government for the simple reason that he was a resident of Shevapett. Your petitioner can cite a few instances in which public servants, who live close to the centres where meetings were said to have been held and who are natives of Shevapett having real and personal property and whom the Collector did not suspect had any knowledge of the riots. If they had no information, it was not at all possible for your petitioner to have previously known any thing of the riots in question.

9. Your humble petitioner begs to enclose a true sketch map of Shevapett showing his residence and other places referred to. It can be easily seen from the

No 23 in Salem [illegible]
[illegible] 6/12/83

residence is far off from the places where the meetings were said to held and as your petitioner stated above, your petitioner's house is rounded by Mahomedan houses.

10. Your humble petitioner had been a servant of Government nearly 18 ye… …d was never on any single occasion found fault with; and in proof of his statement he begs to submit his Service Register and Testimonials for the consideration of the Honorable Board. He had entitled himself to one-third pension and was steadily rising in the service with the earnest hope of retiring soon from it on half pension.

11. In summing up, your humble petitioner respectfully invites the attention of the Honorable Board to the following points:—

I. That your petitioner is a perfect stranger to the Town of Salem and has no property, relation or interest of any kind in the Salem District.

II. That his heavy office work deterred him from mixing with the natives of the Town, or contracting friendly intimacy with them.

III. That at the time, when the Collector supposed him to have been present at the meeting at Komatti Mattam, your petitioner was engaged in doing work at the office till a late hour in the evening.

IV. That native officials of Shevapett living close to the places where meetings are said to have been held, were not suspected of criminal knowledge and have not been visited with any kind of punishment.

V. That the general supposition that native officials were privy to the criminal intention of the Hindu faction is ill-founded.

(h) VI. That the Collector made no enquiry to satisfy himself as to the accuracy of the statements made by the petitioner in explanation of the charges made by the Collector.

VII. That your Petitioner had every thing to lose and nothing to gain by withholding information, which he was bound to disclose to his superiors.

Under these circumstances he very earnestly prays that the Honorable Members of the Board will be graciously pleased to give his case due and careful consideration and direct his restoration to his post with full pay for the period during which he has been unjustly kept out of employ.

12. Your humble petitioner further begs to submit that should the Collector assign any other reasons than that stated in the order of dismissal, he (petitioner) may be allowed an opportunity to explain himself before his case is finally disposed of

AND YOUR PETITIONER SHALL EVER PRAY.

8th April 1883.

118

Salem Collector's Office,
[illegible] No. 37. 16th April 1883.

BRD. PETN. REG. No. 1224 OF 1883
Stamps Recd

From C. D. Macleane, Esq.,
Ag. Collector & District
Magistrate of Salem.

To

The Secretary
Board of Revenue
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward the petition of C. Viapoory Moodely. His case is recorded in G. O. dated 10th February 1883. No: 353 - Judicial. With regard to G. O. dated 15th Sept 1879 No 1401. Public - referred in para 3 of the petition, the case was considered to fall under the definition of a dismissal "in consequence of facts or inferences elicited at a judicial trial." Petitioner being my own clerk was under my observation, and his case was subject of consideration during the whole pendency of the trials.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant
C. D. Macleane
Acting Collector.

No. 64. m Salem
Nom. List of 6/12/83

Enc. 1 to Letter Circuit No. 37
128 / 9/16. 4. 83

Stamps Paid

To Enclosure

TWO RUPEES

The Honorable the President & Members of the

Board of Revenue,

Madras.

Through the Collector of Salem

The humble petition of C. Viapuri Mudaliar late English Accountant on Rs. 15 . u . u per mensem of the Salem Collector's office,

Most Respectfully Showeth,

That Your Petitioner begs most respectfully to lay his hard case before the Honorable Members of the Board of Revenue for their favorable consideration and orders.

