

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 130

DATED 19th Jan. 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

CONVICTS

Declining to interfere with the sentence passed on convict Rama-
-swami Gounden confined in the Madras Penitentiary.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O.	214		7-1-295				

Nominal Roll of Convict No. 6508 Ramasamy Gaundam

Crime	Sentence.	Date of Sentence.	Adjudicating Court.	Present	State of Health.	Conduct in Jail.	Result of the Appeal to Appellate Court.	Number of previous convictions if any and remarks.
Secd 114, 302 & 148.	Transportation for life.	11 August 1894	Sessions Judge Madura	11/2/95	Good	Good	Dismissed.	No previous convictions.

Pris Penitentiary office
Madras 11 December 1894.

Deo Sooddy
Superintendent of Prison Jail,

To

His Excellency,
The Right Honorable,

BEILBY LAWLY,

BARON WENLOCK, G.C.I.E.,

Governor-in-Council,

Fort Saint George.

The humble Memorial of RAMASAMI GAUNDAN
late Village Munsif of Vannivelampatti, in Tiru-
mangalam Talak, in the District of Madura, but
now a prisoner, undergoing imprisonment in Her
Majesty's Penitentiary, Madras.

SHREWETH,

That Your Memorialist, the 1st prisoner and 10 others were charged before the Sessions Court of Madura, in Session Case, No. 39 of 1894—July Session—as follows: 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th prisoners with murder and rioting with a deadly weapon; offences punishable under Sections 302 and 148 of the Indian Penal Code; and the 1st (Your Memorialist) and 2nd prisoners with the abetment of the said offences, under Sections 114, 302 and 148 of the same Code.

2. That in the opinion of both the assessors at the trial—one a Muhammadan and the other a Brahman—Your Memorialist was pronounced not guilty; the finding of the 1st assessor being, that all the prisoners were not guilty, and that of the 2nd assessor, that all the prisoners, except the 1st (Your Memorialist) 8th and 11th were guilty of causing hurt.

3. That notwithstanding the opinion of the assessors to the contrary, as aforesaid, the Sessions Judge of Madura found Your Memorialist and all the other prisoners guilty, of the offences with which they were severally charged; and sentenced them to transportation for life.

4. That Your Memorialist and the other prisoners appealed against the sentence and finding of the Sessions Judge of Madura, to the High Court, at Madras, urging among other grounds, that the evidence for the prosecution, whether as to the commission of the offences, or the identity of the accused, was interested, discrepant, meagre, and unreliable; that the implication of the accused in the commission of the offences, was an after-thought; and that the gradual development of the prosecution showed, that it was a conspiracy, on the part of designing persons, to implicate the accused; but the High Court, relying, as usual, on

findings of facts, by a lower Court, dismissed the appeal; and, in doing so, observed that "the attack upon a man engaged in what was regarded as a sportsman-like trial of skill, was brutal and cowardly, and deserving of severe punishment; but at the same time, they—the learned Judges—thought that transportation for life was too severe a penalty. They have therefore directed that the records shall be submitted for the consideration of Your Excellency in Council."

5. That, while Your Memorialist fully endorses the justice of the observation, made by the learned Judges, as to the brutality and cowardice of attacking a man engaged in a fair trial of skill, he still regrets, that their Lordships did not see their way to discriminate Your Memorialist's case, from that of the other prisoners, and this unhappy result, Your Memorialist is forced to admit, was, in a great measure, due to the mistake Your Memorialist had made, in filing a joint-appeal with the other prisoners, instead of going before the High Court with a separate appeal, and engaging Counsel, solely and specially devoted to his defence, to argue his case.

