12-24

~~2189/RT~~

~~16310/79~~

11.1.90

6/1/924/RH
~~24A/94~~

4 2/09 /RH/09/R1

~~183/09 RH~~ RT

~~1723 4/09 RH~~

4707

Sectt. I (1)-E—10,006—7-10-70.

(1) Number of pages

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Judl DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	1055	Press / Mis.
Dated	18. 5. 1887	~~197~~ .

to be folded or roughly handled

1562

1855

City Police Office,

Madras, 19th January 1887.

19/1/87

From Colonel J. Weldon,
COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
MADRAS.

To The Inspector General
of Police,
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honour to return the petition of J. Rungasami Row late Sub Inspector of the City Police with the following remarks:—

1 —— Petitioner is now quibbling on matters of form. He was dismiss as the result not merely of a searchi departmental Enquiry Extending ove six months but on the facts as found by three juries at three

trial

trials before the High Court at the Sessions held in April and August 1886. Those facts as they concern Petitioner were that a gang of professional swindlers were in league with the Superior Officers of the Police of the Mylapore Division and by means of the active assistance given by order and act of the Petitioner and others intimidated the victims of the Conspiracy. In one of the cases the Police Officer deputed on that occasion to assist the gang was duly convicted and sentenced to heavy punishment. Besides the departmental enquiry there were three public preliminary investigations by the Magistrate before the cases came on for final trial. Both in the Enquiry held by me and at the final trials by the High Court the Petitioner was

referred

referred to and personally identified as the Superior Officer of Police who was in most active co-operation with the gang and to whom the principals of that gang applied when the presence of Police Officers was desired not in the honest discharge of their duty but for the basest purposes. The nature of the cases was such that it was impossible the gang could have carried on their disgraceful proceedings for so long and in such a bare-faced manner without either the grossest neglect of duty on the part of the Superior Officers of Police - which in itself would deserve dismissal from the service - or an actual complicity in the Crimes as was publicly sworn to exist. The existence of this complicity was affirmed by the verdict at three distinct trials and we have just succeeded, after a search of upwards of twelve months, in tracing a young man who was in the employment of the Chief director of swindling operations in Madras and who, being the person who kept the Accounts of the Confederacy, had full knowledge of what passed. He has given very valuable information confirmatory of the information we previously obtained and the evidence given in Court, and he speaks to being personally cognizant of the payment of hush money to both the Petitioner and the Divisional Inspector. Had we obtained this evidence at an earlier stage we would have certainly convicted the whole gang and have also probably taken criminal proceedings against other Police Officers as well.

2 —— Paras. 5 and 6 of the petition are contradictory of what is apparently the contention of Petitioner viz: that

he

he was - and it seems he would say is still-ignorant of any charge to his prejudice. Petitioner knew perfectly well, and shows in the papers he has submitted giving the names of all those whose evidence told against him, that he knew what was alleged. He was with other Police Officers paraded and identified as one of those in communication with the gang - As matter of fact he submitted two written statements defending himself. In one he made an allegation of orders or instructions said to have been given by the Assistant Commissioner which that Officer flatly contradicts. Even now Petitioner "purposely abstains from stating his defence."

3 —— The cases in which Petitioner was interested were heard at the 2nd and 3rd Sessions of the High Court and it was clearly impossible

to retain in the public service a Police Officer who had — to use no stronger terms even — permitted such disgraceful complicity as was proved to exist between the Police of his division and a gang of professional swindlers who for years had been carrying on a successful career of fraud in Madras, Poona and Bombay, culminating eventually in downright robbery. I may mention that this gang have within about three years committed frauds to the extent of nearly 28000 Rupees and they have been following their nefarious profession for some fifteen years. The conviction of the principals and the removal from the public service of their disloyal abettors has been an incalculable public relief.

4 —— The papers Petitioner applied for and was refused are confidential departmental papers containing

other matter not immediately concerning Petitioner. His desire to obtain copies was doubtless with a view to ascertaining how much information we had obtained. The Copies of depositions given in Court for which Petitioner said he had applied were sufficient to satisfy the juries; and the Judge who presided at the trial in which the Petitioner's subordinate and alleged tool was one of the accused expressed his full approbation of the verdict.