2. That Your Petitioner begs to state that he received an order No. 67/Cocnb. dated 11th January 1883 from the Collector Mr. Macleane dismissing him from Service in as much as he had not given information to the authorities regarding the riots which took place in August 1882; copy of the Order is herewith submitted. On receiving the order Your Petitioner in his petition of the 5th February 1883 requested the Collector to inform him of the grounds to suspect want of fidelity to Government on his part so that he may be enabled to explain his conduct satisfactorily to him (Collector), and thus establish his innocence or to restore him to his appointment. But

having

ived no reply, he ventures to submit this appeal to the Honorable Members of the Board

3. It is needless to say that he was taken by surprise for he was in possession of no information whatever nor had he the means of knowing anything of the riots as will be seen from the circumstances that he shall presently relate. It is very unlucky for him that he was not asked anything in the matter before he was dismissed nor was he afforded any opportunity to explain himself as required by the orders of the Government of India to which the attention of the Local Governments has frequently been called by the Supreme Government. In the absence of the above information from the Collector and of the alleged charges against Your Petitioner for his summary dismissal by the Collector he is at a great disadvantage to convince the Board of his innocence

4. That Your Petitioner begs permission to submit that he had no opportunities of receiving any information whatever regarding the riots. He was a friend of none of those who have been convicted as ringleaders nor was he acquainted with any of them. They all belong to the highest circle of the local community and your petitioner being an insignificant official of no permanent interest in the locality being a native of Coimbatore had neither access to their company nor

was

was he ever ambitious of getting it. He begs also to state that he was a young man of 23 with a year's service of secluded habits and was put up in one of the out-of-the-way lanes. Such habits were the outcome of the training he received from his father who mostly kept him indoors strictly confining him to his studies for the Special Tests.—

5. That Your petitioner had no sympathy for the agitators on behalf of Mariamman for he was trained to avoid idol worship his father being of Bramo Persuasion.—

6. That if he had been dismissed for the simple reason that he was a resident of that place there are a hundred others who can similarly be suspected. There is the Head Compositor, the two other shroffs and some other Clerks of the Collector's own establishment, the District Registrar, the Schoolmasters, Clerks of the District Court and many other officials most of whom are permanent residents and live in the main streets of the Town of Sevapet and near of the quarters where the meetings are said to have been held.

7. That Your petitioner begs also to submit for the Boards consideration that while the conspiracy said to have been hatched up escaped the sharp eyes of the Police, the Mahamedans, the Municipal officials and the other executive officials who are always expected to visit every

cr-2d

k and corner of the Town, it is not in the least likely that one of your petitioners age and position should know anything of the lamentable riots. Moreover he is a stranger to Salem having no property (real or personal) or relations there to connect him with the plots and prejudices of the people. He has been in Salem but nearly 2 years and had made no friends. There was no importance attached to his age, position or reputation which could have induced the rioters to take him into their confidence nor had he any motive to thrust himself into their plots. While those officers of Government whose duty it was to detect such plots and while the Mahamedan Community against whom the plots were made were ignorant of them, it was not possible for your petitioner to have known anything about them. He had no position of any kind among the local communities. He was an officer just admitted into the Service and was expecting promotion by hard and honest work. It would have been the height of folly on his part to have shown the slightest sympathy with the rioters and thus risk his prospects. On the other hand if he had known anything of the conspiracy of these rioters he would have at once reported it to his official Superiors and thus made himself worthy of the District Magistrate's

favor

favor.

8. That your petitioner further begs to add for the information of the Board that he belongs to a respectable family and that his forefathers and relatives were and are holding high offices under Government and have proved loyal to the salt they have eaten of Government. The certificate of Mr. J. Honner Superintendent of Post Offices at Bangalore is based upon this; copy of which is also submitted.

9. That it is impossible for your honor's petitioner to have had a knowledge of the conspiracy said to have been incubated and hatched up by the Salem people for which the Collector summarily dismissed your petitioner may be seen from the following facts:-

(1) That the Superintendent of Police at Salem in his letter of the 7th September 1882 to the Collector of Salem published in the Madras Mail of the 23d September 1882, states that the meetings were so secretly held that it was wholly impossible for the officials to have known anything of the alleged conspiracy.

(2) That the High Court in their Judgment expressed that it was not possible for the Official Community to have known anything of the riots.

10 Consequently your humble petitioner craves the Honorable Members to restore him to his former place cancelling

the order

the order of the Collector dismissing him from service.

11. That your petitioner further begs that if the Collector assigns any remarks regarding any point which is not set forth in the order of dismissal, he (Petitioner) may be allowed an opportunity to explain such before his case is finally disposed of.

And for this act of Justice and Charity your petitioner shall ever pray.

C. Viapuri Mudaliar

Madras 6th April 83.

Late English Acctt. Collector's office

Salem

Address

C. Viapuri Mudaliar
66/87 Triplicane Baraakadai, Royapet, Madras.

Encl. No. 1224/83.