6. That the case for the prosecution, as narrated in para. 3 of the Judgment of the Sessoids Judge of Madura, is briefly as follows: "A bull from Vannivelampatti, which was famous for its speed and ferocity, and had never been actually made captive in any Jellicut, was let loose at the Kattanipatti Jellicut, on the afternoon of the 2nd April 1894, with the usual challenge, that any one might seize it, who dared. Thereupon Muthukaruppa Tevan of Villur seized it by the hump, and Pattalatu Virabadra Tevan, also of Villur, caught it by the tail. Clinging to the bull, these two men were dragged along the western bank of the Teppa Kulam, where the 1st (Your Memorialist) and 2nd prisoners, the Village Munsiff and Kavalgar respectively, of Vannivelampatti, were standing on a cart. Seeing Muthukaruppa Tevan and Virabadra Tevan hanging on to the bull, these two prisoners shouted out to the Vannivelampatti men near them, "The Villur man has caught the famous bull of Vannivelampatti; beat him". Then Ambatta Sundram, the 4th prisoner smote Muthukaruppa Tevan on the nape of the neck, with a boomerang, and Otta Sundram, the 3rd prisoner, struck him on the head, on the side with a long stick. Muthukaruppa Tevan fell down and the men of Vannivelampatti, including the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th prisoners, rushed at him and beat him with sticks, pelted him with stones, and shot stones at him from pellet bows * * * Muthukaruppa Tevan died under the blows inflicted on him".

7. That the case for the prosecution, as far as Your Memorialist is concerned, is an after-thought, which has been gradually worked up by designing persons, becomes apparent, when one studies the history of the case and its origin, with an unprejudiced and unbiassed mind. Before commenting on the untrustworthy evidence of the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 9th and 10th prosecution-witnesses, who except the 7th witness, are related to one another as follows: 1st witness is the brother of the deceased, the 4th is his paternal uncle, the 5th is his nephew, the 6th is his wife's nephew, and the 3rd, 8th, 9th and 11th are his cousins, and who more or less, were persons mixed up in the Jellicut, and on whose stereotyped statements alone, the prisoners, including Your Memorialist, were found guilty and convicted by the Sessions Judge of Madura, Your Memorialist craves Your Excellency's attention to the facts set forth in the following paras.

8. That on the very day, that the riot is said to have occurred, the following Official Reports, were severally written by the Village Munsifs of Nallamaram, Lakshmipuram, and Villur. The first was Report, Exhibit D, written by the Acting Village Munsiff of Nallamaram to the Stationary Magistrate, Tirumangalam Taluk, and dated 2-4-94, stating "that a riot took place between the Agamudia Maravars of Villur and the Valayars of Vannivelampatti, within the limits of the said village, and serious hurt was caused". The next was Report, Exhibit F, written by the Village Munsiff of Lakshmipuram to the 2nd Class Magistrate, Viridhupatti Division and dated 2-4-94, 6 p.m., to the effect "that he heard that some Agamudia Maravars of Villur village and some Valayars of Vannivelampatti had come to see the sport, that a riot had ensued, and that a marava of Villur died, within the limits of Nallamaram Village, and that 2 or 3 persons were wounded; that he went to the place indicated and looked, but neither the corpse nor the wounded persons were there". The third was Report, Exhibit J, written by the Village Munsiff of Villur to the Station House Officer, Kallikudi and dated 2-4-94, 8 p.m. stating "that in the rioting which ensued at the Jellicut, Muthu Karuppa Tevan, son of Poochee Tevan was beaten and killed by some persons, that the corpse was brought to his village, that he went to see it, accompanied by some Mahajana ryots and that there were marks of blows with sticks on the nape of the neck, the chest and head." These same Village Munsiffs were examined as the 12th, 13th, and 15th witnesses respectively for the prosecution, and their evidence, as far as they bear upon your Memorialist's case will be considered further down.