5 —— I append extracts from a statement made last month / December / before the Deputy Commissioner by Saiyad Mohideen the individual alluded to in para: 1 of this letter.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.
Colonel
Commissioner of Police

From

The Commissioner of
Police
Madras.

To

The Inspector General
of Police
Madras.

Dated 19th January 1887.
Recd. " "

Enclosure
1. Petition with papers attached to
2. Extracts from ~~Statement~~ of Syed
Mohidin.

No. " 1562

Submits report on petition to Government of T. Rangasami Row, late Sub Inspector of Police, Madras City.

J309/87
1

5/1555

Extract from Statement of
Syed Moideen.

Syed Moideen states:-

I have been with Pir Bux for the past six years and was employed to teach him to read the Koran.

× × × × × × ×

Early next morning Parthasardy came to our Bungalow and told Pir Bux that the Coimbatore Saits would not leave the place and that Bhow Row wanted him to go and send the Sub-Inspector (Rungasamy Row) there to frighten them away. Pir Bux and Parthasardy left in a jutka - the former returned and told me that he had sent the Sub-Inspector to the Adyar Bungalow.

× × × × × × × × ×

The same evening Bhow Row and Siddick Saib came to our Bungalow and explained to Pir-Bux how they, with great difficu, and with the assistance of the Sub. Inspector got the Saibs out of Madras-

× × × × × × × × × ×

Pir Bux asked Bhow how long after the Sub. Inspector had left did the Saibs remain. He replied that they took their food sharp and lost no time in leaving the Bungalow for the Railway Station where they remained during the day and left by the evening's Mail train-

× × × × × × × × × × ×

The third day after I brought the Rupees away from the Adyar Bungalow I was sent by Pir Bux with Rupees 150 to the Sub. Inspector's house. It was about 7 P.M. when

I got there - I went in a Jutkah The money was all in Rupees - The Sub - Inspector was at home and I gave it to him - He was not satisfied and remarked what share am I to give to the Inspector and to the Constables out of this sum. I said Come and speak to my Master - The Sub - Inspector Came to Pir Bux's house on the night the Saits left for Coimbatore on the second occasion - Pir Bux was gambling with Rampersand - Wuzzier Khan - Kumber Ally - Karee Bux and another Bombay man whose name I do not know - Chinna Came and Called me, I went to the gate and found it was the Sub. Inspector (Rungasamy Row) - I opened the gate and let him in and went and informed Pir Bux - Pir Bux closed the front

door

85/1055

door and spoke to the Sub Inspector in the Verandah - I was present - Sub-Inspector said he had been to Bhow Row's house in Black Town and Complained to him of the insufficiency of the money viz Rupees 150 and he directed him to go and represent matters to Pir. Bux - Pir Bux said to the Sub-Inspector "Keep the 150 Rupees" "yourself - I will send more money" "for the Inspector" - Rungasamy Row then went away and the Gambling went on till 12 P.M. The following day Pir Bux gave me Rupees 50/- It was about 2 P.M. I paid the money to the Sub. Inspector in his house. He was lying on his Cot in the Side room as you enter the house - That room has two entrances - One from the street passage (Nada) and the other from inside the main building. We enter the room from the Nada or Street passage – a day or two afterwards Carthasardy reported that the Mylapore Inspector was very angry because he had not been paid properly. Pir Bux sent me to Call the Sub. Inspector. I delivered the message – the same night about 9 P.M. the Sub. Inspector Came to our Bungalow in a jutkah. Pir Bux asked why the Inspector was angry. Sub. Inspector said he is not satisfied with 50 Rupees – Pir Bux said "you shumjau him" "I had no money then. I will send" "him some more soon. Tell him not to be angry." The third day after this Pir Bux gave me one Sovereign and 48 Rupees and told me to give

it

W/1055

it to the Sub-Inspector - I did so - He was in the same room (Dewan-kana) - Subsequent to this Dr. Brex went twice to the Sub-Inspector's house - I engaged Jutkas for him when he came back on both occasions he told me that he had met the Sub-Inspector but did not tell me why he had been there - No money could have been paid to him for I made no entry in my Cash Book -

