Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No 1386

Dated 1st July 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

MEMORIAL.

Directing that the---of M.R.RY. A. Chathu, late Tahsildar, Kurambranat taluk, Badagara, Malabar District, appealing against the orders of this Government dismissing him from the service in connection with the Moplah shooting case, be forwarded to the Secretary of State.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	81		12/1/95				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	4424		95				

1ST JULY 1895, No. 1386, JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers :—

G.O., dated 30th August 1894, No. 2107, Judicial.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on reports relating to the recent shooting by the police of a Moplah at Badagara.

G.O., dated 12th January 1895, No. 81, Judicial.

ABSTRACT.—Informing the late Tahsildar A. Chathu, Head Constable P. Sumati and the several constables who were dismissed in connection with the shooting of a Moplah, that the Government sees no reason to reconsider its previous orders.

READ—also the following paper :—

Endorsement of the Revenue Department, dated 5th April 1895, transferring a memorial addressed to the Secretary of State by M.R.Ry. A. Chathu, late Tahsildar, Kurambranát taluk, Badagara, Malabar district, appealing against the orders of Government dismissing him from the service in connection with the Moplah shooting case.

ORDER—dated 1st July 1895, No. 1386, Judicial.

The memorial will be forwarded to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To Memorialist A. Chathu.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Govt. of {1895} Madras.

JUDICIAL.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 1st July 1895, No. 1386.

JULY.

Memorial.

Directing that the — of M.R.Ry. A. Ch athu, late Tahsildar, Kurambranát taluk, Bada gara, Malabar district, appealing against the orde rs of this Government dismissing him from the se rvice in connection with the Moplah shooting cas e, be forwarded to the Secretary of State.

GOVT. OF FORT ST. GEORGE.

JUDICIAL (1895) *DEPARTMENT.*

LETTER to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

Dated 12th July,

No. 5 of 1895.

Forwarding, with remarks, Memorial addressed by A. Chathu, late Tahsildar and Taluk Magistrate of Badagara, in the district of Malabar, appealing against the order of dismissal from service.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

LETTER—to

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

MY LORD,

We have the honour to submit the accompanying memorial addressed to your Lordship by A. Chathu, late Tahsildar and Taluk Magistrate of Badagara, in the district of Malabar, in which he appeals against the order of our Government directing his dismissal for cowardice and mis-management resulting in the unnecessary sacrifice of the life of a lunatic Moplah.

2. The facts of the case are as follows:—

On the afternoon of the 25th May 1894, a Moplah named Kanamvalli Kadiri Kutti, resident in Badagara, a town which is the head-quarters of a taluk of the same name in the district of Malabar, appeared in the streets of that town in a state of frenzy brandishing a table-knife and announcing the intention of taking the lives of his enemies. At about 6 P.M., the Moplah's elder brother brought word of this to the memorialist, who as Tahsildar and Taluk Magistrate was responsible for the maintenance of law and order. The memorialist sent his informant on to the Station-house officer, Head Constable P. Sumati, who, under his orders, proceeded to the bazaar accompanied by four constables armed with batons. They found Kadiri Kutti seated in his shop, knife in hand, and the head constable directed him to lay the weapon down and follow him. Kadiri refused to obey and the head constable then appealed to some Moplahs standing close by for assistance, but they declined to help. At this moment a *Sannyasi*, or religious mendicant, passed by and Kadiri beckoned to him, upon which he approached and sat down beside Kadiri, who said to him, "Where is my gold *murada* *? If you don't give it, I will murder you at once"—a causeless remark which was sufficient to show that he was insane. The *Sannyasi* was alarmed and ran away, but was pursued by Kadiri, slightly wounded with the knife and knocked down. The police followed, and one of them, constable No. 896, struck Kadiri on the head with his baton, whereupon Kadiri turned and stabbed him twice in the arm. The attempt to arrest him was then for the time abandoned, the wounded constable was sent off to the hospital with another constable, and the Station-house officer with the other two men returned to the police station, a quarter of a mile distant, in order to get fire-arms, Kadiri being left at large in the bazaar. In the meantime the memorialist, who had received further information, had started out with his duffadar and two peons. On his way he was met by an excited crowd and was so alarmed at the story of Kadiri's attack on the police and the Sannyasi that, as he himself says, he "receded for self-preservation." About the same time the head constable and his two companions came up on their way to get fire-arms. Four carbines and forty rounds of ball ammunition were procured

* A religious ornament.

