Case

~~Confidential No.~~

189

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O., DATED 14. VII. 95

No. 1395

Series. Mis

First copy sent to Press

Returned for signature

Despatched 15. VII. 95

Confidential.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to reconsider orders passed in the case of C. N. Lutchmana Mudaliyar's memorials to the Secy of State

Read again Order of Government, dated
18 , No.

Back Paper, No. of 18

Further Paper, No. of 18

Enclosures

Spare copies.

Struck .. .. ..
Issued .. .. ..

Current No.

Statement with ditto.

Total ..

In Stock ..

Order, &c., of Government—A.

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

Number of copies required.
{ Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

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.

Withholding the
Memorial of
C M Lakshmana
Mudali

Cs

(Prime orders)

[5]

Ind! DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 10 Oct. 1890, No. 1579 Ind!
Again G.O., dated 18 , No.
Current No. 5749 of 1890, dated ~~17 Dec.~~ 3 Oct. from C. L. Lakshmana Mudali C. N. L. M.
— 649 — 91 — 6 Feb. — D° D°
— 1643 — 91 — 1 Ap. — D°
— 2022 — 91 — 25 Ap. — D°
— 2282 A — 91 — 10 May. — D°
Conf! Current No. 225 of 1891, dated 19 May from Com! of Police, Madras
C. L° 2736 — 91 — 12 June — C. L. Lakshmana Mudali

Order d/ 14 July 1891 N° 1395.

Upon full consideration of the fresh arguments urged by C. L. Lakshmana Mudali & of a report upon the subject from the Com! of Police, Madras, the Gov! see no reason to modify its previous orders & resolves to withhold under Rule XII (8) of the Memorial Rules the petition [5] addressed by Lakshmana Mudali to the Rt. Hon. the Sec! of State dated the 23rd June 1890 & 3rd Octr.*

(From orders)

[illegible] 4 July.

To pet! (with Twenty Enclosures).
Copy to I.G. of Police
" " Com! of Police, Madras

* Vide List with Confid! Clerk.

Init for Cs.

This I submit need no longer be kept confidential.

I think it had better [illegible]

Init for the Hon. Mr. Garstin C.S.I.

With reference to Hon's remarks [illegible]:—

It is the case that G.O.s are at times printed at the L. A. Press, Ootacamund & issued direct, but this is rare & only occurs where there is great urgency.

A fresh petition (C. L° 2736) has been received from Lakshmana Mudali & is subm.d; it contains nothing new apparently.

25 June.

26 June

2/7/91

Init for Hon. Mr. Garstin C.S.I.

Re Lakshmana Mudali's case

Hm 16/6
R 23/6

5

Qu.

I was under the impression that L. Mudali's letter reporting the loss of his card was received in Ooty — & that the cover which was posted to his address was posted at Ooty — but the dates show they were received & posted in Madras. —

J.H.G

Is it not the case that sometimes G.O.s are printed at the Lit. Press, Ooty — & issued direct from the Govt. office, here?

J.H.G

22/6/91

Note for the Honorable Mr. Garst

With reference to Hon's remarks ~~of~~ regarding the despatch of papers from Ootacamund

(1) Lakshmana Mudali's papers were returned to him with G.O. of 23 Jan. 1890 No. 90 Mis. & that order issued from Madras because Govt. was in Madras at the time.

(2) In regard to the general question:

All purely confidential papers issue from Ootacamund when Govt. is here & non-confidential papers are treated in the same way when they happen to be really urgent.

In the case of references & orders to officers stationed at Ootacamund the rule is to issue them from the Ootacamund Office provided that they are not of great length & that they have not to be printed.

In all other cases orders & references issue from Madras because the Establishment at Ootacamund is insufficient to do the work of copying etc.

13 June.

15 June

Confid. No. 228
19/5/91

Lackmana Mudali's case

Col: Weldon's long D.O letter is plausibly & ingeniously argued but he does not state his own inference or conclusion quite as clearly as he might have done — For instance, he does not say that the torn card was sent to Shormack Lall (or Shanmuga Lall as his name really appears to be) at all — although from paras 13 to 17 of his letter he shows very clearly that Shanmuga Lall got the registered letter No. 582 & ~~that~~ it contained only an anonymous letter — Hence it may be inferred that S. Lall denied ever having received the card, though this is not stated in terms — but it is the turning point of the case — for clearly if he had recd. them he would either have carefully preserved them as proof of forgery of L. Mudali, or have so utterly destroyed them ~~by burning~~ them, that they could never have again been of any use to L. Mudali —. My Hon. Colleague seems to think ~~that~~ S. Lale tore up the card — I don't believe this for a moment. The evidence shows that the ~~papers~~ packet containing the card ~~been~~ was posted at Madras to L. Mudali's address. but one link is

x vide his signature on the receipt for Regist'd. letter No. 582.

missing – The papers' been put together under Mr Schmidt's supervision in the Ootacamund Sanitarium & must have gone by post to Madras – Why were they not posted at Ooty direct to L. Mudali? This point is not noticed by Col: Weldon – If the papers were put up in a packet & sent to the Registrar at Madras & by him sent on there was an opportunity at Madras for abstracting the cards –

However, assuming that the cards were not abstracted in the Post Office at Ooty or at Madras, then they must in the ordinary course of affairs, have reached L. Mudali – who was extremely interested in their preservation – and although they have been torn into pieces the tearing has been so done that every piece is fairly put back into its place – & not one is missing – Therefore these facts seem to me to point strongly to the inference that they were torn up by some one interested rather in their preservation than their destruction – & that therefore L. Mudali himself tore them up – in order to make up a case out of their apparent disappearance & destruction, but really their careful preservation – It seems to me now, therefore, that, whatever may be the truth regarding these cards before their latest development, it is so clear as anything depending on inference can be, ~~that~~ L. Mudali has concocted the whole of this business himself – & therefore the gravest suspicion at once attaches to him ~~that~~ his conduct throughout has been fraudulent & that the cards are really forgeries – & this impression is strengthened by the wording of the letter ~~of~~ from him to a ~~an~~ correspondent (whom Col: W does not specify), ~~in~~ which fell into the hands of the Police which desires to ~~that~~ L. Mudali has instructed ~~[illegible]~~ Lakshmana, (the supposed writer of 2 of the postcards) how to play some part –

The tearing up of the post-cards is a matter of no consequence whatever of itself since they are practically preserved – but this act in the drama throws a strong side-light on L. Mudali's character & makes me quite ready to agree in maintaining the decision already come to in refusing to forward his memorial to the Sec. of State

8/6/91 J.H.G

Note. My perusal of Col. Weldon's letter has made me change my view of the case – but considering ~~that~~ L. Mudali wrote to Post: reporting the loss of the 4 enclosures by return of post on 26/1/90 it seemed to me impossible ~~that~~ he could have had any hand in making away with them – & therefore it seemed to me (as the ~~[illegible]~~ P.O. itself of 23rd Jan/90 showed that only 6 instead of 10 enclosures had gone back to him) that the others must have been abstracted in the Pol: office or Post office. – It see [illegible] now, that he must have plotted the whole scheme carefully beforehand & reported the loss of the enclosures (although he actually [illegible]) directly on their receipt.