× × × × × × × × ×

About a month after the Sait's Case Moonesamy Pillay was robbed in the same Bungalow at the Adyar -

× × × × × × × × ×

When we got home Dr. Brex took Charge of the bundle of clothes and Carried it into his wife's apartment

The following morning Parthasardy and Ramasamy Came to our Bungalow and informed Pir Bux there that the Complainant Moonesamy Pillay had gone to the Mylapore Police station to make a Complaint - Siddeck and Cundasamy were also in the Bungalow at the time - they arrived a little before Parthasardy. Pir Bux directed Parthasardy and myself to go and see the Sub Inspector (Rungasamy Row) and told Siddeck Cundasamy and Ramsamy to go to the Jemadar's station, Mylapore and see what was going on. We met the Sub. Inspector near the Station and accompanied him to his house. He told me that Moonesamy Pillay had Complained only against Mahomed Shah and directed me to inform Pir Bux to order Mahomed Shah to put-an appearance at the Police Station that they would dismiss the Case against him, saying that the Complainant had gambled and lost his money. He also told me to tell Pir Bux that he would not take less than 10 per Cent in this Case as the man had made a Complaint and he would have to take a great deal of trouble to get him off. I went back and Communicated what the Sub. Inspector had told me, to Pir Bux. He said the money belongs to four persons. I shall ask them and hear what they have to say in the matter. The following day Pir Bux sent for Zoroolla Shah the brother of Mahomed Shah and asked him to arrange for his brother's presence in the Police Station. Mahomed Shah declined to go to the Station and asked

Pir Bux to pay any ſum the Sub-Inspector wanted and ſettle the matter - That ſame night at 8-30 P. M the Sub. Inspector Came to our Bungalo It was a Wednesday night I think I was there. Pir Bux and the Sub. Inspector had a Conversation - We remained there till 9-30 P. the Su Inspector asked Pir Bux to ſend - Mahomed Shah and that he would have Complainant present, make ſome ſort of enquiry in his presence and dismiss the Case as being one of Gambling - Pir Bux ſaid he declined to Come - You must do your best - (Summal tao) - The Sub. Inspector then asked for 200 Rupees. Pir Bux ſaid he had no change, but would ſend money the following day - Sub-Inspector got a rupee for Jutka hire and went away - the next day Pir Bux gave me one hundred rupees and told me to take it to the Sub-Inspector, I did so, and gave it to him. He asked "who is this money for and did you tell Pir Bux about what I said about the 10 per Cent"? I said "I did - I don't know who the money is for - I was directed to hand you the amount" - I went back and reported what the Sub-Inspector told me. The Complainant was going daily to the Police Station. We were watching his movements. Sub-Inspector used to send information daily to Pir Bux by Parthasardy. Pir Bux then directed me to go and see the big Inspector (Mr Wayne). I did so. and told him Pir Bux had sent me. He asked me to Come in by the side door into the back of the house and asked me to sit down. He then said, yes, why does not Pir Bux send Mahomed Shah.

that is the Station, go and tell him to do so - or Mooneswamy Pillay may be going to higher Authority (oopur Jayanga). Tell Pir Bux to Come and see me or if he wants I will Come and see him at night - I told Pir Bux this - The next day he sent Siddeek to ask the Inspector to Come and see him. The Inspector Came in a Jutkah about 10. P. M - accompanied by a Mahomedan Constable named Shaik Hyder. I had seen the Constable before but was not acquainted with hi The Inspector wore a long Coat dow to his ankles. It was like the Cloa that Sepoys wear and had on a sm black round Cap. Shaik Hyder first Came to the house and enquired for Pir Bux - I told him he was in. He said the Inspector had come. I went in and told Pir Bux He said ask him in. I went to the corner of the street near the Judge's house (Mr. Ponnoosamy Pillay.) and found him seated in the jutka. I called him and took him in. Pir Bux was lying down, he got up and I gave the Inspector a seat. I was told to go out by Pir Bux. I did so and joined the Constable and conversed with him, About 11 P.M. Pir Bux called me and asked me to get the jutka ready. I did so. He gave the Constable 5 Rupees and told him to take 4 Rupees and pay one Rupee to the jutka driver He told the Inspector "I will send my man tomorrow". The next day Pir Bux sent for Honkar and told him

