

Rebenn {189 } Department

N. 53.

From

688-
The Collector,

Godavari District.

No. A

Dated

Despatched

Received

16 FEB 92

1892

Three Enclosures

No.

SUBJECT.

Reporting on the telegram
of Langapu Langial Appawar
and stating that the allegations
therein contained are not true.

Confidential B

Godavari District

Magistrate's Office

Bureau and a.

Dated 12th February 92.

740

From

J. H. Hammett Esquire

Offg. District Magistrate, Godavari

To

The Chief Secretary to

Government, Madras.

Sir

With reference to the endorsement
on Current no 438 and in continuation
of my report no A dated 11.2.92 on Current
no 288, I have the honor to return herewith the
papers noted in the margin) which were forwarded
to me for report.

1. Telegram Current
no 288.

2. Petition of S. Saugale
Appawar

3. Endorsement no 1086
30.10.91
marked A, given to
B. Dalappa by M. Council.

4. Notice no 375 marked B
given to B. Dalappa.

5. English translation of
Mahagar.

6. Mahagar petition
dated -

2. My report no A fully explains all the
circumstances of the case but there are
some new points raised in the printed
petition, Current no 438, about which I
would offer the following remarks.
(a) The allegation in para 2 of the petition

to the effect that the petitioners showed me
the Municipal Council's sanction to keep
the shed till 31-1-92 is false. On the
contrary they never urged this as a reason
for keeping up the shed knowing probably
that I would have moved the Council to
cancel the previous sanction as being
granted for too long a period.

(b) The fact of my having ordered the
removal of the shed on the Pongal feast day
is not at all to the point. The petitioners'
admissions show that the erection of the
shed had no connection with the Pongal.

(c) The allegation in para 6 that I ordered
Assistant Inspector Kern to pull down the
shed and that he hesitated is quite
false. I asked him to hold my
horse and that is why he did not
get the shed taken down and why I
was obliged to personally get the
bystanders to remove it.

(d) The allegations about my ordering

a pariah Constable to interfere is also
false. There was a constable I remember
came up after I had mounted and was
riding away and he went towards the
shed. I think I did tell him to see that
the shed was removed, for, as I have stated
in my previous report, I rode off before
its removal.

(e) The petitioner's remark that acts such as
they describe would lead to a breach of
the peace is quite true and their admission
that there was no breach of the peace shows
the falsehood of the allegations.

3. In my previous report no A I referred
to a petition presented to Mr Hapell complaining
about my interference with the religious
practices of the Hindus in burying their
dead and submitted a copy of my
report thereon marked M(31). On referring
to the records in the District Magistrate's Office
since despatch of my report, I find that
the petition in question was not presented
to Mr Hapell but was sent to Government

MO
CE,
189

ed. transferred to Mr. Hapell. (vide
the enclosed copy submitted herewith). The
similarity of the false allegations in this
petition and in Current no 138 and the
allusions in both to the "Indian Magna charta"
or the "blessed Queen's proclamation of 1857"
show I think pretty clearly, that my confidential
information that both petitions have a common
origin is correct.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

W. H. H. H.
Off. Dist. Magistrate.

Nov 189

CURRENT NO. 740

Judicial
Revenue {1892} Department.

From
The Collector & Magistrate.
Godavari District.

CONFIDENTIAL. No. 53
No. B. CHIEF SECRETARY
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
17 FEB 92

Dated 12 }
Despatched 12 } 2 - 1892
Received 17 }

Enclosure No. 7 One
C. No 288 returned
3 S.C of C. No. 438
3 Enclosures to C. No. 438
SUBJECT.

Reporting on the new point
raised interpretation of
Language Panchab Apparatu,
Current no 288.

C. No 288, C. No 438,
C. No 711 & this

For orders
19 Feb.
20 Feb.

It was unfortunate that Mr.
Hamnett proceeded to cause the
removal of the shed on the pongal
fest day and before the date fixed
in his own order. It would also have
been better if he had not himself
used any violence at all in enforcing
his order. But it is also clear that
the petition & telegram in the
matter are grossly exaggerated &
probably prompted by persons of
evil disposition who want Mr.
Hamnett's official action. In these
circumstances the petition should
be endorsed that Govt. having
enquired into the matter finds
that petitioner's statements are
misstatements and that there
is no ground for interference.

Done 24 Feb. 1892
H. H. 6/10/92 So do I
to Mr.

Confidential
No. C

Judicial DISTRICT
MAGISTRATE'S OFFICE,
Cocanada, 16th February 1892

818

FROM

J. H. Hamnett Esquire,
Offy District Magistrate,
Godavari.

TO

The Chief Secretary to
Government, Madras.

SIR,

In continuation of my confidential
no A dated 11-2-92, I have the honor to
enclose the office copy of Mr. Moberly's
confidential report about Y. L. Karasimhan
and copy of my judgment in the
defamation case brought by him against
K. Veeresalingam, which I have referred
to, in the above letter.

2. I request that these enclosures
may be returned when no longer
required.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
J. H. Hamnett
Offy Dist Mag

Judicial Dept
Magisterial { 1892 } Department.

From
The District Magistrate,
Godavari.

No. C

Dated 16 21 FEB 92
Despatched 16 2 1892.
Received
Enclos: 2

SUBJECT.

Forwarding Mr. Incherly's
report about Mr. Y. L. Narasimham
& joint Magistrate's judgment
in C.C. 42 and requesting
that they may be returned when no
longer required.

Submitted in continuation of
previous correspondence on the
same subject regarding Mr. Kammet's
alleged desecration of a temple.
The papers referred to by Mr.
Incherly in his confidential
Note are not available but a
Local & Muni's report on the same
subject is put up.

Nothing (has) found
There seems no objection by perusing these
papers. It appears to have been quite
unsuccessful and useless.

Papers sent on. There seems to be
no objection.
immaterial
2 Mar

523-10-2-92
given to city
18/3/92

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 18, No.

Again G.O., dated 18, No.

Current No. 288 of 1892, dated 21st Jan from the Private Secy.

438 " 1892, " " S. Sangaiah Ayyararlu

509 " " 5 Febry " D.W. Godavari - Tel.

711 " " 11 " " D.W. Godavari - M. A.

Current No. 740 of 18 92, dated 12 " from

818 " " , dated 16 " " do. - M. C.

Order. 18 March 92 A-5-23.

The Petitioner will be informed that
Govt, having enquired into the matter of
his complaint, finds that his statements
are untrue and that there is no ground for
its interference.

(From Order)

Sangaiah Ayyararlu
Priest of Derangies
Rayammund

D.W.
Godavari (with two enclosures
to Offy. D.W.'s letter No. C of
16.2.92 returned).

DESPATCHED
22 MAR 92
IN M.S.

Copied 19/3

Confidential No. 43-A
1892.

Judicial	DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED	16. 3. 92
No.	523
Series.	Mis

Confidential.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition from Sangapa
** Sangiah Ayyarartha against*
the protest of Desangies against
3.4
Mr. Hammett Sub. Collector
of Godavari