from the police station, which was close by, and the memorialist, the station-house officer and four constables proceeded to the bazaar, where they found Kadiri in front of his shop with the wounded constable's turban on his head, brandishing his knife and shouting defiance. The memorialist called on Kadiri's relatives to seize him, but the crowd fled in terror and the memorialist himself, as he deposed before the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, "receded ten paces for self-preservation and ran into a lane." The police then called on Kadiri to surrender under pain of being shot, but he advanced towards them crying out that the bullets would not hit him. When he was about thirty yards off, two constables fired at him, but without effect, probably because, as the head constable says, the shots were fired *at the ground*, under his orders and with the approval of the memorialist who was close behind the police. Kadiri continued to advance slowly until close to one of the constables—No. 581—who fired without orders and wounded him in the stomach. Even this did not stop him and it was not until two more shots were fired without orders by constables Nos. 674 and 815 that he was brought to the ground killed by a bullet which struck him in the neck.

3. When dealing with the case we considered that, had the most ordinary degree of resolution been shown, the lunatic could easily have been seized and disarmed by the police; they were five to one, armed with carbines which might have been used with effect as clubs, and with batons, and as the lunatic had nothing but a table-knife, there was thus no excuse whatever for firing upon him. The memorialist was a magistrate and it was his duty to see that so extreme a measure as using fire-arms was not resorted to until every other means had been tried. In this duty we held that he entirely failed as he concerned himself more with thoughts of his own safety than with his duty as a magistrate. For his cowardice and entire failure to act up to the responsibilities of his position he was accordingly dismissed from the public service.

4. The District Magistrate of Malabar subsequently requested Government to reconsider this order—*vide* his letter, dated 17th November 1894, No. 1340 M.-Gl., on the ground that further light had been thrown on the incident by an enquiry conducted in June which tended to show that Kadiri was not a lunatic but a fanatic. There was, however, nothing in this letter which in our opinion afforded ground for reconsideration and the original order was therefore upheld. As the memorialist relies upon it for his defence, it is necessary to point out certain inaccuracies which it contains.

The District Magistrate considers that "most people when charged by a man brandishing a knife and apparently mad with fanaticism would shoot him down." Now it was not a case of a single man being "charged" by a fanatic. The head constable and the memorialist both speak of the Moplah as "advancing with measured steps" and "continuing to advance slowly." There was thus plenty of time in which to concert a plan of action. Again, the District Magistrate speaks of the memorialist as having had no opportunity of showing cause why he should not be punished. The statement is misleading as the memorialist gave an account of what he had to say to the Divisional Magistrate, Mr. Ayling, on two occasions, and made a formal deposition before the Stationary Sub-Magistrate. It is hardly necessary to controvert the District Magistrate's broad assertion that a "madman would have gone for all alike".

5. It now remains to discuss the grounds on which the appeal is based.

The memorialist contends—

(i) that he had reasonable grounds for believing that Kadiri was a fanatic and not a mere lunatic;

(ii) that it was consequently necessary to dispose of him before nightfall;

(iii) that Kadiri was a man of great strength and activity;

(iv) that he was armed, not with a mere table-knife, but with a weapon having a blade seven inches long;

(v) that the only way of disposing of him was to shoot him, and that the memorialist could not have acted otherwise than he did;

(vi) that the Moplah outrages which had occurred in April justified the stringent action taken in this case, or at least formed extenuating circumstances;

(vii) that the memorialist had no opportunity of defending himself;

(viii) that his previous long and good service should have been taken into consideration.

6. As regards point (i), which is not pressed, it may be observed that the balance of evidence is in favour of the theory that Kadiri was mad. Both the Divisional Magistrate, Mr. Ayling, and the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Mr. Macartney, who enquired into the matter, came to this conclusion and the Government accepted it as correct. The memorialist himself stated before Mr. Ayling, "Judging from his (Kadiri's) appearance I should say he was terribly mad", and again, "I have since heard that he was mad for some time and was shut up by his brothers in an upstair room from which he escaped just before the offence." It appears therefore that the memorialist had little doubt of Kadiri's madness until he found that it would serve his interests to describe him as sane but fanatical.

The second contention may be admitted; it was certainly desirable to secure the lunatic before nightfall, not because he was a Moplah fanatic, but because he was not unlikely to do more mischief in the dark.

As regards the third contention—viz., that Kadiri was a man of great strength and activity—it is to be observed that the Divisional Magistrate describes him in these words:—

"His physique was by no means out of the common and a huge scrotal hernia which he suffered from must have considerably impaired his fighting powers."