17/2055

him to Cash the Sovereigns and bring him 50 Rupees. He brought the money. I cannot say if the Sovereigns were disposed of. Pir Bux gave me the 50. Rupees and told me to go to the Inspector's house and give it to him. I did so. The same night Bhow- Izzoolla shah; and Siddeek Came to Pir Bux's house and enquired what bundobust he had made. He told them, that the Inspector and Sub. Inspector had been there and he had paid them. Bhow said I should like to satisfy myself. May I go and ask them? Pir Bux said by all means and pointing to me said there is the man that took the money and paid them. Bhow. Siddeek and I went to the Inspector's house in Royapettah and were admitted by the side door. He gave no seats.

Bhow asked the Inspector, what Sir, what about Mooneeammy Pillay's Case? The Inspector said, he is giving plenty of trouble and threatens to go to the Commissioner. Why don't you send Mahomed Shah. I will dispose of the Case. Bhow replied Mahomed Shah is a very timid man and declines to come before you, do your best and settle the Case. The Inspector said I told Pir Bux that Colonel Weldon had come as Commissioner, and asked him not to commit any more Cases, but you see he would not listen to me and then Complainant now threatens he will go and Complain to him. You see Pir Bux has only sent me 50 Rupees for all my trouble. what has he given the Braman? (Sub. Inspector) Bhow replied,

I

I will tell him to send you more. It seems he gave the Braman 100 Rupees. We came away and Bhow spoke to Pir Bux and asked him to send 50 Rupees more. The following morning Pir Bux gave me the money 50 Rupees and I went to the Inspector's house and paid it to him. The Inspector told me to tell Pir Bux that he had quieted the Complainant very nicely but the Braman w setting him up in order to have a few more rupees out of him (Pir Bux). On my reporting th to Pir Bux he got upset and s me to Call Zyroollesahab. I fe him. We then got into a jutka went to the Sub-Inspector's m either 60 or 70 Rupees. There wa twenty rupee Currency Note wi

C

Cash. The Sub Inspector declined
to take the Note. Pir Bux explained
to him that it was not one of the
stolen Notes, however, he would not
have it, but took the Coin only. The
Sub. Inspector then explained the
great difficulties he had to Contend
with and said Pir Bux should
be prepared to pay up half of the
money looted and then think hi
-self lucky if he gets out of the
scrape. For four or five days we se
no one. We only heard that the Su
Inspector was Knocking the Com
plainant about all over Madras a
had been on one occasion to Bhow
house in Black Town, but he
not at home. The Inspector tur
up one night at 10. P.M. with the
Constable and asked Pir Bux
Rupees 60 as he wanted to purc
a pair of Spectacles at Messrs Orr

Pir Bux went into his wife's room and brought Rupees 60 in Cash and gave it to him, and gave the Constable one rupee for jutka hire - The Inspector said as he was going away "all your fault - had Mahomed" "Shah appeared before me, all this" "trouble would have been avoided" - A few days later the Sub-Inspector came one night and informed Pir Bux that Moonesamy Pillay had made his Complaint to the Commissioner and that he had driven down to the Division in his dog Cart and made enquiries, but that he had put him (Commissioner) off the scent by telling him he had made enquiries at the Adyar and had ascertained that it was a Gambling Case and the Complainant in order to get his property back had made a false Complaint. You see what trouble I am taking in your behalf and how I am playing my part. Pir Bux was much pleased and gave him Rs 50/ and so informed Bhow, Zoroola Shah, Siddeek of the good news the following day when they came to the Bungalow. That same day Zoroola Shah and Pir Bux had a row on account of the latter paying away so much money to the Police. Later on they made friends."

(True Extract.)

City Police Office
Madras.
January 1887.

Commissioner of Police

Extracts from Statement
by Syed Mohedin
relation to collusion
between the Police of
the E. or Ruglapore div.
and a gang of Swindlers

J 309/87
2

23/105

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

ENCLOSURE Six

In a letter from the Inspector General of Police, dated Madras 24th January 1887 No. 275.