Read – the folg papers:-

18P

18

Revenue Board Office Madras

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue,

Dated 21st April 1883.

No. 3344 – Miscellaneous

Read – Board's Petition Register Nos. 1118, 1131, 1148, 1150, and 1224 of 1883.

Resolution – D/21 Apl 83, Mis. No 3344

18P

These petitions of appeal from 5 out of the 6 Cutcherry servants dismissed by the Collector of Salem, and referred to in paras 1 & 6 of his letter to Government, dated 26th January 1883, No. 252, upon which G. O. dated 10th February 1883, No. 353, Judicial, was passed, will be submitted to Government for orders.

2. As the Government have passed orders direct, without reference to the Board in the case of the other parties implicated in the riots, the Board presume that the Government will prefer itself to dispose of these appeals also.

[True Extract]

J. A. Davis

Ag. Sub Secretary.

To
The Secretary to Government, Revenue (Petition) Dept.
with five Petitions & their enclosures.

16 P

No. 865

Forwarded to the 5th Magte ~~Collector~~ of Salem for any observations he may desire to offer on each Petition.

C. Master
Chief Secretary

Cotacamund 24
April 1883

NOTE—This paper should be returned with reply.

30 APR 83

Judicial (1883) Deptt.
~~Confidential~~

R.P. No. 689.
1882.

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Rev.-Petn. Department.

Judicial

L8

24/4/83

Proceedings, dated 21 April 1883
No. 3344 Miscellaneous.

Subject. C.W. 159

Submitting for orders appeal petitions from certain Cutchery servants dismissed by the Collector of Salem in connection with the late Riots.

Recd 24th April

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
23 APR 83
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

with Endorsement

CHIEF SECRETARY
24 APL 83
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

10

+ No. 5 in O.S. No. 350 of 83
H.J. 22/4/84

Enclosure

28

Ent. 6/84
R. Rathnavelu
24-4-84
Rangasamy [illegible]
7/5/84

1 Re 2 L.Ks.

3691. Splitted [illegible] and the [illegible] on the 22nd day of April / 84 appeared against the plff.

S.J.

Vakf.

Vijayaraghava Chetty

The Secy. of State.

Appendix

The numbers refer to the Salem Nominal List of December 6th 1882, herewith submitted.

4. D. M. Kanagarathnam Pillay.- English Head Accountant on Rs 85.— Dismissed by Takeed No. 59 general dated 11th January 1883 for having given false evidence. See 6th Witness, page 53 of Evidence in Additional Sessions Calendar Case No. 1 of 1882. (The Complete pamphlet of printed records will be hereafter submitted.) He swore that the Clerk Komaraswami Iyen, 8th Prisoner was in the Cutcherry at an hour when it is impossible he could have been there according to the findings of Courts. Komaraswami Iyen relied on this person's oath to get him off. Komaraswami Iyen was the first person to mount the mosque. Apart from the question of false evidence Kanagarathnam could have given

racte

formation regarding Kumaraswami Iyer after the riots. He is known to have been at this time going three nights a week to spend the night with Kumaraswami Iyer's widowed sister. Kanagarathnam bears a bad character in the town.

23. C. Muthuswami Mudly - 4th English Clerk on Rs 35. Dismissed by Takeed No. $\frac{68}{\text{General}}$ dated 11th January 1883, for not giving information. An intimate friend of Vencatachella Mudly, Local Fund Overseer, convicted as ringleader. He was at the Komatti Mattam meeting, and also at the riots. It is impossible but that he had information which he could have given.

48. M. Govindaswami Chetty - 7th English Accountant on Rs 20. Dismissed by Takeed No. $\frac{69}{\text{General}}$ for not giving information. An intimate friend of Soondream Chetty's. He was at the Komatti Mattam

and was privy to the whole affai

64. C. Veerapoori Mudly. English Acc-ant on Rs 15. Dismissed by Takeed No. $\frac{67}{\text{General}}$ for not giving informatio A relative of the Local Fund Overseer Venkatachellam and also of No. 23 Muthuswami Mudly. He was at the Komatti Mattam meeting, and also at the Mosque. He was privy to the whole affair.

69. T. Muthuswami Chetty. Shroff on Rs 15. Dismissed by Takeed No. $\frac{66}{\text{General}}$. He was at the last named meeting and also at the riots.