It is thus improbable that he could have made any effectual resistance if simultaneously attacked by four or five determined constables.

The fourth contention may be disposed of with the following quotation from Mr. Ayling's report:—

"[It was] an ordinary table-knife of medium size with a bone handle, blade slightly bent."

The fifth contention—viz., that the only way of disposing of Kadiri was to shoot him and that the memorialist could not have acted otherwise than he did—may be answered by the reiteration of the statement that "had the most ordinary degree of resolution been shown, the lunatic could easily have been seized and disarmed." It was the memorialist's duty as a magistrate to have taken command of the police and directed them to make a combined assault with clubbed carbines or with their batons. Instead

of doing this, he, to use his own words, "receded into a lane for self-preservation," took refuge behind the police and permitted them to shoot at the lunatic as he was advancing slowly and deliberately towards them.

We cannot admit the sixth contention, viz., that the Moplah outrages which had occurred shortly before in a distant part of the district were any excuse for unnecessary violence towards a mere lunatic, although a Moplah.

The seventh contention—viz., that the memorialist had no opportunity of defending himself—calls for but few remarks. The memorialist had given a statement before Mr. Ayling on the 25th May in which he admitted the correctness of a detailed account given by the head constable and said, "On our way to the place I told the "head constable that, as it was getting dark, if the man could not be arrested, he "must be shot." He had also made a formal deposition before the Stationary Sub-Magistrate. The deposition and the head constable's story agreed with the account of the incident which has been given above, the general accuracy of which is not disputed, and it was upon these admitted facts that we found the memorialist guilty of cowardice and inefficiency such as to warrant his dismissal from the public service. He was therefore in no way prejudiced by not being given a further opportunity of explaining himself. It is to be added that he subsequently made a more detailed statement before Mr. Ayling and presented a lengthy review petition to us, both of which were carefully considered with the result that we saw no reason to modify our order.

The petitioner's previous service does not appear to have been particularly good; it is to be noted that he was reduced for misconduct some three years since and there is nothing in his previous record to justify his being treated with exceptional leniency.

7. We have therefore no recommendation to make in the memorialist's behalf.

We have the honour to be,
My Lord,
Your Lordship's most obedient, humble servants,

(Signed) WENLOCK.
(„) H. W. BLISS.
(„) J. GROSE.

Ootacamund,
12th *July* 1895.

Exd. A. Raitt.

CURRENT

1721A

Jud

G. O. No 1721 A.
G.O. 733 : 6.4.95.
G.O. 390 : 21.2.95
G.O. 81 : 12.1.95
G.O. 2351 : 28.9.94.
2186/94 &c
G.O. 2107 : 30. aug 1894.
G.O. 1487/94 -
Loose file about dismissal of Tahsildar

A & B Book memorial Rules

From

A. Chathu
late Tahsildar
Tellicherry.

Dated 2/4/95
Recd 4/4/95
Regd 5/4/95
Encl. 1

Subject

Forwards a corrected copy of an appeal to the Secy. of State against the order of the Madras Govt. dismissing the memorialist from the Public Service and requests that this may be substituted for the one already submitted.

Wg 29/4

Forwarded

A

To

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE HENRY FOWLER, M.P.,

Secretary of State

For India in Council.

The respectful Memorial of A. CHATHU, late Tahsildar, Kurumbranad Taluk, Badagara, Malabar.

SHEWETH,

For a little over 24 years I had been serving the Government of Madras loyally and, if I may place any reliance on the Certificates (Appendix XI) of those under whom I had held office, with honesty, with energy, and with zeal, when suddenly, without warning and without hearing, that Government on the 30th August 1894 summarily dismissed me from its service. (Appendix I).

2. Against that dismissal I appeal as well with reference to the procedure adopted as with reference to the merits of my case. The former, I respectfully submit, equally contravenes the sense of natural justice and the rules which both the Imperial and the Local Government have repeatedly published for the security and well-being of their subordinate officials. The latter will, I trust, in their mere unfolding, recommend me to that alone to which I desire to appeal, your sense, Sir, of strict and impartial justice.

3. If the Indian subjects of Her Majesty the Queen have any claim to the application and protection of those principles which are presumed to safeguard the liberties of their English fellow-subjects, then I pray that I, too, may now be permitted the practical benefit of the maxim that no man shall be condemned unheard, or be punished before trial. The Government of Madras has both condemned me unheard, and punished me without trial.