Genl: Deptt:

24/105

CURRENT NO. 36

No. 275

Chief Office of the Inspector General of Police,
Madras, 24th January 1887.

FROM

Colonel T. K. Guthrie

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,

TO

THE Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George.

SIR,

Enclosures. Six.

With reference to Endorsement No. 2098C, dated the 21st December 1886 Judicial Department on Petition of T. Rungasamy Row lately a Sub-Inspector in the Madras City Police, I have the honor to submit herewith the report of the Commissioner of Police thereon with Extracts from statement by one Saiyid

Muhi-ud-din relative to the Collusion of the Police of the Mylapore Division with a gang of Swindlers.

2. The enclosures received with the Endorsement are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obed^t. Servt.,

Col:
Inspector General of Police.

mk
Cd. DK

8/4055

25/1055

Judl. G.O. 16-9-84, No 2204
Public 2-12-83, No 2290

CURRENT No. 309

Judicial (1887) DEPARTMENT.

FROM Col: T. K. Guthrie
INSPECTOR GENERAL
of Police,

CHIEF SECRETARY
26 JAN 87
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

No. 295.

Dated 24th } January 1887.
Received 25 }

No.

SUBJECT.

Submits the Commissioner's report on petition of T. Rungasamy Row late Sub-Inspector in the Madras City Police.

26/185

Judl. DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 309

From Col. T. K. Guthrie, I. G. of Police.

FOR ORDERS.

With the above letter the I. G. of Police forwards the report of the Commissioner upon the petition of T. Rangasámi Row, a Sub Inspector in the City Police who was dismissed for complicity with a gang of swindlers locally known as 'The Adyar Gang'. Their *modus operandi* was briefly as follows. A likely victim having been obtained one of the gang represented that he was the servant of the brother-in-law of ~~Bhow Row~~ the Baroda Raja, who had some jewels that he wished to dispose of; these could be got as a bargain as the owner wished to avoid publicity, fearing that the Govt. wd. confiscate the jewels, wh. had belonged to his late sister, the Rani, if they discovered them.

A few real ~~and some~~ jewels were borrowed from a dancing girl, and these supplemented by sham jewels, were shown by appointment to the victim, who eventually agreed to buy them for considerabley less than their real value. He was told to bring the money in sovereigns and while these were being counted out a police constable would enter and arrest some of the gang, the victim, and the jewels, one of the gang ~~not~~ being careful to bolt with the money. On the way to the station the victim was allowed to escape and he was generally glad to get off at any price

price, fearing a prosecution for receiving stolen property.

The above account was given the undersigned by Col. Weldon.

Eventually the gang were prosecuted and many of its members were in three trials before the High Ct. convicted and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. At one trial a constable also was convicted for complicity, but it does not seem to have been deemed advisable to prosecute any other members of the force, although the evidence given at the trials pointed to their complicity. Further evidence of this is to be found in the fact that the gang seem to have invariably conducted their operations in the same Police Divn. (Mylapore) always returning there after one of their sudden departures. But whether the petr. was implicated directly or not, it seemed to Col. Weldon that the frequent recurrence of these frauds in his Division without the slightest success in the way of detection showed that the petr. was at least wholly inefficient, and he therefore recommended his dismissal. Petr. was accordingly dismissed by the I. G. on the 26th June 1886.

The petr. now urges that he was not given an opportunity of defending himself, as the Standing Orders require. There seems to be some truth in this, but he ~~put in~~ gave the Commr. two ~~state~~ written statements defending himself, in one of which he pleads the Astt. Commr's.

FOR ORDER

orders in defence of his action (Col. Weldon does not state what this action was) He does not seem therefore to have been prejudiced by the manner in which the inquiry was conducted — an inquiry extending over six months — but it wd. be well to draw Col. Weldon's attention to the Standing Orders, as compliance with them is not difficult, and non-compliance with them gives a petr. an opportunity of making capital. ~~out of~~

The petr. further states that he is willing to resign if it is thought not desirable that he shd. remain in the Police. It is submitted, however, that he should not be permitted to do this as there is very good evidence that he was actually in league with the gang and not merely inefficient. In the first place the utter failure to detect the swindlers affords fair primâ facie evidence of complicity. In the second place the petr. was identified by witnesses as one of the friendly police officers, and sworn to in the trials before the High Ct. And in the 3rd place the police have now succeeded in tracing the man who kept the accounts of the gang, and this man states that the petr. was deeply implicated and received hush-money frequently.