9. That at 7 a.m. on the 3rd April 1894, the day following the riot, the Police appear to have held an inquest, after which, a Mahazar, written and addressed to Government, was subscribed by 18 respectable inhabitants of Villur, including the Village Munsiff, the village Maniem, and Annamalai Tevan, the brother of the deceased and 1st prosecution witness, who headed the list. The Mahazar, Exhibit III, was in the following terms: "It is ascertained from Annamalai Tevan (1st prosecution witness,) that he learnt that his younger brother Muttu Karuppa Tevan, son of Poochee Tevan of the said village, had gone to see the Jellicut at Kattanipatti during day time yesterday, and seized a bull, and some one had beaten him and that he was lying with wounds on his head, nape of the neck, back, &c., that thereupon he (i.e., Annamalai) went, lifted and brought the wounded man, and that when he was being carried near Karaikanni, the wounded man died, being unable to bear the pain caused by blows inflicted on him, and we have signed this." So it will be seen, that in the very earliest statement made by the brother of the deceased, there is not the remotest reference, by name or description, to Your Memorialist.

10. That on the 4th April 1894, the Station House Officer of Kallupatti, submitted an Occurrence Report—Exhibit XIX—to the 2nd Class Magistrate of Tirumangalam, in which, for the first time, particulars are given of the riot which ensued at the Jellicut. The Station House Officer examined the following 6 witnesses, viz., Sangli Tevan of Villur, Kudan, son of Moona Kuravan (probably the same as Muthukaruppa Koravan, the 7th prosecution witness), Sankara Tevan, Alaga Tevan, Suppan Chetti, son of Muthukaruppan Chetti, and Arunachala Tevan, son of Parasuraman Chetti; and their statements, as to the person, who incited the

Vannivelampatti men to beat the man, who had seized the bull, was severally as follows:—Sangli Tevan stated “that Vembuli Muppan of Vannivelampatti said Vellur fellow is seizing the bull, beat, beat;” Kudan “that Vannivelampatti Vembuli said beat the Thayoli;” Sankara Tevan, “that Vannivelampatti Vembuli Muppan said he has seized my bull, kick him,” and Alaga Tevan “that Vannivelampatti Vembuli Muppan and another said, he has seized the Vannivelampatti bull, beat”. The remaining two persons are silent on the point. Here also Your Excellency will be pleased to note, that no reference is made to Your Memorialist by any one of the men examined.

11. That on the following day, the 5th April 1894, the Station House Officer of Kalpatti, sent a second Occurrence Report—Exhibit XX—to the 2nd Class Magistrate of Tirumangalam, in which a further development is given to the prosecution story; and Your Memorialist's name is mentioned for the first time, as being one of the persons who incited the riot, at the Jellicut, which resulted in the death of Muthukaruppa Tevan. The Occurrence Report gives an account of the Station House Officer's proceeding to Kattanipatti on receiving a Takid, Exhibit L, from the Division Inspector, Panchapakesa Aiyar, the 22nd prosecution witness, who, Your Memorialist has reason to believe—for his own ends—gave form and shape to the prosecution case. The Occurrence Report states further, that the Station House Officer, on arriving there, learnt from the statements (which had been already taken down by Panchapakesa Aiyar,) of Peria Virabadra Tevan, Murugandi Tevan, the 5th prosecution witness, Ponnusami Tevan, the 4th prosecution witness, and Virabadra Tevan, the 2nd prosecution witness, that among other things, Your Memorialist and the 2nd prisoner incited the Vannivelampatti men at the Jellicut, to attack the deceased.

12. That it is a circumstance to be carefully noted, that of the 6 witnesses examined on the 4th April 1894—two days after the riot—by the Station House Officer of the Kalpatti, as reported in his 1st Occurrence Report—Exhibit XIX—not one has been called to support the prosecution; except, it is contended, that Kudan, son of Moona Koravan, is the same person as Muthukaruppa Koravan, the 7th prosecution witness. There is also the further fact, that a number of witnesses were examined before Usalampatti Magistrate, but they have been studiously kept out, lest their evidence should prove inconvenient for the prosecution.