[illegible] to know, however, whether it is the practice in the Ooty office for every paper to be sent to Madras for despatch. ~~[illegible]~~ Lakshmana Mudali's ~~papers~~ ~~were~~ not sent to him direct from the Ooty office.

If a petitioner is residing in Ootacamund itself, must the P.O. on his petition be sent to Madras before it can be despatched to him?

AHG

---

affected & should be maintained. Also that the memorial to the Secretary of State should be withheld under Memorial rule XII.8.

Lakshmana Mudali's ingenuity undoubtedly extorts admiration though I think it has overleaped itself. I would add that the presence of so skilful a concocter of evidence is not at all desirable in the Police force.

Statement [illegible] though [illegible] the [illegible], were [illegible] owing to their being sent to the I.G. of Police. That however is a minor point.

H.S.
3 June

Case of Lakshmana
Mudali

Also [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

(For orders)

Jud. DEPARTMENT.

C No. 5149/17.12.90) 5/649/6.2.91, 1643/1.4.91, 2022/25.4.91,
2282A./10.5.91 & Conf. C. No. 228/19.5.91

From

Dated 189 .

FOR ORDERS.

C. Nos 5149) 5/649, 1643, 2022 & 2282 are petitions from C. L. Lakshmana Mudali praying for restoration to his post.

C. No. 228 is Col. Weldon's reply to the D.O. directing him to make certain enquiries in the case. This D.O. will be foun under cover of P.O.y 10 oct 10 No. 1579 Jud.

There are two points calling for orders:—

(1) is Lakshmana Mudal to be restored to the servic

(2) is his *memorial to Secretary of State in P.O.y 10-10-90 No. 157 Jud. to go on or to be kept back under Rule XII (8) of the Mem rules?

The case will doubtless be remembered by Hon. Members & Col. Weldon's letter is clear in itse

28 May.

The case appears to be as puzzling as ever. Col. Weldon's explanation seems to be plausi enough but if it is correct Lakshmana Mu must be a remarkably clever man

This is certainly a most wonderful case. Col. Weldon's conclusion evidently is that the postcards were not taken from the cover in the Govt. Office, but afterwards on receipt by Lakshmana Mudali and were sent by him to Sharmack Lall in order to their being destroyed and to support his theory of a conspiracy against him. It is true that, as pointed out by my hon. colleague, the postcards were his chief piece of evidence and that it was apparently his interest that they should be preserved, but on the other hand all the facts about them, very particular as to their writer & appearance, were fully on record and, though they were held to be forgeries, all materials for an opinion as to their genuineness were sufficiently, and almost as fully, available as if they were forthcoming. From this point of view it is conceivable & I think probable

* Enclosure 5.

that in weaving proof of the imaginary conspiracy against him which it was important to Lakshman Mudali to establish he should risk the loss of this evidence of the postcards.

Col. Weldon explains how the weight of the cover was made up, to make it appear that the cards were taken from it before it was posted to L. M.'s address.

The letter about Lakshmanaji the writer of the 2 chief postcards throws considerable light on the original case and confirms the view that the postcards were forged in the sense that the marks on them indicating transmission by post were spurious.

But whatever be the true fact as to the abstraction of the postcards since the decision of the case, it appears to in no way

---

Confidential No. 228.

CHIEF SECRETARY
22 MAY 91
GOVERNMENT C. MADRAS

CONFIDENTIAL.

D. O.

Dated 19th May 1891.

Enclosures - Fifteen (as per list within)

Reporting about the alleged abstraction of Certain documents from a Cover despatched from Government Office.

List of the Documents received and returned.

Received with D. O. dated 26th September 1890.

√ 1. Petition from Lachmana Moodely dated May 1st 1888.

√ 2. ——— Do ——— Do ——— " Decr/17. 1888.

√ 3. ——— Do ——— Do ——— Jany 6th 1889.

√ 4 ——— Do ——— Do ——— July 11th 1890

√ 5 Petition from Lachmana Moodely to the Secretary of State dated 23rd June 1890.

√ 6. Explanation of Shanmuk Lal to the I. G. of Police dated 15th Decr/ 1888.

√ 7. The Original of G. O. No. 229 dated 21st Feby. 1890 & enclosures.

√ 8. The Original of G. O. No. 989 dated 10th June 1890.

√ 9. Copy of G. O. No. 90 dated 23rd July 1890 with 4 enclosures returned by Latchmana Moodely of these 4 docts. are now placed in a separate Cover marked XX.

2 are only with two

√ 10. Cover marked XX with four patched papers referred to in above and in para: 18 of my D. O. d/19-5-91

√ 11. Cover marked $\frac{XX}{1}$ referred to in the end of para: 18 of my D. O. d/19-5-91

√ 12. The Telugu petition received by Porleous.

√ 13. The four post Cards sent with (12)

√ 14. The Statement of Mr. Schmidt the Confidential Clerk of the Government Office.

Received direct from Chief Secretary on 6th October 1890.

√ 15. Petition from Lachmana Moodely to the Secretary of State dated 3rd October 1890 with 2 Enclosures.

Weldon
Comr. Police
19.5-91

with the next letter "p".

31.—— Why then should this paper have been torn and repaired if not done in the Government Office? The only solution of this which occurs to me is, that it was designedly so prepared to meet any question which might be raised as to similar treatment of the other documents, when this paper would be relied on to show that all the patching must have been done in the Government Office as this particular document had not been out of possession of the Government Secretariat since its first receipt from the Petitioner. The repair is so well done that ordinarily viewed on the face one would not suspect it was a damaged paper.

32.—— I confess that this Case is one of the most puzzling I have ever had to deal with and if the theory indicated above be the correct solution it displays an amount of ingenuity and careful study of design and details of performance which almost excites admiration.

33.—— A list of the Documents received by me and now returned is attached.

Yours Sincerely.

The Honble W. J. F. Price C.S.
Chief Secy. to Govt.

documents probably took him by Surprise and, if the suspicion as to the abstraction of the post Cards be well founded, Some time would be necessary to prepare the documents for re-inspection and Comparison with the weight noted by the Post Office.

28 ——— There is another Curious Feature in the present Condition of the documents which is, that Lachmana Moodely's petition or Covering letter dated 10th April 1890 sent when returning the G. O. and Enclosures, is also patched, and has evidently been torn before patching when the paper was folded double only (breadthwise) for the rents Correspond.