It is thought, therefore,

that the order of dismissal shd. not be disturbed.

HAS
19.3

H.C.S.

It is not at all clear why the man was not prosecuted before, even without the evidence of Syed Mohideen. The reasons why none of the Police (except one Constable) have been prosecuted ~~should~~ ~~be stated~~, & why they are not now prosecuted should be stated. If they are not satisfactory & Govt. see fit to order prosecution petitioner will have with a vengeance the public Enquiry he demands.

H.C.S.

Let us have Petr.'s two written explanations and ap. Also ask Col. W. confidentially if he thinks with Syed Mohideen's evidence he can safely prosecute

28 march

Petition from late
Sub Insp^r. of Police
Rungasami Rao

---

[28]

30 / 1055

Judl DEPARTMENT.

N.B.—*The reply to this communication should be addressed to the Chief Secretary.*

CHIEF SECRETARIAT, MADRAS.

Memorandum.

[illegible]

Dated the 2^d April 1887.
No.

With reference to his letter to the I. G. of Police d/19^th Jany. 1887, No. 1562, the Comm^r. of Police is requested to forward ~~to~~ for the information of the Govt. the two written explanations submitted by ~~the~~ late Sub Inspector Rangasami Row.

2. He is also desired to report confidentially whether he considers that, now Syed Mohidin's evidence has been obtained, the Sub Inspector could be safely prosecuted.

H.C.S.
31/3

H.C.

The Commissioner of Police. Despt 2/4/87

Interim
Reference in Cr. 370

Sub Inspector
Rungasami Row states:

24. 4. 86

In October 1885 Mahomed Shah reported that Bhow Row and others had occupied a bungalow for certain (illegal) purposes. I reported to the Near Counsel the landlord. I saw Bhow Row and 5 or 6 others at the bungalow. I only know Bhow Row. I warned them.

× Approver.

Parthasaradi× has been to me several times and admitted he was concerned in cheating one Ramasami Iyengar in Mylapore in respect of 4000/- No it was Ramasami Iyengar who told me that Parthasaradi and Bhow Row had cheated him. It was a private complaint not officially reported. I did report this to Inspector (Wayne). This was in May or June 1885.

Ramasami Iyengar again complained that he had been again cheated by one Cunniah Naidu and Bashiam Chetty.

Cunniah has absconded.

It was Constable Shaik Hyder I took with me in October 1885 when I went to the Adyar Bungalow. I asked Bhow Row who let the house to him. He said "Padri let it". I asked the people who they were. Two of them said they were from Coimbatore - two others said they were from Secunderabad being friends of Bhow Row. I entered their names in my note book. I cannot find the book. I left it in the station. I have looked for it. I reported to Inspector (Wayne). Mahomed Shah said they were gamblers and cheats. Mahomed Shah said they had cheated Ramasami Iyengar in the house known as "Inspector's bungalow" at Mylapore and had gone to the Adyar for similar purposes. Mahomed Shah was then at variance with Bhow Row's lot.

Two days after I went again to the Adyar bungalow - all had gone. I saw the

the gardener or a cooly. I did not lend my cooking pots to Bhow Row as Parthasaradi states.

I was on leave from 5th to 12th December 1885 at Tanjore. I returned only on the evening of 12th. I left on the morning of the 5th.

In Munisami Pillai's case Parthasaradi pressed me to go to Shoolay to examine two witnesses to prove that it was a gambling case. I was satisfied it was not gambling but riots. I therefore did not go to see these witnesses.

Once before when Parthasaradi was arrested Pir Buksh did come to my house to get him out on bail or get him and Cunniah off.

It was at my house Mahomed Shah informed me about the people in the Bungalow at the Adyar. I did nothing that evening. I went next morning taking Shaik Hyder with me.

I never told either Head Constable Narrainsami or Police Const: Cunnee Laul to go to the Adyar bungalow on any occasion.