Rajagopaul Naidu. 2nd Clerk, Local Fund Engineer's Office on Rs 20. Dismissed by Takeed No. $\frac{36}{\text{Local Fund}}$ for not giving information. Was aware of the conspiracy. Was present when a Mohamedan was shot in Sogai and gave no information.

Balakistna Iyer. Salem Taluk Gumastah on Rs 15. Dismissed by Takeed No. $\frac{1169}{98}$ dated 31st August 1882.— Pleader Vijayaragav No.

as in the habit of obtaining official information from my Cutcherry for the purpose of communications made to the "Madras Times" and "Hindu" newspapers. At the above date most unscrupulous use was made of it. I found that Bala-Kistna Iyer was the go-between. Had he been in employ I should have suspended him but as he had taken leave without pay and had no intention of reverting to the service, I could only punish by dismissal.

C.M.
26 JAN 83

Ag Collector & Magistrate.

Jus. 1846/5 (84

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

No. 1597

From Board of Revenue of 21 April /83 No 3344

Submitting for orders appeal Petitions from the undermentioned Cutcherry Servants dismissed by the Collector of Salem in connexion with the Late Riots

1. D.M. Kanagaratnam Pillai, late Head Acct in Salem Collector's Office
2. C. Muthusami Mudali late 4th English Clerk
3. M. Govindasamy Che late Accountant.
4. C. Viapuri Mudaliar late English Accountant

FOR ORDERS.

Send to Macleane, for any observations he may desire to offer on each Petn.

F.R. 27/4

tract
as] in
for
r the
ead
Vir

T. Moothoosawmy Chetty
late 3d Shroff &c

Vide paragraph 6 of
D.r McLeane's letter
d/ 8 January 1883
No 252. The present
appellants are five
out of the six per-
sons there men-
tioned and in an
appendix
to the Collectors letter
will be found notes
regarding each
individual and
the reasons for
dismissal

YM

G. O. 10th 6 83 No 353
Judicial

seven

Petitions from dismissed
Cutchery Servants
Salem -

FOR ORDERS.

Hon D. F _ C -
CSC

Do fr C. Macleane
10 May 83 - sent
in Cir with G.O. 1994/83
31/5

Salem Collector's Office,
Circuit No. 42
10th May 1883

From C. D. Macleane, Esq.,
Ag. Collector & District
Magistrate of Salem.

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Judicial Department

Sir,

Replying to reference No. 865 dated 30th April 1883 I have the honor to report on the five Petitions therewith forwarded.

2. Petitioners were dismissed from office for withholding information regarding the Salem riots of August 16th and 17th 1882. In one instance this minor charge was covered by the more serious one of giving false evidence.

3. The general case against the Collector's Cutcherry Servants is described in Paras 2 to 5 of letter in G.O. dated 10th February 1883 No. 353 Judicial. I would

Impress

draw attention to the distinction between a Charge within the terms of Para 3 and in the terms of Para 4 of that letter. The former means withholding information before the event and is in a greater or less degree, as the case may be equivalent to conspiracy. As I am aware of the difficulties under this part of the subject I have been very cautious in charging any Official under this head. The latter head of Charge means that when called on to aid justice by giving information after the event the persons charged have not done so. There is little difficulty in bringing this Charge home to a number of persons and the only question is who is the most blameworthy.

4. On the morning of the 18th August I went with the District Judge, the Head Assistant Collector

and

and others (Page (32) of the Pamp to the Mosque and the surrounding ruined houses, and the fir persons mentioned by the Mahomedans who were congregated there, were Kumaraswamy the Cutcherry Accountant, Venkatachellum the Local Fund Overseer and Manikkam Mudly the Native Surgeon. The Mahomedans specially denounced Kumaraswamy who they said brought men from Gogai and was the first to mount the Mosque. This was the earliest complaint I received in person. Later in the day I gave out publicly in the Cutcherry that it was the duty of those who knew any thing to come forward and assist the authorities, and I warned them at the same time that if it was found afterwards that any one was possessed of information and k

concealed to

Unfortunately these statements were not taken down as evidence, at once
By

[illegible] draw attention [illegible] distinction betw. notice would in the terms of circumstance. the terms of Para 4 warning. The former meant to higher informations and told them and is meant their subordinates as them. It is impossible to [illegible] any one can plead ignorance of the call thus made on the office.

5. As the Government are aware the authorities were isolated and detection was at fault. It was evident from the nature of some of the names which had transpired that there must be some knowledge available in the office. I go so far as to say that there could scarcely be any one in this large office who had not some information which he might have contributed. But no Cutcherry servant from that day to this has done

any

any thing to assist the autho-
-rities and no information whatever has come out of the office.