29 ——— Now, where was this done? It may be Considered very unlikely

that any Petitioner would submit a mutilated document to Government. Paper is Cheap — the kind used in this instance the very Cheapest, and the matter inscribed very short and would give little trouble to rewrite on a perfect half sheet.

30 ——— So far as can be ascertained this patching was not done in the Government Office and a close inspection affords support to this denial. The document on receipt was initialled by Mr. Cardew with blue pencil, and if his writing be examined it will be noticed that the upstroke of the "A" of "April" was obstructed by the inequality of Surface Caused by the edge of the patch at the back and therefore is blunt and shortened as Compared

alleged writer of two of the post Cards, and the man who is supposed to have been making remittances to Arcot. In this letter besides referring to family matters Lachmana Moodely says, "you must" "speak to Lukmanji sahib much." "His trouble will not go in vain. As he" "is a poor man you must some how" "try and pay him one rupee for his" "present expenses. I will return" "the same to you when I come." "Otherwise he will be very much" "displeased. You alone must at" "present manage to avoid his being" "displeased". His Correspondent was further directed to tell Lukmanji that if the Commissioner sent for him he was to decline to attend unless his expenses were paid and to say that if the Commissioner wanted any information his questions might be put into writing and a written reply would be sent

the Object of this of Course was that the answers would be Composed by Lachmana Moodely. The letter also advised Lukmanji to require an Order in writing adding: "If they" "send for him in writing we Can send in" "a bill for expenses (incurred) and if they" "do not pay we Can recover through" "the Court". This does not look like any desire on Lachmana Moodely's part to facilitate enquiries to test the genuineness of his evidence.

27 —— There was great delay nearly a month — on Lachmana Moodely's part in replying to the demand for a return of the G. O. and Enclosures. This he explains by saying he was absent at Trichinopoly from 10th March to 9th April. The Call for a return of all the

Lachmana Moodely relied, it may be asked why would he make away with his best evidence?

24 —— His line of Contention is that he has been ruined by a Conspiracy among his own brother Officers, and it is, probably, in furtherance of that argument that the post Cards temporarily disappeared, for, lo! they re-appear in a mysterious manner rescued from the grave as it were and as useful as ever for his purpose.

25 —— The Contents of the letter sent from Mylapore to Shunmuga Lall were designedly of such a nature that it was probable the recipient would not like to disclose, showing, as they would, an improper traffic between him and the Manager of the Chief Office. It was never anticipated

that such a letter would be retained and produced, though it really contained nothing that was not well known already. The Chances were that rather than admit that the Manager had been Corresponding privately on Official matters, Inspector Shunmooga Lall would either destroy the letter, or say the Contents of that Cover had been mislaid, and so, by nonproduction, favour the allegation that it Contained the missing post Cards. Unfortunately Shunmooga Lall did not preserve the Cover of this letter.

26 —— Strangely enough owing to a dispute in a family with which Lachmana Moodely is Connected a number of papers Came lately into our hands and among them a letter written by Lachmana Mudely at the time when we were first enquiring into the genuineness of these post Cards. It will be remembered that Lukmaji was the

had been marked in the Government Office in 1886 and 1888, for the Endorsements are partially Covered by the patches. It will also be seen that these papers have never been folded in 4 as were the papers returned to Lachmana Moodely in the Cover now marked XX/1.

20 ——— Paper of a similar quality to that used for the patches has been Cut into strips exactly Corresponding in Size and form to the fresh patches on the Affidavit and Superintendents' Memorandum. these pieces exactly make up the weight of 4 post Cards.

21 ——— Enquiry has been made in the Government Office and it is asserted that these patches were not put on there. It is said there was no necessity to do so as these papers being of minor importance were not required to be handled. Mr. Schmidt

Says he had all the enclosures locked up in the (Confidential) Almirah until they were given out by him to be despatched to Lachmana Moodely with the G. O. and that they were fastened together in his presence.

22 ——— The inference is that the 4 post Cards have been abstracted after delivery of the Cover to the addressee and the figure "6" entered on the Cover and at foot of the G. O, as it now appears, to support the allegation that the post Cards were not enclosed in the Cover when despatched from the Government Office, the weight equivalent to that of the documents extracted being made up by pieces of paper gummed on as patches ostensibly to repair the enclosures.

23 ——— Now, seeing that these post Cards formed the main point on which

entries are distinctly repudiated and the repudiation is borne out by the Office records. How then, if the post Cards were enclosed in the Cover posted from the Government Office in Madras, Could the weight of the remaining documents as now produced, exactly Correspond to the weight received by the Post Office? -

17 —— If the Copy of Affidavit dated 30th January 1884 and Memorandum by Superintendent of Police North Arcot dated 24th February 1884, Extract District Police Orders dated 21st December 1883 and Tamil Letter from Lukmaji to Lachmana Moodely dated 23d April 1888 (Now placed in a Cover marked XX) and which formed a portion of the enclosures returned with the G. O. be examined it will be seen that they have been patched at the back with clean white paper. It will also be observed that some of these patches were undoubtedly put on after the documents

declared their purport and have Cast them down to be picked up by any one and used against him as is now sought to be done. Further, how is it that the anonymous writer Carefully treasured up those pieces for two months and produced them only in June, when Lachmana Moodely was petitioning the Secretary of State and laying stress on the absence of these post Cards. It will be observed that not a single piece of these papers Cast to the wind is wanting and that they have been Carefully torn lengthwise and in such manner as to be perfectly legible when joined together. -

18 —— The Office notes show that the entry specifying the number of enclosures either at foot of the G. O. or on the Cover is unusual. In this Case such

15 — Lachmana Moodely in his petition dated 11th July 1890 argues that this registered Cover No. 582 must have contained the missing post Cards.

16 — It would appear to be Shunmooga Lall's interest to preserve these post Cards – if he got them – rather than to destroy them, as they had been pronounced to be forgeries. On the other hand Lachmana Moodely claims them as genuine and as the strong point of his Case which it was Shunmooga Lall's interest to destroy.

17 — It is not clear why Shunmooga Lall should wish to possess himself of these post Cards, but if he took the trouble and risk of abstracting these documents from the Government records assuredly he would not, when he got them, have, as stated in the anonymous letter to the Inspector General, openly

Case brought by L is settled in your"
favour. Please exert yourself to Confirm"
in your present post. I will let you"
know if you would answer me."

" Yours faithfully"
" (Initials). A. K."

18 — Shunmuga Lall states that he was surprised by receipt of this Communication and was at a loss to know who "A. K." might be. Subsequently it was suggested to him that these were the initials of A. Kistnasamy Iyer the Manager of the Inspector General's Office. Shunmuga Lall accordingly wrote to this Manager asking if the latter had written about his (Shunmooga Lall's) Case. The Manager asked Shunmooga Lall to send him the letter to which he referred. Shunmooga Lall did so and the Manager returned it repudiating it as a forgery.