4. I subjoin in an Appendix (II)extracts from Government Orders shewing how stringent in theory are the precautions enjoined by executive authority in the interest of officials against whose conduct there has arisen any cause for complaint, investigation, and censure. These precautions have not been adopted by the Government of Madras in its treatment of myself.

5. As to the merits of my appeal, the facts, briefly stated, are as follows:—

About 6 P.M. on the afternoon of Friday the 25th May 1894, whilst I was engaged in verifying the cash balance in the Taluk Treasury, a Moplah, named Kanamvalli Hassan, ran in and informed me his brother Kadiri had gone mad, was stabbing people with a knife, and would, unless seized, commit more serious mischief. Unable to leave the Government cash unchecked, I ordered the Head Constable to proceed at once to the spot. The counting of the cash over, I heard that Kadiri intended to set fire to the bazar. I adjourned the verification of the stamp stock till next day, and hurried off to the bazar. On my way I met a crowd of people running and shouting of Kadiri's attack on a Sanyasi (a religious devotee) and the Police. I turned off the narrow path by which I was advancing, and getting on to the high road collected some men and armed them with stakes pulled out of the adjacent fence. A little further on I met a constable, wounded by Kadiri in a fainting condition and covered with blood, who was being carried by his fellow constables. The constable's arm was cut open as far as the wrist right down to the bone, an artery being severed. Immediately sending back word to the Stationary Magistrate and the Inspector of Police, I pushed on to the spot where Kadiri was reported to be, fol-

lowed by some Hindus armed with stakes and the Police who carried carbines. I directed the former to secure Kadiri and the latter to shoot him should we not succeed in arresting Kadiri before nightfall. In this order to the Police I intended, not that Kadiri should be shot dead, but merely that he should be disabled. I was then, and still am, of opinion that if Kadiri were not arrested before nightfall his fanaticism might spread and, infecting other Moplahs, create a serious disturbance which it might be very difficult to overpower.

6. On reaching the bazar, I found all the shops closed. There were many Moplahs there; yet not one, though all were appealed to, would help me to seize Kadiri. On the first alarm of Kadiri's approach the Hindus, whom I had armed with stakes fled. Of a sudden, at a sharp turn in the road, I found myself face to face with Kadiri, on a narrow path flanked with closed shops. He was wearing the turband of the wounded constable and was breathing threats against the Hindus. I was in front of the Police. Kadiri was flourishing a knife with a blade seven inches long. He was a powerfully built man, and an athlete. I was totally unarmed, and knew nothing of the art of self-defence. If it be a crime to have felt some personal apprehension, then I must plead guilty to that crime. It was obvious I could do nothing alone, against Kadiri. Had I continued to confront him my life would probably have paid forfeit for my rashness. And the sacrifice, useless in itself, might have precipitated a very serious crisis. Believing, as I still believe, that Kadiri was a religious fanatic, any successful onslaught upon myself might have turned the passive sullenness of the surrounding Moplahs into an active outburst of fanatical frenzy. The past history of Moplah outbreaks in Malabar justifies the position that one act of accomplished violence would possibly have inflamed the whole District. Both personal prudence and a care for the general interest prompted me to avoid an unwise and unnecessary conflict. Behind me were the Police. I stepped aside into a lane about 10 feet to my then rear. The Police marched up, and were thus free if necessary to use their carbines against Kadiri.

7. That necessity arose almost immediately. Kadiri came on brandishing his knife. He was called on to lay aside his knife and surrender. For answer, he advanced on the Police. As a warning the Police fired two shots on the ground. Unfortunately this clemency had the reverse of the desired effect. Kadiri believed himself bullet-proof, and boasting of his immunity, advanced more boldly. The Police, anxious to avoid extreme measure, did what I had myself done previously. They retreated, till further retreat by reason of a wall was impossible. In self-defence the Constables fired at Kadiri at close quarters (Appendix VI). And the man fell dead. That death I deeply regret. But, for it, I maintain, I cannot fairly be blamed.

8. For this I have been dismissed unheard on a charge of cowardice. To my petition for a rehearing, dated 4th November 1894 (Appendix III), the Government replied with the curt order "that it saw no reason to interfere."

9. I respectfully maintain (1) that I had reasonable grounds for believing Kadiri to be a fanatic stirred by religious frenzy, (2) that in my action following on that belief I acted as a prudent man would act, (3) and that I betrayed no such cowardice as justifies my present punishment at the hands of the Government of Madras.