13. That the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th witnesses for the prosecution, are men more or less related to one another, and interested in the case, as having been mixed up in the riot, that ensued at the Jellicut; and the burden of their evidence, given in an off-hand style, as far as it relates to Your Memorialist, was with slight variations as follows: Ramasami Gaundan (Your Memorialist) and Vembuli Muppan were standing on a cart, and said the Villur “men have seized the bull; beat them.”

14. That the following analysis of the evidence of the prosecution witnesses, so far only as it concerns Your Memorialist, will serve to show that the case brought against him, was an after-thought and the outcome of a conspiracy. Annamalai Tevan, the 1st prosecution witness, who says, that Your Memorialist and another man were standing on a cart and inciting the Vannivelampatti men to beat the men,

who had seized the bull at the Jellicut, is the same person, who on the very next day after the riot, made a statement, at the inquest on his brother's body, to the effect that he had learnt (not that he had been present and seen anything), that his younger brother Muthukaruppa Tevan met with his death, from a beating he had got at the Jellicut. This statement, as Your Excellency will observe, was embodied in the Mahazar-Exhibit III-submitted to Government on the 3rd April 1894, by the Village Munsif and 17 respectable inhabitants of Villur, including the witness himself whose signature is the first in the Mahazar. It was not till the 6th April 1894, or 4 days after the riot, that Annamalai Tevan made a statement, Exhibit II, before the Station House Officer of Kallikudi, in which for the first time he sought to implicate Your Memorialist. Sheik Budan Sahib, the 2nd prosecution witness, says nothing which concerns Your Memorialist. Virabadra Tevan, the 3rd prosecution witness, says that when Muthukaruppa Tevan seized the hump of the bull and was running with it, he caught its tail. The bull went some distance, and they went with it. While intent on pursuit and capture of the bull, he heard Your Memorialist and the 2nd prisoner say “they have caught the famous bull of our village; beat them.” This is a statement, the utter falsehood and improbability of which, must be evident to the commonest intellect. Ramasami Tevan, the 4th prosecution witness states, that he was an eye-witness to the attack on the deceased, and got a beating for his interposing. He says, that Ramasami Gaundan, Your Memorialist, was in a cart and the 2nd prisoner was standing in front of it, and both said, “A Villur man has seized the bull; beat him.” The statement of the witness varies from that of the other so called eye-witnesses, in a material point. These have all asserted, that both Your Memorialist and the 2nd prisoner were standing in a cart. Furthermore this witness is said to have mentioned to the Police Inspector, 2 days after the riot, that he went to the scene of the attack only on hearing, that Muthukaruppa Tevan had been beaten and knocked down. How this statement is reconcilable with the later statement of the witness before the Session Court, to the effect, that it was at the instigation of Your Memorialist and the 2nd prisoner, that the deceased had been attacked, does not appear plain or easy to Your Memorialist. Murugandi Tevan, the 5th prosecution witness, says, that he was present at the Jellicut, when the bull was let loose; that Muthukaruppa and Virabadra went and seized it, and came running with it, and that Ramasami Gaundan (Your Memorialist) and Vembuli Muppan said, the Villur man has seized the bull; go and beat him. The transparent falsehood of the statement becomes evident, when it is compared with that made by him to the Police, embodied in Exhibit XXII, wherein he stated, to quote his own evidence, “they said at 5 nalgays before sunset that Vannivelampatti men had beaten and killed a Villur man and were beating those that went there. I ran. Ramasami Gaundan, Village Munsiff of Vannivelampatti (Your Memorialist) and Vembuli Muppan said,” It is a Villur fellow that has come, “beat him,” or with that other statement made by him at a latter development of the case, before the committing magistrate, which was in the following words:—“I went to see the sport, I was within the crowd, they said a Villur man had been beaten and had died. I ran to see, then Ramasami Gaundan (Your Memorialist) and Vembuli Muppan said, “beat the Villur fellows whosoever may come.” Viranan, the 6th prosecution witness, says, he was an eye witness to the attack on the deceased and that the assailants had been instigated by Ramasami Gaundan