12 —— The portion shown above in pencil was written with Carbonic paper in the Mylapore Post Office and the Copy so produced and now retained in the Punganur Post Office shows that the orrection of the word "Arcot," in ink, was evidently made after the receipt which accompanies the article was first prepared and the Mylapore record still appears without the Correction. If the letter to which this receipt refers had borne no address other than that recorded in the Mylapore Post Office it would have gone to Arcot not to Chittoor. Therefore the inference is that instead of recording a Complete address as he should have done, the Mylapore Postmaster merely entered shortly, that No. 582 referred to a letter for a Police Inspector (North) Arcot. When packing up his letters he saw by the full address that this letter would have to go to Chittoor so he Corrected the slip and despatched the Cover to Chittoor. Otherwise it must be supposed that the Correction was made En route, by the Railway Mail Service. But that Could only be done if the Railway Sorter was specially instructed as to this particular letter — an unlikely contingency — or, from his perusal of the full address on the letter.

13 —— There is no doubt this letter No. 582 was delivered to Inspector Shunmooga Lall who admits the receipt and produces the document which he says was in this Cover. The following is a Copy of this paper:—

"Mylapore
9-4-90."

" To.

Shunmook Lant Inspector of Police Chowdape

" Sir,

" You know I. has took. Charge. to me

9 —— It has further been ascertained that this letter did not go to Arcot at all but was sent through Chittoor and Punganur to Chowdapalli, and was accordingly delivered to the Inspector of Police at the latter place, namely, Chowdapalli. Chittoor as the Head Office merely entered the No. "582" and the Office of delivery "Punganur," to which Chowdapalli is a branch Office

10 —— Punganur has on its records not only the No. "582" but a full address:-

Shunmooga Lall
Inspector of Police
Chowdapally
North Arcot.

11 —— On the registered article receipt made out at Mylapore the entry now appears as follows:-

Registered Article Receipt

Registered article receipt No. D 582 addressed to (Name) Chittoor
~~Arcot~~

The Inspector of Police North Arcot

Signature of addressee Shunmuga Lall

Date of delivery 11th April 1890

CONFIDENTIAL.

POLICE COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE

Ms. 19th May 91

My dear Price,

I return the papers handed to me with your D. O. of 26th September last in reference to the alleged loss of 4 Post Cards from an Official Cover addressed to Lachmana Moodely late a Police Inspector of North Arcot.

2 —— There has been great difficulty in tracing the two registered letters he refers to as posted at Mylapore. A special Officer had to follow them throughout; then other State matters intervened so I hope the delay will be excused. The matter was puzzling in the Extreme. I state the Case and Conclusion arrived at.

3 ____ The Question is:-

Were the post Cards withdrawn or withheld in the Government Office? or, Elsewhere after despatch from the Government Office?

4 ____ The Officials who dealt with the papers in the Government Office say they enclosed all the documents received from Petitioner Lachmana Moodely including the 4 post Cards. They repudiate the Entry of the number "6" at foot of the G. O. and on the Cover. But the weight of the Cover as returned by Petitioner with its "6" enclosures as now appears marked on it and at foot of the G. O. Corresponds exactly with the weight marked by the Post Office as being that of the Cover when posted in Madras.

Was it not first posted in Ooty?

5 ____ About five months after Lachmana Moodely had brought

the short delivery to the notice of Government the fragments of the missing post Cards were received by the Inspector General of Police with an anonymous letter purporting to have been written by a Police Constable of the North Arcot District, dated 13th July 1890; and setting forth that about two months previously these post Cards were received by Inspector Shunmuga Lall in a registered letter and that the Inspector having read the post Cards and openly alluded to their purport tore them up and threw away the fragments which the writer says he subsequently collected.
We have not been able to discover the writer of this letter.

6 ____ The inference sought is, that whoever abstracted the post Cards did so in the interests of, and despatched them to, Shunmuga Lall? The anonymous writer mentions that the letter enclosing the post Cards

was posted at Mylapore in Madras. Lachmana Moodely also says that two letters were posted at Mylapore for the North Arcot District.

7 —— Enquiries were made at Mylapore and it has been ascertained that on 8th April 1890 two registered letters were posted there. Both have been traced to destination. One of these two letters was an application by a Police Constable of Vellore then on leave, asking his Inspector for an extension of the leave. The other was a letter addressed according to the Mylapore Post Office record – to

Inspector of Police
N. Arcot
Arcot.

was posted and registered as No. 582.

8. This letter No. 582 has been traced as delivered to Inspector Shunmuga Lall at Chowdapalli (N. Arcot District) on 11th April 1890.

(4)

CURRENT No. 2736

[9].

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

From

C. S. Lutchmana Moodali
late Inspr of Police North
Arcot District

No.

Dated 12 June 91
Received 15th Do
Enclosures 4

SUBJECT.

Requests to reinstate ~~him~~
him in his former post –

For Mr. Schir[illegible]
16/6

Ref. 16/6

excellency the

D

CURRENT No. 2736

To

His Excellency The Right Honorable
Beilby Baron Wenlock G.C.I.
Governor of Fort Saint George in Con
Ootacamund

CHIEF SECRETARY
15 JUN 91
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

The humble Petition of
C. N. Lutchmana Mudelly la
Inspector of Police North Arco
District.

Most Respectfully Sheweth.

1. That your Lordship's petition most respectfully begs to submit the followi for your gracious Consideration, praying tha they will meet with your approbation, and th your humanity will be pleased to pardon h for thus intruding upon your precious momen

2 - That on receipt of government ord N.o 90, dated 23d January 1890, stating, that the government is not prepared to Comply with petitioner's request, for restoration to his appoi-nment of Police Inspectorship; the petitio has on the 23d June 1890, forwarded to govern an appeal Memorial to the address of tion Excellency the Secretary of State, again

bove order for reasons therein detailed.

3. That on the receipt of some
more material informations in support
t the Appeal memorial, petitioner has
rwarded supplemental petitions, dated
: July, and 3d October 1890, respectively, Conveying
e above informations to government.

4. That the government on perusal
l the facts therein explained, supported by
ocumentary evidence, issued order No. 1579, dated
o: October 1890.

5. That Copies of the Appeal
memorial, Supplemental petitions, and
e order of government, mentioned in paras
. 3 and 4 marked A. B. C. and D are herewith
closed, for your Lordship's kind perusal.

6. That it is 9 months since and
ting is known as yet.

That petitioner has been
missed from the service on the 5th April
4, that he is quite destitute of any means
livelihood, that ever since his dismissal
of Course, driven to the greatest extremity
hardships to carry on his livelihood with

a

a family of 6 Children and others, for the la
7 years and odd, that his distressful and
languishing circumstances, as your Lordship
will figure, forced him to beseech the
government, earnestly to take the petition
Case into deep Consideration and favor h
with an early order towards relieving him
from his misery, by 4 reminding petitio
of the 17th December 1890, 6th February. 1st and 2
April 1891 respectively - all these appear
be unnoticed.