10. First as to Kadiri being a religious fanatic and not a mere lunatic. At the outset I respectfully submit that it is immaterial to consider with any very nice precision whether Kadiri was really a fanatic or merely a lunatic. The facts were, that lunatic or not, he had severely wounded a Constable, had wounded a religious mendicant, and had gashed a cow. He was armed with a knife seven inches long. He betrayed considerable determination, and evidently thought more of taking the lives of others than of safeguarding his own. The injuries he had inflicted, and the further injury he contemplated inflicting, were equally serious whether they were inflicted by a lunatic or a religious fanatic. At the best, the partition between the two is thin. Placed as I and the Police were placed, there was little time to stop and estimate the exact shade of delirium under which the man was acting.

But in fact I believed then, as I believe now, that Kadiri was under the influence of religious frenzy. His attacks had all been confined to the Hindus. The wounding of the cow was a deliberate insult to the religious sensitiveness of the Hindus who regard the cow with veneration. He had prefaced his attacks by previous prayers in his Mosque. The day was a Friday, the Mahomedan Sabbath, the day usually selected for fanatical outbreaks. His threats were confined to slaying Hindus. He made no attempt to attack his co-religionists, the Moplahs.

A few days previous to the occurrence he had been seen to snatch reed flowers from the hands of Hindu pilgrims on their return from a temple. By way of contempt he had swept his shop with these emblems of religious piety. There is evidence in Mr. Logan's Malabar Manual to show that such unprovoked abuse of Hindu religious feeling has been accepted as evidence of fanatical frenzy. His co-religionists when called on for assistance refused to render it. His brother subsequently admitted before the District Magistrate that Kadiri had never been, and was not, mad (Appendix III, Exhibits B. & C). A lamp has been kept lit in the place where Kadiri fell, in token of the Moplah feeling that he had died the death of a martyr. (Vide para. 15 Infra.) These surely were and are strong grounds for holding Kadiri to be a religious fanatic.

The importance of my belief lies in its influence on my conduct. Those best acquainted with Moplah outbreaks will admit that it was impossible to leave Kadiri at large after nightfall. In this view I am sustained by the report of the Inspector-General of Police (Appendix I, pp. 2-4) to which I crave your careful attention.

11. Secondly. I submit I could not well have acted otherwise than I did. The Inspector-General of Police, who by reason of his personal familiarity with Moplah outbreaks, writes with especial authority, admits (Appendix I, p. 2, S. 2, ii) that Kadiri was an athlete, and that those who refused to help me in his arrest, refused on the ground that he was a "skilled athlete." (S. 6, iii). The Inspector-General further states (S. 19,) that in his opinion "the arrest of Kadiri might have "been effected by four or five determined men in the first instance when he attacked the "Sanyasi," an opinion which is shared by the Joint Magistrate (Appendix VIII) and the Inspector-General adds that he can feel "no surprise at the Police, when driven to close quarters as they were, having used their fire-arms." Now, as a fact, when the Police first went armed with batons, to arrest Kadiri, they were in number five. If these five men could not effect Kadiri's arrest, and the fact is that they did not arrest him, how could I be fairly expected to have done that later single-handed which five men had earlier failed themselves to accomplish?

12. Thirdly. I have been dismissed for "cowardice" and "for entire failure to act up to the responsibilities of my position." I will deal shortly with each. The Government has nowhere in its order formulated any specific charge of cowardice against me, and has given no indication of what, in its opinion, is the cowardice for which I have been punished unheard. Groping in the dark, I am left to speculation and to inference. In paragraph 2 of its order (Appendix I, p. 5) the Government sneers at the statement that I "receded 10 paces and ran into a lane." The word "ran" is a mistranslation. I neither ran, nor said I ran. I have endeavoured to explain what I did. And I again respectfully submit, that I acted as a prudent man would be expected to act who did not desire to make a useless sacrifice of his life at the risk of provoking a very serious and extensive rising. The same paragraph states that I "approved of" the shots fired on the ground. I maintain that this is clear evidence both of the fact that I did not lose sight of my responsibilities and that I was actuated by no desire needlessly to destroy human life. I did not give the subsequent order to fire. The last shots were fired in self-defence by men whose own lives were in imminent danger. It takes long to write of these doings on paper. As a fact the shots were fired suddenly, without premeditation, and the whole thing was the work of a few moments (Appendix VI). I could not charge Kadiri as I had originally intended to do with stakes, for my followers had all decamped. It was true that the Police could have charged with their clubbed carbines. Had they done so, seeing the desparate antagonist with whom they had to deal, the Inspector-General's surmise (Appendix I, p. 4, S. 18) would probably have been verified, and Kadiri been clubbed to death. The method of his death would have been changed. But in all human probability the man would have died. Had this occurred, I cannot help feeling I should still have been arraigned and condemned unheard for the effect of such a charge upon the Moplah. Finally, it is a fair inference from the injuries he had already inflicted that Kadiri would have died fighting. And one result of such a charge would, humanly speaking, have been an increase in the number of wounded men laid to the credit of Kadiri's account. The Government writes of a "table knife." However euphemistic its description, there is no gainsaying the fact that the knife had a blade seven inches long; that it was in the hands of a man who was morally resolute and physically strong; and that its efficiency had already been established by successful experiment upon two human beings and an animal.