(Your Memorialist) and the 2nd, prisoner. This witness says in his cross-examination that he was interviewed by the Inspector on the 3rd day; but this is untrue and improbable. The Inspector would have made reference to this witness, in his diary, Exhibit XXIII. Muthukaruppa Koravan, the 7th prosecution witness gives the same story as the preceding witnesses, except the 2nd, and, says that one Muthukarappa Tevan and Virabadra, seized the bull. Ramasawmy Gaundan (Your Memorialist) and the 2nd prisoner, said "He has seized the bull of our village; don't let him go; beat him." If this witness is the same as Kudan, son of Moona Kuravan, mentioned in Occurrence Report—Exhibit XIX—then it is clear, he made a very different statement before the Station House Officer of Kalpatti; for in the Occurrence Report, he is said to have stated, that when Muthukaruppa Tevan seized the bull and went hanging on it, Vannivelampatti Vembuli, the 2nd prisoner, said "beat the Thayoli." No reference whatsoever was made by him, in respect to your Memorialist. Muruga Tevan the 8th prosecution witness supports the previous witnesses except the 2nd, and he evidently got the story from them. The same remarks would apply to the evidence of Kaliani Tevan, the 9th, and Periamuthu Tevan, the 10th witnesses, for the prosecution. These men, as well as Muruga Tavan the 8th witness, were forced to admit in their cross-examination, that they had been spoken to by the Head Constable, before their examination by the Committing Magistrate. This alone ought to speak volumes in support of the theory for the defence, that the case against Your Memorialist was the outcome of a conspiracy, got up by Panchapakesa Aiyar, the 12th prosecution witness, of whom presently, and his myrmidons. The evidence of the next 11 witnesses for the prosecution, from the 11th to the 21st inclusive, does in no way touch Your Memorialist. Of Panchapakesa Aiyar, the Division Inspector, the 22nd witness, it must be said that there is not the least doubt that it was he, who gave that development to the prosecution story, which has resulted in mixing up Your Memorialist in the case. According to his diary, Exhibit XVIII, he appears to have examined a number of witnesses of whom none have come forward to support him, except Muthukaruppa Koravan. He seems to have made further enquiries of which nothing is known except a desultory reference to them in Occurrence Report, Exhibit XX, of the Station House Officer of Kalpatti. This witness's motive to implicate Your Memorialist and others, clearly arises from a desire on his part to rehabilitate himself in the good opinion of his superior officers, before whom he was often brought up for misconduct, carelessness and breach of discipline. He often got black marks; and on his own admission, he was reduced from 3rd to 4th grade Head Constable. Here was a fine opportunity to work up a "*Cause celebre*" and, he has so far met with success; Your Memorialist's respectability and status lending a flavour to the case for the prosecution.

15. That it is astounding, how in the face of so many contradictions, pointed out in the foregoing para, the prosecution witnesses can be said to have made good the case for the Crown, while no notice whatever is taken of the prosecution witnesses the 2nd, 11th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th 21st, the really and disinterested witnesses in the case, who say nothing to implicate Your Memorialist. The following witnesses have to some extent supported Your Memorialist. Mootharasu Tevan, the village Munsiff of Lakshmipuram, the 13th prosecution witness, says in his cross-Examination, that he did not see either Ramasawmy Gaundan (Your Memorialist) or Vembuli Muppan at the place where the Jellicut was held;

and Sesha Aiyangar, Village Munsiff of Viilur, says he was present when Mahazar, Exhibit III, was read out in the presence of Annamalai Tevan, the 1st prosecution witness, and that the latter signed it, of his free will. In the said Mahazar, which contained the result of the inquest, held over the body of the deceased Muthukaruppa Tevan, it is stated that the same Annamalai Tevan gave information at the inquest stating that he had learnt, that his younger brother Muthukaruppa Tevan son of Poochee Tevan had at the Jellicut, on the previous day, seized a bull and some one had beaten him, and that sometime after he had died from the effects of the beating.