8. That petitioner therefore ha
ventured to address your Lordship direct, —
praying to obtain that indulgent Consid
-ation, of perusing the above petitions, w
the evidence and circumstances of the Case
and rendering him justice by ordering his —
restoration to his appointment of Inspector
which he has no doubt but your Lordship
humane disposition will deem his distress
Case deserving of, that through the benevole
of your grace he may be as a grateful —
monument of your Lordship's royal cl

For this act of Charity Petition

as

as duty bound will ever pray.

Petitioner humbly begs to Remain

Your Excellency's Most Humble and Obed^t. Serv^t.

Lutchmana Mudelly

ij Nattam
Chingleput
12^th June 1891.

D

Judicial Departm

Proceedings of the Madras Governm

Read the following pap

From C. N. Lutchmana Mudali dated 2
and 11th July 1890.

Order dated 10th October 1890 No. 1579.

Under Rule XII (8) of the Rules relat
the transmission of Memorials to the Secre
State, His Excellency the Governor in Co
resolves to withhold for the present the p
addressed to the Secretary of State by C. N. Lu
Mudali praying for a reconsideration of
Order confirming that of dismissal passe
the Petitioner by this Government.

2. The present order will not, ho
prevent this Government from reopening
Case should the further enquiries which it
intended to make into the matters now br
to light tend to the belief that a reconsidera
of the circumstances under which the peti
was dismissed, is desirable.

(True Extract)
(Signed) J. F. Price
Chief Secretary

F. 1. D. 20

C. N. Lutchmana Mudali
Chinglepet.

(True copy)
Lutchmana

---

and o
tered letter No. 562 being addressed to the
f Police Vellore, Petitioner suspec
been to the address of the said Shurm
wdapalli Division, sent through the
petition the Post Masters of Vellore and Poonganoor
r petition registered letter No. D. 562 was disposed of correspondence
now put enclosed for your Excellency's kind perusal, that the
his letter gave no decisive information about it.

of the That petitioner begs to submit for your gracious consideration
the registered letter No. D. 562 has no connection with this Case
seal of delivered to Shurmunt Laul, but actually delivered to
Inspector of Police Vellore and his receipt obtained, then Registered
562, which was addressed to the Inspector of Arcot and
ed to Shurmunt Laul Inspector of Police Chowdapalli
in the subject of which having had connection to
to some extent must have contained about 30 or the Cards
cation, and this fact will be ascertained by the postage
be affixed on the letter. A bare letter that contained about
lines as stated by Kistnasamy Iyer, would not be of more than
tola's weight.

That this fact will convince your Excellency, that it is
this manner mischiefs were played by the Police against
r petitioner in this case from the beginning with the intention
ruining him entirely by defeating justice.

That your petitioner therefore earnestly requests that
Excellency will be pleased to call for the information
the Post Master General regarding the disposal of the said
tered letter No. D-562 of the 31st March 1890 sent from Mylapore
ost Office addressed to the Inspector of Police Vellore and disc
your Lordship's satisfaction by whom the Cards we
the said Shurmunt Laul, and administer justice to this
essed Petitioner.

For this act of charity Petitioner as in duty bound will ever

Petitioner humbly begs to Remain
Your Excellency's most humble and Obedt. Servt.
(Signed) C. N. Lutchmana Mudali

(True copy)
Lutchmana Mudali

xcellency the Rig[illegible] Viscount Cros
Secretary of State for Ind
Lond
The humble petit
Latchmana Sundelly late 5th Class
Police North Arcot District in the
of Madras in the Empire of Indi

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That in continuation of you
appeal petition of the 23rd June last to your Excellen
subsequent petition of the 10th July 1890 to the address of
excellency the Governor of Madras submitting the inf
obtained from the office of the Inspector General of Pol
the petitioner's lost card & being traced out he most re
begs to submit that he since met Krishnasamy Iyer
of the office of the Inspector General of Police and
from him that on his perusing the Register of registere
of Mylapore post office he found that on the 8th of April
a registered letter No. D. 582 entered therein addressed to the
of Police Arcot; that on suspicion that this might have
the address of Shunmuk Lal Inspector of Police Chow
Division he wrote to him for it, that he accordingly obtaine
from him that on reading it owing to his surprise it was mark
it as if addressed by himself with his initial A. T.
as brought against you by L. was dismissed that you need
aid in future that you should exert yourself for confirm
and that if you write to me I shall reply" that he deduct
any more such letters in the Register and that he brought
same to the notice of the authorities.

That your petitioner thereupon requested the D.
Postmaster of Mylapore post office to see in the Register i
any more entered like this, that the Deputy Postmaster

---

ition
petitioner's innocence
petitioner craves leave that
ur petition to your Excellency
his second petition to the gover
of the latter thereon all of which
be taken and read by your Excellency in connection
rcel of this petition

copies of your p
with all the enclosures t
nment of Madras, and the
are herewith transmi

That the main charge on which your petitioner wa
nally dismissed from the public service was that he ha
t his Superintendent one Mr. Stevenson a currency note for
by way of a bribe; and that this charge so easy to fabricate
out of your petitioner's power satisfactorily to rebut at the
e he had written his defence in the absence of direct eviden
prove its falsity; and that such direct evidence which fo
basis of his subsequent correspondence with the Inspec
neral of Police and his second petition to the Government of
dras fortunately came to your petitioner's knowledge under
ircumstances hereinafter mentioned, some time in April 18

That your petitioner despairing of ever being ab
clear his character of the serious charge against him publi
notice in the Madras Standard and the Hindu of the 1st Augu
offering a reward of Rs. 10 to any person and in the
Samuthran" a Tamil news paper of the 3rd August 1887
offerin

most obed. servt.

depur
May 1891 50

Latchmana Sundelly

D

circumstances connected with his
Excellency the
service and prayed that the decis
might be reviewed, and that he mig
appointment, but that your Excellency
by your despatch dated London 17th June 1886 No. 4 was pleas
decline to interfere with the order of the government of Madras as a

That in April 1888 on the discovery of certain new
portant matters shown in detail below which gives a new co
exion to the serious charge against your petitioner of having se
his Superintendent a currency note for Rs. 100 by way of a bribe
which was not within his knowledge when he had submitted his orig
explanation and defence to the Inspector General of Police or his p
petition to the government of Madras against the order of dismissal
the Inspector General of Police dated 5th April 1884 your petition
addressed the Inspector General of Police on the subject of h
dismissal and prayed that his case might be reviewed by t
fresh light thrown thereon, but that the Inspector General (
A. Parsons having stated that as petitioner's case had b
disposed of by his predecessor in office he could not reope
without the sanction of the government of Madras, and t
thereupon your petitioner memorialized the government of
Madras by petition a second time, wherein he exposed

how
who

from him that on reading it ou to his surprise it was
it was as if addressed by himself with his initial A. F. rdera
brought against you by L was dismissed that you need hete
in future that you should exert yourself for confirm
and that if you write to me I shall reply" that he did not
any more such letters in the Registers and that he brou
same to the notice of the authorities.