6. These being the circumstan[ces] in the first week after the riots it was decided to await the issue of the trials and meanwhile ascertain in different ways who among the Cutcherry servants had had the best means at their disposal for assisting Govern-ment and therefore who were the most blameworthy. The three sources of information are mentioned at Para 11 of my letter above mentioned. The results are reported in that letter.

7. Kanagarathnam Pillay. The two brothers Kumaraswa-my Iyer (Cutcherry Clerk) and Gurunada Iyer (Jail Clerk) were seen at the Mosq

to

mer leaving the Gogai ing on the 16th August. These re at Brahmins in spite of the name "Iyer". Five witnesses saw Kumaraswami mount the mosque and clap his hands (Pamphlet pages 13, 15, and 18 Appendix). Four other witnesses saw him at the mosque. (Pamphlet Pages 12, 16, 19 & 20 Appendix). The time was fixed at 12-30 Noon. (Pamphlet Pages 12, 15, and 20 Appendix). It came out at the end of the trial (Pamphlet Page 60 Appendix (out witness) that as early as 31st August while Kumaraswami was in jail awaiting the commencement of proceedings before the Committing Magistrate, he had given the name of Kanagarathnam Pillay to his counsel as his first witness for an alibi.

Before

8. Before the Sessions Kana-garathnam Pillay depo as follows:- (Pamphlet Pag Appendix) "I remember the judge Mr Wilkinson comin there (Cutcherry) after 2 p.m. He came to send off a telegram. I think I saw 8th Prisoner (Kumaraswami) a little while before that." (Cross-Examined). "I don't think 8th Prisoner could have gone away and come back without my knowing it" "I think I told 8th Prisoner to compare the contingent accounts" — I can positively swear that I saw 8th Prisoner up to nearly 1 P.m. and I have a strong recollection that I saw him afterwards". — (By the Court) "8th Prisoner used to live with his brother in Gogai. I have been to his house on business

9. The Cutcherry is a mile from the mosque and

Go-

-ogai is beyond again- -is alibi was upset by the last Witness Called in the trial a Court witness (pamphlet page 60 appendix) who deposed that he saw the two brothers leave the Cut-Cherry in a Cart at 12 Noon along with other Clerks. The proof as to the brother was Corroborated by separate evidence. Circumstances also Came out in the Cross-Examination which Confirmed the Credibility of the testimony, and it was accepted by the Courts.

10. Kumaraswamy Iyer was committed and Convicted and his conviction was affirmed by the High Court on appeal.

11. The Courts Commenting on the defence Evidence of Kanagarathnam and two others said that they must have been "altogether be- as to the hour". My inform-ation enables me to say Kanagarathnam was not mistaken but intentionally mis-represented from a motive. Kanagarathnam was ~~a~~ widower and has had no wife for 10 months. He at the time in question had in his Keeping Minatchi Ammal. Kumaraswamy's widowed sister living in the same house with Kumaraswami. As to the two Clerks P. Muthuswami Naidu and S. Sreenivassa Chetty they were his subordinates and acted on his prompting.

12. Points raised in the Appeal Petition. (a) That the Witness who disproved the alibi was kept in readiness by a Mahomedan. This may have been so but he certainly gave Evidence with Cross-exa

willingness- (b) That Koneaswamy belonged to a different race religion and country to himself- This difference does not prevent a connection of a private nature- Kanagarathnam was in April 1882 publicly posted in the town of Salem for having committed adultery with Boyee Ammal, wife of Elayathambi Pillay a School master on leave at Jafna, a man of a different religion, a half-sister of the same Koneaswamy is now living in adultery with a goldsmith who is of a different caste- (c) That the witness above named deposed with a view to avoiding the fate of another Vakil Vijayaraghava Charry. The latter was put on trial for conspiracy and taking part in the riots, not for defending

defending Prisoners- The witness was at no time suspected, nor is there any parallel between the two Cases- (d) That this witness was not a credible witness. The Courts have accepted his evidence- I happened to be in Court myself that day, and his manner appeared to me eminently that of a man telling the truth. (e) That his own character is good- There is nothing against his official character, but I have described his private motives- (f) That the other clerks who gave similar evidence were either less punished or not punished at all- They were his subordinates and were led by him- Sreenivassa Iyengar was transferred to Paramathy. (g) That the only object he had was to the truth. The Temporary puty Collector called him out of the Office during the trial and asked him what he knew about the matter, but he would not tell. He declined also to give information to Mr Stevenson. This is not the conduct of a man anxious only for the truth. (h) That no written statement was taken from him relative to his dismissal. I would refer for this to Para 1 of Resolution in G.O. dated 15th September 1879 No. 1401 Public.