I tried to arrest Mahomed Shah in Munisami Pillai's case but could not find him. I did not enquire at his house nor at Pir Buksh's. I could not find Bhow Row either.

On Sunday evening about 6 P.M. Head Constable Roodraji reported the cheating case of Munisami Pillai to Inspector Wayne about 6 or 6.30 P.M. Head Constable Narainsami was standing there. I asked him what was the matter and he told me "some man" has come to complain of cheating". I saw Munisami Pillai at station at 7 P.M. I told him to write a complaint. As he was writing Inspector came and enquired. Next morning Munisami came and completed his complaint. Then only I came to understand it was Bhow Row & Co who were concerned.

I wanted to tell the Commissioner that my own Division was not working properly and I wanted to ask the Commissioner to be allowed to employ some

some other Division men. I did not tell this to Commissioner when I saw him. It was on the 16th of January that I was told to draw up a charge sheet and bring Diary &ca.

I did not mention the fact of my having travelled as far as Gundacal with Houkaram as no one asked me.

Before I went to Bellary in Christmas Rampersad said that Houkaram and others had clothes and property and asked me to bring him before Commissioner and he would give information. I mentioned this to Commissioner. I did not name Houkaram. I was not told to bring Rampersad. So I kept quiet.

I did go to see Rampersad. He did not give definite information as he wished to see the Commissioner. I did not ask the Commissioner.
I did ask the Commissioner to let me bring him. I knew Munisami's case was more than Cheating.

I have heard what Police Constable

Cunniah Lant has said. It is not true. I never sent him as he says with Parthasarady to the bungalow.

In 18 months the only cases reported were :— one 1500/.

Complainant came from Town. I don't know his name. He was a Chetti. China articles were got from him.

Confidentially mentioned not reported	Ramasami Iyengar vs. Bhow Row	June/85. 4000/.
	Ramasami Iyengar vs. Cunniah Naidu	July/85. 3000/.

Reported as theft.

My leave from 5th to 12th December/85 was from Commissioner's Office.

When I say that the Division was not working properly in the case I mean that the Head Constables and Constables seemed to be mixed up with the accused especially Head Constable Narrainsami No 707. That Head Constable

was

was encouraging a report that it was only gambling. The Inspector also was of the same opinion. I never sent Head Constable Narrainsami to the Adyar bungalow to wait for me saying there was gambling going on there and that I would meet him there with a warrant.

I spoke to Sub Inspector Jay Sing a few days after Munisami's case to assist in the arrest of Mahomed Shah. He said he was watching for him. I also told Gopal Rau of G. Division at the Park Fair. I told him to watch Pir Baksh's house to arrest Bhow Row and Mahomed Shah.

I have not spoken to the Vicar General since Munisami's case. I spoke to him at first in October.

When enquiring into the case against Cunniah Naidu (Ramasami Iyengar's case) I went over with Parthasaradi to Pir Baksh's house as he had promised to produce Cunniah Naidu. He wanted me to get Cunniah Naidu off. They charged Cunniah with theft, but I told Pir Butsh it was not theft simply to get him to produce Cunniah Naidu.

I went also to see Bhow Row's house thinking Cunniah Naidu might be there. I saw Bhow Row. I only went on those occasions.

The complaint by Ramasami Iyengar against Bhow Row of cheating 4000/- was told to me confidentially but the charge against Cunniah Naidu of theft of 3000/- was not confidential. It was about 7 or 8 P.M. when I went to Pir Butsh and Bhow Row's house. For nearly a month I was wandering with Parthasarady in search of Cunniah Naidu. 24.4.86

(True Copy)

Weldon

Commr of Police

Statement of late Sub Inspector
Rungasamy Row

Called for No. 309 of 1887. Dated
D/. 2. April 1887

Confidential

No. 8. 27.

City Police Office.
Madras.