That your petitioner thereupon requested the D
Post Master of Singapore post office to see in the Registers i
any more entered like this, that the Deputy Post Mas

Late Inspr of Police Nagpur

ation
Copies of your p
with all the enclosures to
ment of Madras, and the
are herewith transm

No.

Dated 10th May 1891

Received 13 — Do —

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Praying for restoration

May 1891)

[illegible] his evil [illegible]

in Naggri on the 17th January [illegible] were petiti

tioned on that date with an additional le

empts answer the weight of the above let

urrency note of 100 Rs he intended to enclose

usual Course reached Arcot on the 20th Ja

which cover he introduced the above l

note and fraudulently to petitioner by hi

22nd February 1884 more than a month after

e despatch of petitioner's home letter on the 17th Janu

That either your petitioner's letter of the

e 15th January 1884 from Tiruvanaveram or the c

bearing the Naggri post mark of the 17th Ja

ed by no possibility give cover to currency not

Rs 100 which had not until 18th left the hands

Lakm

---

of most wholesale s[illegible] prosecuted the

dship that he is in need of words to express

tressful and tormenting Condition he is driven to, in

sequence of his dismissal from his appointment

e mischief of the said [illegible], and therefore

quests that your royal Clemency will be pleased

to review the records of his fresh appeal and kindly

nsider the circumstances attending the case, and favor

im with an order of restoration to his appointment.

That petitioner being fully convinced of your

rdships generosity and power to relieve the distresses,

and your humanity to every one in distress he is filled

with Cheerful hopes that his request will meet

with a favorable reception and that your Lordship

will reflect with pleasure that your bounty has

rescued him from misery and enabled him to enjoy

ose comforts of life to which he has been a

tranger since some time of his removal from

berth.

For this Act of Charity and Kindness petitioners in duty bound will ever pray for your long life and prosperity.

Petitioner begs to Remain

[illegible]
[illegible]
May 1891

Your Lordships most obedt. and humble Servant.

that w   ray corr

r. Laul tamp red with your petitioner

January 1884 written from Naraimanaram

ed it and the currency note for Rs. 100 which

rchased from Mallie Ghulam House Sait

January into the concocted cover bearing

post mark of the 17th January 1884 and w

d Arcot on the 20th idem

That Shurumuk Laul's letter to your petitio

21st June 1883 proposing a transfer with th

a Inspector Narayana Iyer who was a fri

Superintendent was practically given

appointment of the said Madura Su

place of Petitioner on his unjust dismiss

That the case against your petitioner is

conspiracy hatched by Shurumuk Laul the circ

writte

---

upon the whole

Chief Secretary. That thereupon petitioner wrote

Mylapore Post Office and found out that a reg

letter has gone to the Inspector of Arcot on the

April 1890 No. 582, and delivered to Shurumuk Laul

Inspector of Chowdapallay, that its contents wa

about petitioner's case purporting to have bee

written by the manager of the Police Office, that

was another registered letter entered in the Regist

the 31st March 1890 No. 562 to have gone to the address

the Inspector of Police Vellore, and that petition

being unable to ascertain by correspondence

the post Offices to whom No. 562 was delivered,

mitted all the above for the information of Govern

on the 10th July and 3rd October 1890 respectively.

That the Honourable Government on perusal of

the above 3 petitions advised petitioner by order No.

of the 10th October 1890 that it is resolved to withho

the above petition of the 23rd January 1890 under

XII (8) of the rules relating to the transmission of

Memorials to the Secretary of State for reopening

Case and reconsidering the circumstances of petitio

dismiss

rteous
f your au[illegible] [illegible]ication since
the work to his subordinates who as you
dibly informed at the time by means of an
ted 30th December 1888 tampered with [illegible] er
d.

That on the further report sent on his
ent of Madras by its Order No 90 dated 23 J
to reopen the subject of your petitioners
sal from the public service.

That the Government of Madras in re
etitioner the enclosures to his said petit
the 2 post Cards aforesaid and that the
urther correspondence between your p
Government of Madras with the result
erson in holding that it had sent the

Late an Inspector

a part the whole story and misrepresented the
e to the Government, tho' the Government of course,
ly unaware of the underhand works, confided
on this report, and dismissed the second Appeal also.

That the Government in revising petitioner's
the above order of dismissal of the 23rd January 1890
turned the petitioner's documents minus the two post
rds which formed the ground of his second appeal
entirely falsifying the charge against him by
proving that the currency note was in the hands of
tain Sowcar at Madras after the date of the letter
lleged to have contained the note - that petitioner
sked the Government for the return of the Cards and
nother letter that was also missing, that Government
returning the letter only informed that the post cards
ere already returned, that petitioner pointed out to
overnment by the records that they were not returned
him as stated by Government.

That petitioner thereupon forwarded his
ppeal to His Excellency the Secretary of State, through
is Government, setting forth all the above in detail
on

on the 30.
without being record   that officer de
without the previous sanction of the Gov
being obtained, and that your petition
his second petition aforesaid to the Gov
on the 1st May 1888 wherein he entered in
ject matter of the case meet the new aspect
forwarding at the same time the original letter of
your petitioner together with Sutkanaiji said
Ghulam Ghause said advising him of the re
rency note and the latter's post card of acknowle
the Government of Madras referred his said pe
spector General of Police Colonel Porteous for his
That in pursuance of the reference afor
ernment of Madras, the Inspector General of
your petitioner to Ootacamund, and there ex
im

No. 2 S/9
J.S.D. also like
10th Oct. 90. No. [illegible]
[illegible]
sent to [illegible]
from the [illegible]

Inspector of Police Narayan
Division North Arcot Dis

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That petitioner most resp
fully begs to submit the following few lines for yo
Lordships kind and benign consideration and or
hoping that you will be pleased to excuse him f
thus intruding upon your precious moments.