This refers to a Rule laid in that G.O. is need not taken of Defence from a man whose conduct comes out in a Judicial inquiry.

13. There is ~~also~~ not a shadow of doubt in my own mind that this Petitioner set himself against the authorities in their endeavour to ascertain the truth, and that he gave false evidence in Court to screen his acquaintance and

and subordinate in the Kornaraswami. But even if he explain away his evidence about the brown bag saying it was bonâ fide he will not avoid falling under my para 3 above (ad finem). The intimacy of Kumagaratnam with Kornaraswamy's sister can be proved.

14. **Govindaswami Chetty.** This Petitioner an Accountant on Rs 15 was in the habit of giving information from the records to Soondrum Chetty. This can be proved. He would have been dismissed at the time but it was thought better to take him with the others and dismiss him on the 'general ground which was notorious' that he had information after the riots which he kept back. He was intimate with Kornar

the [illegible]araswamy as well as with Soondrum. His name was given by the Mahomedans to the Temporary Deputy Collector on the 24th August 1882 immediately on the arrival of the latter as having been present at the destruction of the Mosque. It was stated that he was at the Komatti Mattam meeting which was the first Conference between Soondrum and the Silk weavers of Salem. In the view of the meetings I do not wish to go beyond what is expressed in the following extract from Mr Justice Innes's Judgment in Criminal Appeals No. 331 332, 334, 335 345 and 346 of 1882:—

"The meetings of which we "have evidence with exception "of the first and last appear "to me to have had for their "object in a great measure "to ascertain the temper of "people and their readiness "fall in with the plan of the "Conspirators and to accustom "them to the idea of the destruction of the Mosque "which may have been determined on by the Conspirators "or some of them some days "before the date of the first "meeting."

15. Petitioner was dismissed specifically because it was impossible but that he had information after the riots which he could have given to the authorities.

16. C. Muthuswami Chetty — This Petitioner was frequently seen with Soondrum between the two riots. He was particularly interested in getting off 4 Komatties who had been committed to the Sessions

is knowledge at one [illegible] that he was setting up the Press establishment against the Superintendent. In 1874 he was degraded from the post of Head Clerk in the Sub-Collector's Office on Rs 50 after 3 years' incumbency to a Revenue Inspectorship on Rs 30, for communicating confidential papers.

20 Points raised in the Appeal Petition.- (a) That he was a stranger to Salem.- He has been in the District for 18 years.- (b) That he served as Clerk in Sub-Division till 1876. He has omitted to mention the reduction. His connection with Hossoor ceased in 1874. (c) That he had no sympathy with those engaged in the riots. His intimacy with Venkatachellam's brother Manikia Mudly of Darampoory for 18 years and with Venkatachellam &c.

Lately

leading Sudra of Shiv[illegible] he had every opportunity of at any rate knowing all that had happened. (d) That all Sudras were punished except a few.- 24 Sudras (including 6 native Christians) still remain in the Office.- 4 of these have been promoted. One has been newly introduced. The six dismissed Cutcherry Servants have been replaced by six graduates of the University.- (e) vide ab. I do not recognize myself in this conversation.- I never supposed Petitioner was a relative of Venkatachellam.- (f) That he was at Office at the time of the Komatti Mattam meeting.- As Petitioner's work alternates between the main building and the Record Office, he could easily have absented himself without

Good

being strong [illegible]

dependent position in the office. (g) That the order of dismissal was prepared before this conversation. This was not so. Where within a day or two, Takids bear the date of taking effect and not that of despatch. Takids in this matter took effect from date of receipt of High Court judgments but were prepared the following day or day after. (h) That no inquiry was held. I inquired for 5 months and in Petitioner's case I questioned him several times.

21. Petitioner having produced a Service Register I would point out that Column 8 with testimonials is of no practical value, as till a recent date officials could insert and omit what testimonials they pleased

pleased.

22. Petitioner was Judicial because his initial Venkatachellam was and from this and o circumstances it was ~~that~~ he had information regarding Shivapett affair which he did not give. there were several othe things against him as above mentioned.