18th April 1887

From Colonel J. Weldon
Commissioner of Police
Madras

To The Honourable H. E. Stokes
Acting Chief Secretary to Government
with the Governor
Stonehouse Hill

Sir

Referring to your No. 309 dated 2nd April 1887 calling for the two statements submitted by the late Sub Inspector Rungasami Row I have the honour to forward copy of one - the first statement. I regret that I am unable to find the second, nor is it among the papers in this case at the Inspector General's Office. I observe however in one petition Rungasami alludes to a communication of his dated 30th June 1886 "which was returned to him". There is unfortunately no record-keeper in this Office and it is very difficult to trace papers or fix responsibility when documents are not forthcoming. I will shortly submit for approval a proposed re-arrangement of the Establishment to remedy this defect.

2.— As regards the suggested Criminal prosecution of Rangasami Rao I do not advise it. We have already had three trials in the same case and I think it would be well now to let the scandal be regarded as one in which the requirements of justice have been sufficiently vindicated.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
J. Weldon Colonel
Commissioner of Police

Confidential

From
The Commissioner of Pol
Madras
To
The Chief Secretary
to Governme
Ootacamu

Dated 18th } April 1887
Received }

No. P. 27.
Enclosure One.

Late Sub Inspector Rungasamy
Forwarding Statement o
whose prosecution is not reco

37/1855

Confidential

CURRE[illegible]

Judicial (1887) Deptt.

From
The Commissioner of Police
Madras
To
The Chief Secretary to
Government
Ootacamund

Dated 18th } April
Received 20 } 1887.

N. P. 27.
Enclosure One.

Late Sub Inspector Rungasamy Row
Forwarding Statement of —
whose prosecution is not
recommended

38/1855

Judl. DEPARTMENT.

C. Nos 309 and 1731.

From Inspector Genl. of Police nos. 275 & P. 27, dated 24 Jany & 18th April 87.

Dated 188

FOR ORDERS.

I accept Col. Weldon's view on the ~~first~~ second point.

On the first it is unfortunate that Petr's second explan is not forthcoming & Col. W. He must be requested to adhere carefully to the standing order as suggested in Mr Stuart's note. But it seems abundy clear that Petr. was well aware of the charges against him all along & was fully heard, & that he was properly dismissed

16 May

Current 1731. being Col. [illegible] reply to reference on Current 309, is submitted for orders in continuation of previous note for orders of date 19th March.

There are two questions for orders :-

1st. whether the Petition of the late Sub Inspector Rangaswami Rao - C 4602/86 - is to be rejected or not.

2nd whether the Govt. will order the Petitioner to be put on his trial for complicity in the Adyar Frauds.

Taking the 2nd question first, it will be seen (C 1731) that Col. Weldon does not advise the prosecution of the Petr. Col. Weldon's reason is that the scandal may be allowed to drop. He gives no opinion as to the evidence agst. the Petr. It is submitted for orders whether a prosecution shd be ordered.

As to the 1st question - the disposal of the Petition there seems ample evidence to support his dismissal - viz - (1) the evidence given in the High Ct, identifying him as an abettor of the frauds.

(2) the evidence given by the young man Saiyed Moidin to the Dy. Commr. of Police.

H.C.S.

12/5.

FOR ORDERS.

Case of dismissed S. I. Inspr
of Police Rangaswami Ra

39/1055

Judl. Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Currents 309 and 1731.

order. 18 May/87 No. 1055.

1. The Petitioner will be informed that the Govt., having considered a report from the Commissioner of Police on his case, have rejected his appeal.

2. With reference to the statement in the Petition that the Petr was not given ~~a chance~~ an opportunity of defending himself, as required by paras. 2 and 6 of the Rules contained in the Resolution of the Govt. of Bombay on the procedure to be adopted in the dismissal of native Subordinates, recorded in G.O. 3rd Decr 83, No. 2290 Public, the attention of the I.G. of Police and the Commissioner of Police will be drawn to the necessity of

Confid.

Case of a dismissed Sub Inspector of Police

adhering carefully to the Standing Orders in the disposal of such cases.

(From orders)

Alp
16/5.

Para 1. (only) to Petr. Desp.d 23/5
I.G. of Police Desp 23/5
Commr. of Police Madras town Desp 23/5

From orders

I/18/5

(108)

[7]

ORDINARY, MS.

Judl DEPARTM

G. O. DATED 18 May 1889

No. 1055.

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

Page 16-38