That your petitioner having been dism
from the post of Police Inspectorship by the late Insp
General Colonel Guthrie for an ungrounded Con
charge of sending a currency note of 100 Rs. No. 43258
a letter of petitioner of the 15th January 1884 to his sup
intendent Mr. C. S. B. Stevenson as bribe, appealed to
Honorable Government for an order of restoration; th
Government having referred the petition to the said
Inspector General for report thereupon dismissed

That petitioner subsequently by chance discov
some

25. April 1[illegible])

of the postcards was, as directed by
Members, placed together with
the papers bearing on the case in
Colonel Weldon's hands. The pap
were handed to the Commissioner
Police by the Under Secretary in pers
on the arrival of the latter at M
from Ootacamund last year. Colon
Weldon has made verbal enquiries
in the office himself and thro' the
Assistant Commissioner at various
times since then, and only lately
sent up some questions in regard to
the papers, which were answered &
returned to him. The four reminder
referred to by the Petitioner are
almost identical with that whic
the Honorable Member has received
and were, as they contain no ma
not already before Govt. or the Comm
of Police, ordered to lie over pending
Colonel Weldon's report on receipt of
which they will be taken up. A
reminder would have been sent to
CA

Las an Dalmony

late Inspector of Police

of Naraimanceram

No.

Dated 25·4·91

Received 27·4·91

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Praying for reinstatement to his post

Note The ... and second remainder was taken out by the M's in the ... verbally told him that E.H.W. had only lately been supplied with answers to certain queries from the Secy in regard to the case. CS

Lie over pending C.S.'s relation report.

CS 5/5

Apr 26/4 2 PM

Los an Inspector

roar from it, but by your Royal Clemency as is accustomed to no other means of livelihood save that of his pen.

That Petitioner has passed the General Police Inspectors' Test (criminal lower grade) sanitation lower grade - and Precis writing higher grade.

That petitioner has submitted for the consideration of the Honorable Government by means of 3 petitions of the 17th December 1890 and 6th February and 1st April 1891 reminding of the violence of his distressful circumstances. That your Lordship and the Honorable members of Government have not been pleased still to open their gracious eyes upon petitioner to relieve him from his agonizing misery.

10. That your petitioner therefore most earnestly implores that your Lordship will be speedily pleased to take the above into deep consideration and quench the thirst of a poor drooping family, as the cloudes protect the crops from withering away, by ordering petitioner to be restored to his appointment.

And Petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray &c.

Petitioner Begs to Remain

Your Excellency's Most Obedt. and humble servant.

H. Autetumana Mudely

Big Nattam
Chingleput.
25th April 1891

Inspector of Police Karaina.

Division North Arcot Dis

Most humbly Sheweth

1 That your Excellency's petitioner hav been dismissed from the post of Police Inspectorship b the late Inspector General Colonel Guthrie for an ungrounded Concocted Charge of sending a Currency Note of 100 Rs N: 43258 in a letter of petitioner of the 15th January 1884 to his Superintendent Mr. E. S. B. Stevenson as a bribe; appealed to government for an order of restoration, that government having referred the petition to the said Inspector General for report and thereupon dismissed it.

2 That petitioner subsequently by chance discovering some fresh and important grounds forwarded his appeal again to government, that the same was referred to Colonel Porteous the then Inspector General for enquiry and report that officer very carefully and minutely enquired and reported the result to government. the

is, and disposed it of by dismissal.–

That government in advising petitioner such order of dismissal of the 23d January 1890, turned the petitioners documents with the exception the two post Cards, which formed the Chief ground or his second Appeal, and which entirely falsified the Charge by proving that the Currency Note was in the hands of a certain Sowcar at Madras after the ate of the letter alleged to have contained the Note. hat petitioner asked the government for the return of the Cards and another letter that missed from the records, that the government in returning the letter only informed that the Cards were already returned, that petitioner pointed out to government by its own records that they were not returned as stated by government.–

4.– That petitioner thereupon forwarded his Appeal to His Excellency the Secretary of State through the Honorable government, setting forth all the above in detail on the 23d June 1890.–

5.– That petitioner subsequently learnt from the Police Chief Office that the above missing post Cards were

Inspector of Arcot on the 8th April 1890 No. 582 & delivered to Stiruvanat Lant. Inspector of Choudap– that it contained about petitioner's Case purportin to have been written by the manager of the Police Ch office, that there was another registered letter on th 31st March 1890 No. 562, entered in the Registers to have gone to the address of the Inspector of Police Vellore that petitioner is unable to ascertain by correspondnc with the post offices, to whom No. 562 was delivered and that these facts petitioner has submitted to co government by his petitions of the 10th July and 3d October 1890 respectively.

6.– That the Honorable government on perusal of the above 3 petitions advised petitioner by its order of the 10th October 1890 that it is resolved to withhold the petitioner's petition at present under Rule XII (8) of the rules relating to the transmission of memorials to the Secretary of State, for reopening the case and reconsidering the circumstances of petitioner's dismissal that it is six months since and nothing has been known as yet.–

That

roar from it but by your Royal Clemency as
is accustomed to no other means of livelihood save
that of his pen.

That Petitioner has passed the General
Police Inspectors' Test (Criminal lower grade)
sanitation lower grade - and Precis writing higher grade -

That petitioner has submitted for the consideration
of the Honorable Government by means of 3 petitions of the 17th
December 1890 and 6th February and 1st April 1891 reminding of the
violence of his distressful circumstances: that your Lordship
and the Honorable members of Government have not been pleased
still to open their gracious eyes upon petitioner to relieve
him from his agonizing misery.

That your petitioner therefore most earnestly
10. implores that your Lordship will be speedily pleased to take
the above into deep consideration and quench the thirst of a
poor drooping family as the clouds protect the crops from
withering away, by ordering petitioner to be restored to his
appointment.

And Petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray &c.

Petitioner Begs to Remain
Your Excellency's Most Obedt and humble Servant.
Hutteman Amdely

Big Natham
Chingleput.
25th April 1891

Late an Inspector
Narayanavaram Division
North Arcot District

No.

Dated 1st } April 1891
Received 6th }
Enclosures "

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be restored to his former appointment of Inspectorship.

Lie over pending Colonel Weldon's report
20/4

Cl
20/4

Late an Inspector

Police

late Inspector of
Narayanavaram Divi
North Arcot Distric

Most Respectfully Sheweth

1. That your Lordship's peti
was unjustly dismissed from the appointm
of Police Inspectorship by the late Inspe
General Colonel Guthrie, upon a false a
ungrounded malicious accusation of sendi
a currency Note of 100 Rupees No. $\frac{B}{79}$ 43258
the Superintendent of Police Mr. C. S. B. Stevenso
by post, with petitioners letter of the 15th
January 1884 in the way of bribe. —

2. That your petitioner had prove
to the satisfaction of Government both b
respectable witnesses and authentic docum
that petitioner had not sent the Note; tha
the Note was since found out to have been
in

ble as he was already in bad terms w
titioner.

3 That several humbugs and mis-
ieves were played by the said Shumunk Lant
his friends, with the documents which
ere material for the ends of justice in
etitioner's favor, while his appeal was
eading disposal by government.

4. That this fact has since, of itself,
rovidentially come to the notice of
government, that thereupon the government
advised petitioner by its order of the 10th
ctober 1890 No. 1579, that it has resolved to
ith hold petitioner's memorial to the
Secretary of State dated 23rd June 1890, for
he purpose of the government reopening the
Case.