16. That under the foregoing circumstances, it must appear evident to any unprejudiced mind, that Your Memorialist is the victim of a conspiracy. The case against him is purely fictitious, and there is little doubt in Your Memorialist's mind, that it was mainly got up by Panchapacasa Aiyar (the Division Inspector) the 22nd witness for the prosecution. There is a strong under-current of facts which go to show, that the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th witnesses who, with the exceptions of the Koravan, are all persons related to the deceased man, were worked up and manipulated by the Inspector; or otherwise there is no reasonable way of accounting for the very gradual growth of the story for the prosecution, and the attempt, so far unfortunately, successful on his part, to set up that there was a strong anxiety on the part of the Villur people, to stifle the prosecution, as against Your Memorialist is untenable. There is no evidence of any kind, good, bad or indifferent to support this preposterous view.

The genesis of the case must have been as follows: The Vannivalampatti men were mixed up in the affray; whether true or false, it was alleged, that a Vannivalampatti bull was let loose at the Jellicut; a riot ensued; and a Villur man was killed. Under these circumstances what was the most natural thing to be expected, but that the Vannivalampatti Munsiff (Your Memorialist) was himself present at the scene, and that he incited the Vannivalampatti men to attack the Villur men, who were audacious enough to attack their bull. This idea being caught up by the Inspector, it was not difficult for his Brahman brain, to work up the whole case, into a very plausible story, and thereby earn a cheap reputation for vigilance, tact and skill, and regain the good opinion and confidence of his superiors in the Department, where hitherto he had been looked upon as a black sheep.

17. That Your Memorialist, although it is himself who says it, is eminently a man of peace. During his whole life time, he was never known to have been mixed up in any affray. And in token of his good character, popularity and other qualities, Your Memorialist has learnt with satisfaction, that the leading men and other respectable inhabitants of not only his own village, but of the villages around, within a radius of 5 miles, have submitted to Your Excellency, a Mahazar most numerous signed, praying that Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to reconsider the terrible sentence passed against Your Memorialist of transportation for life, which in Your Memorialist's case is equivalent to living death.

18. That Your Memorialist declares most solemnly, that he is absolutely guiltless of any complicity in the riot, which ensued at the Jellicut referred to in

previous paras; that in reality he was elsewhere at the time; that he knew nothing of the death of Muthukaruppa Tevan, until sometime after; that there was no attempt on Your Memorialist's part, or on that of his friends to stifle any prosecution, as against him, and that the prosecution itself, so far as it relates to Your Memorialist, is an after thought, and the outcome of a conspiracy, the leading spirit wherein was the Division Inspector, Panchapacasa Aiyar the 22nd witness for the prosecution.

19. That Your Memorialist craves leave to forward for easy reference, herewith, the printed judgment of the Sessions Judge of Madura, marked with the letter A; the printed records of the Sessions Case, No. 39 of 1894, before the Sessions Court of Madura, marked with the letter B, and wherein will be found the depositions of the prosecution witnesses, and the Exhibits, commented on, in the foregoing paras; and the judgment of the High Court, in Criminal Appeal No. 402 of 1894, dismissing the joint appeal of Your Memorialist and the other prisoners, and marked with the letter C.

20. That notwithstanding the reasons set forth in the foregoing paras, if Your Excellency, is of opinion that Your Memorialist is a guilty person, Your Excellency will be graciously pleased, to exercise in Your Memorialist's favor, the PREROGATIVE MERCY, vested in Your Excellency as the Illustrious Representative of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen Empress of India, and forgive his offence, and release him from prison, or commute the terrible sentence passed on him to some lighter punishment.