23. Vyapoori Mudly. This Petitioner is also a Shivap Sudra a son-in-law of the last named and a relat of Venkatachellam. The evidence ~~that~~ he was at Kovilattee Mattam meeting. Also ~~that~~ he left his house (in Chinna Muthu Street where a drum was beaten and the mob gathered) and joined the riots. The evidence not being strong enough for

Court

knowledge treatment, and
depending on the same
office. (in the case of his
ticket in law.

I have gone through
Petition as directed
the Reference. I would
remark finally that there
has been a combination
in the Collector's Cutcherry to defeat justa.
and that none of the present
Petitioners deserve the
clemency of Government.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obdt Servt.

Charles McAleans

Ag Collector & District Magistrate

To,
The Chief Secretary
Judicial Department
with Pamphlet and
file returned.

pleased

READ AG … der of Government, dated
, No.
Miscellaneous.

308

Judicial
tial

[illegible]

Judicial (1883) Deptt
(Salem Riots)

From the Collector

and District Magistrate,

Salem.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government Judicial Department

Dated 10th May 1883.

Circuit
No. 42
Recd 12th May 1883

SUBJECT.

No. 1830

Reporting on five petitions.

Hon Dr. Carmichael

CHIEF SECRETARY 14 MAY 83 GOVERNMENT OF

CHIEF SECRETARY 12 MAY 83 GOVT MADRAS

& officials [illegible] insert and
& omit what testimonials they
pleased

Read a
er of Government, dated
, No. Miscellaneous.

30 P

Note.
I consider that Wilkinson sh.d be formally asked to explain his conduct in cases (2) (3) (4) mentioned in Macleanes d/o letter of 10th inst
H.L.

Ge[illegible]

Judicial

Confidential

From Bd. Rev.
d/ 21 – 4 – 3.

No 3344 Misc.

Endorst. No 865 d/ 30th idem transferring above to ~~Dt.~~ Magte of Salem for ~~his~~ observations – –

Letter from Macleane No 42
d/ 12th May /3.

We may say: Order – 23 May 1883 No 1374

It is observed ~~that~~ on the 26th Jany last the Dt. Magte of Salem reported as follows :– "the criminal trials connected with the Salem riots being now brought to a conclusion by the delivery of judgt in the High Ct on the principal appeal cases, I have dismissed 6 cutcherry servants, & punished, by reduction or transfer, fourteen others; and 3 cases regarding Govt. Officials remain for the orders of Govt." If to the 6 ~~[illegible]~~ cutcherry servants dismissed at the juncture described the case of another clerk dismissed in August last, the month in wh. the Mosque was destroyed by rioters be added, the total 'dismissed' come to seven.

2. In an Appendix to this report of the 26th Jany, the Dt. Magte describes the circumstances incriminating the dismissed officials: but no appear

READ AG... der of Government, dated , No. Miscellaneous.

(1883) Deptt

318

Prop. 10-2/83
No 353

I note that these Progs were sent, without any covering letter to S. of S. & Govt India - Why?

? waiting till the whole complete or why?

as it might very well have been

from any of them being at that time before Govt.; the Order of Govt. disposing of the Magte's report was limited to the cases of the three superior officials wh. had been reserved for their ~~[illegible]~~ judgment.

3. Five of the seven men dismissed by the local authority wh. subsequently preferred appeals, the petitions were sent to the Magte, for any remarks he might desire to offer on each - To his reply will now be appended the Memorandum attached to his Report of the 26th Jany, but not then brought on record -

4 - Having carefully perused this Memorandum, the five petitions now before them, and the Dt. Magte's further report - His Exy the Govr. in C. is satisfied that the petitioners were very properly dismissed & directs ~~that their~~ Memorials be rejected accordingly.

The Dt. Magte Salem
Revenue Deptt
Board of Revl.

} Despd. 2/6/83

Appeals from 5 offenders - dismissed by the Salem Dt Magte

Despatch

[illegible]

Gone 13/5 16/5

Read a[illegible]er of Government, dated , No. Miscellaneous.

Enclosures.

Current No.

all
1597
1830 } a

Statement with ditto.

Order, &c. of Government—A.

Papers kept out of File for despatch in original.
(not paged.)

Order ~~[illegible]~~ three
Letter
Collection 50

N.B.—
A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.
R = Print, but not for monthly volume.

Slav