5. That it is six months since, nothing
has turned up as yet, and petitioner's distressful
circumstances

favor to par[illegible] of your royal
which delights in bringing relief to the
afflicted.

6. That your petitioner therefore
humbly prays by means of this, to obta
that indulgent consideration of bring
restored to his former appointment o
Inspectorship, which he has no doub
that your Lordship's humane dispositio
will deem his distressful case deserv
of, that through the benevolence of yo
grace he may live as a grateful
monument of your Lordship's roya
clemency.

And petitioner as in duty bound wil
ever pray.

Petitioner Begs to Remain
Your

Lai an Inspector
late Police Sup.

No.

Dated 6th Feb/81

Received 8th "
Do press 10th "
Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Praying for restoration.

To lie over pending
Col. Weldon's report.

W
20/2

Rej 13/2

Lent an Inspector

[illegible] works at [illegible]

Sturmuk Land, who was the bottom and [illegible]ence of petitioners misery; justice is not favored [illegible] petitioner.

That petitioner is quite innocent, as already [illegible]plained, of the offence he is maliciously charged [illegible] with, and that to torture him and his children [illegible] in the manner they are done for no lawful reason [illegible] at all, is not just and charitable for this government.

That petitioner therefore most earnestly [illegible]mplores your Lordship's mercy to view his case and favor him with justice, and thus relieve him and his distressed family from the miserable condition they are now driven to.

For this act of kindness petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petitioner humbly begs to remain
Your Excellency's most obedient servant

6th February 1891.

H. Ketelmann [illegible]

C. N. Lutchmana
late Police Inspector of
North Arcot District
living in Big Vatham, Chingle

Most Humbly Sheweth.

That in Continuation of his petition of the 17th December last, petitioner most earnestly submits for your Lordships generous Consideration that the distressful and indigent circumstance he and his lar family are sinking under for the last 7 ye since his unjust dismissal from his ap-pointment, urges him to forward this for reminding your Lordship of the Order of the Government No. 1579, dated 10th October, las

That as already submitted, petitioner is no more able to satisfy the hunger of his poor Children fainting from want of the necessaries of life, unless fortunately the Almi

is

SECRETARY
18 DEC 90

Late an Inspector of Police
N. Arcot Dt.

No.—

Dated 17
Received 18 } Decr 90
Enclosures

SUBJECT.
Restoration

Precis pck 2484

Lie over pending
Col. Weldon's report.

6 Jan

Put up papers already seen please?
This is suggested as the Chief Secretary appears to have handed over a petition to Col Weldon on the 6th October. Please see pencil entry by Col. Weldon at the ~~[illegible]~~ foot of copy of D.O. to him. (in G.O. 1579. of 10.10.90)—

C.S.
6/1/91

No, it seems hardly necessary to send it. I have marked it to lie over.
6/1

10 N. Letchumana moon

SECRETARY
15 DEC 90
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

sp

nestly entreats, and implores your Lordship

weigh the evidence and circumstances and

pleased to administer him justice, and

thus relieve the pining family from

the distress they are driven to and restore

them to consolation.

For this act of kindness and

Indulgence Petitioner as in duty bound

pray

Petitioner humbly begs to Remain

Most Gracious Lord

Your Lordship's most Obedt and Humble Servant

N. Latchumana Moodely

Chinglepaut
Bu Nathan
7th December
1890

in this case on refusive terms of [illegible]

6. That the said Shurmunt Lan[illegible]

being since petitioner's dismissal, pro[illegible]

to Inspectorship, has the influence to

purchase and employ men in all direc[illegible]

to work on his behalf, and to undermine

and weaken the case and thus in every possi[illegible]

ways to mislead the Government from the li[illegible]

of justice.

7. That petitioner believes [illegible]

facts now come to light will certainly [illegible]

your Excellency of the underhand work [illegible]

this case; and that such was the case from the

beginning.

8. That petitioner begs to sub[illegible]

that in his particular case, no special [illegible]

would have been taken of the records, a[illegible]

the length of the time taken by Governmen[illegible]

for its disposal, as petitioner believes [illegible]

appear-

[illegible] ings of his pen [illegible]

[illegible]rnment [illegible]

That petitioner's unjust dismissal

[illegible] his appointment as Inspector of Police

North West District, on a conspired, un-

founded false charge trumped up against

him by some evil motives of the Superintendent

of Police, inspired by his circuit clerk Shurmunt

[illegible] who was in bad terms with petitioner,

[illegible] have been quite plain from the

[illegible] brought to notice.

[illegible]at petitioner and his young [illegible]

[illegible] the last very near 7 years i.e. from

the 5 April 1884, on which date he was dismissed

from the service, are reduced to the greatest

extremity and hardships for want of the necessaries

of life, and their distress is [illegible] possible

[illegible]ute out of the consideration of the merciful

Government, as there is a Hindu proverb "that

[illegible] bullock's pain would not be felt by crows"

[illegible] the Honorable Government would if

pleased

The humble Petition

C. N. Lutchmana [illegible] late

class Inspector of Police of

Narayanavaram Division N.

Arcot District

most humbly Sheweth,

That Petitioner humbly begs to

acknowledge the receipt of Government Order

No. 1579, dated 10th October 18[illegible] [illegible]

that his Appeal Memorial

State for India dated 23 - [illegible]

were withheld for the present [illegible]

with a view to reconsider the circum

under which petitioner was dismissed [illegible]

the further enquiries which it is intended to

make into the matters now brought to ligh

tend to the belief to do so

2 - That in doing so, petitioner most

respectfully begs to submit for the generous

Consideration of your Excellency, that he was

ma

again ~ your petitioner in this
from the beginning, with the intentio
of ruining him entirely by defeating
justice.

5 That your petitioner there
earnestly requests that your Excellen
will be pleased to call, for the informat
through the Post Master General report
the disposal of the said Register
No. D. 512 of the 31st March
Mylapore post office as certainly
Inspector of Police Vellore, and
for your Lordship's satisfaction
whom the Cards were sent to the sa
Shurmuk Saab, and administer
justice to this long distressed Petition

For this act of kindness and
benevolence Petitioner as in

~~[illegible]~~ with this case are not delivered

to Sreenivink Laul, but actually delivered

the Inspector of Police Vellore, and

receipt obtained, then Register letter

[illegible] 582 which was addressed to the

Inspector of Police Arcot, and delivered

[illegible]ink Laul Inspector of Police

[illegible] Division, the subject

[illegible] had connection to

[illegible] same extent must have

[illegible] the Cards in question,

[illegible] will be ascertained

Postage labels affixed on the

[illegible] bare letter that contained

[illegible] lines, as stated by

[illegible] Iyer would not be of

[illegible] of a tollas weight.

That

benevolence