Your Memorialist therefore prays, that this his Memorial may be received, and that Your Excellency, considering the grounds urged in the foregoing Memorial, will be pleased to direct Your Memorialist's acquittal and immediate release from imprisonment; or, should Your Excellency hold to the contrary, that Your Memorialist is a guilty person, Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to exercise in Your Memorialist's favor, THE PREROGATIVE OF MERCY vested in Your Excellency, as aforesaid, and forgive Your Memorialist's offence altogether, or commute the terrible sentence passed on him, to same lighter punishment.

And Your Memorialist will, ever pray.

no to J. L. B. M. A. M. A. M.

I, Ramasami Gaundan, the Memorialist named in the foregoing Memorial, declare the same to be true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

no to J. L. B. M. A. M. A. M.

H. L. B. M. A. M. A. M.
jailor

H. L. B. M. A. M. A. M.
Supdt of Prisons
Madras

From

Convict No. 6508 Ramasamy Goundan
Confined in Her Majesty's Penitentiary
Madras

To
His Excellency the Right Hon.
The Governor in Council
Fort Saint George.

Dated 11th December 1894.

No. 109

The Petitioner prays for
release or less severe punishment

No. 6798

From

A. G. CARDEW, Esq., M.A., C.S.

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF JAILS, Prisons.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.

SIR,

I have the honour to submit for
the orders of Government petition with
the marginally noted papers from
Convict No. 6508 Ramaswami Goundan
confined in Her Majesty's Penitentiary
Madras.

Enclosures.
A.
(1) Nominal roll.
(2) Sessions Court Judgment.
(3) Printed records of the
Sessions Case. B.
(4) High Court Judgment.
(5) Mahazar.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

A. G. Cardew

JUDICIAL.

JAIL (1894) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF JAILS, *Prisons*

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.



Dated

17

Despatched

Received

20

Regd 21

December 1894.

No. 6798.

ENCLOSURES. 2 & 4 separate books

Subject.

Submitting for the orders of
Government petition from
Convict Ramaswami Gounder
N^o. 6508. Confined in Her
Majesty's Penitentiary
Madras.

3151 - 20-12-94

[J]
[14]

1,000-5-2-04.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 6796 of 1894.

Application for remission of sentence from convict in the *Am's Penitentiary*
Jail, at Madras.

FOR ORDERS.

Name of the Convict

N^o 6508: Ramaswami
Gounder

Offence committed.

Abetment of murder &
rioting.
Secs: 114: 30-2 + 148.
186

Adjudicating Court.

Sessions Judge Madras

Sentence imposed.

Transportation for
life.

Result of appeal to High Court.

Dismissed

Previous Convictions.

Nil

Note

Please see G. O. of 20 Dec^r
1894 No. 3151 J^l, which
disposes of a recommendation
by the High Court that (claim)
of Govt. shd be exercised with
regard to certain prisoners covered
in this case. D
11 Jan.

The case was fully &
most carefully inquired
into by the H.C. & has also
been already considered
by Govt. I see no reason
for further interference
than has already been
ordered.

14/1/95

PETITION FROM CONVICT

[J
16]
1000-25-1-94.

Judicial Department.



PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following endorsement:—

From the Inspector-General of ^{Prisons} Jails, dated

CU: 6796 of 94

ORDER 19/1/95 ^{Prisons} 1895, No. 130

The Inspector-General of Jails will cause convict No. 6508: Ramalwami Jandam confined in the ~~House~~ ^{Prisons} Semitinary Jail at ~~Madras~~ to be informed that the Government declines to interfere with the sentence passed upon him.

(True Extract.)

(From order)
8
18-1

Under Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Jails: ^{Prisons}

With reference to the books
Copies
18/1

RECEIVED
23 JAN 95
M.S.

Put up the petition
of the subject which
was disposed of a few
weeks ago.

Direct to
H.M.

Put up: G.O. 3151
20-12-94

Put up the usual
from dealing
with before
2
17.1

en given for copying _____
 en copied _____
 en examined _____
 en signed _____

189 .

AD AGAIN G.O., No.
 189 ,

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only