13. What, I respectfully ask, were the responsibilities I failed to understand or discharge? Such precautions as an intelligent man could take I had taken. I had manifested my desire to avoid the shedding of blood by collecting and arming my followers with stakes. At the approach of danger that following forsook me. I had consented to a preliminary discharge of bullets on the ground by way of warning. Unfortunately the warning was misunderstood. In an instant Kadiri was upon us. In an instant he was shot. Surely some allowance is due for the peril of the moment, the fast succeeding events, the unexpected impetuosity which no sense of impending danger could arrest, the impulse of the moment under which men who, finding their own lives in jeopardy, acted without reflection under the pressure of a sense of self-preservation! If it be counted to my discredit that I gave no orders to charge, I can only reply that the events followed with such rapidity that it was impossible at the time to give commands which seem so easy and so natural to my judges in the quiet and the seclusion of their libraries. I have already stated that in directing the Police to shoot Kadiri my intention was to maim, not to kill him. At all hazards it was absolutely essential in my view to secure Kadiri before nightfall. What would have been my position had Kadiri escaped that night and aroused the ignorant and inflammable ardour of his co-religionists by stating how he had braved the bullets of the Police and was therefore destined to lead his people to victory against the useless weapons of their common foe?

14. Malabar is a district which periodically suffers from fanatical outrages committed by Moplahs (*Muhammadans*) who have not hesitated to signalize their outbreaks by assassinating the highest executive officer of the district. The barbarous death, under most painful circumstances, of the lamented Mr. Conolly, the District Magistrate of Malabar, is fresh in the minds of the public to this day. It has always been considered the imperative duty of public servants of all grades in Malabar to nip Moplah outrages in the bud. Any servant, failing to act promptly and energetically, and affording opportunity by his vacillation for Moplah outrages to develop in any shape, has been looked upon, as undeserving of a place in the service: whilst private parties, who dispose of fanatics, have been rewarded and those who failed to give information of intended outbreaks, have been punished, even by deportation. In April 1894, a serious Moplah outbreak occurred in Pandicad, within about 60 miles of Badagara, which caused terrible panic throughout the district and which necessitated costly military operations to quell it. Though the fanatics were all shot down, and the outbreak quelled for the time, the public mind remained, as usual, alarmingly agitated. Rumours of smouldering outbreaks, here and there, were rampant in the district, so much so, that about the middle of May following, Mr. Bradley, the District Magistrate, forwarded to me, demi-officially, for confidential enquiry, a petition in which it was stated that some of the Moplahs, who had participated in the Pandicad outbreak, had gone in the direction of Badagara, a Moplah Town, where I was the Tahsildar-Magistrate, and that the Moplah High Priest of Karakad in the vicinity of Badagara was countenancing them. The recent arrest of a Moplah Priest, suspected to be concerned in the late Pandicad outbreak, and harboured by the Moplahs in the neighbourhood of Badagara, also emphasises the fact that Badagara was not an unlikely place wherein to expect troubles from Moplahs. I made enquiry into the petition referred to above, and reported the result confidentially to Mr. Bradley. This fact is the most important precursor of what followed. These facts were present in my mind when I found myself called on to deal with Kadiri on the 25th May 1894.

15. In his letter, dated 26th May 1894 to the Joint Magistrate (Appendix VII), the Stationary Magistrate says that when he inspected Kadiri's body immediately after he was shot there were "nearly 200 Moplahs present who all expressed great relief and satisfaction saying that if the "man was not then killed there was no knowing what would happen in the night." He adds "from the information I got yesterday on the spot and from what I observed yesterday I am "perfectly satisfied that if the Police had not shot down the man before dark, he would have "destroyed the whole bazar by fire and the lives of several persons." This is a statement made by one over whom I had no control. I rely on this in corroboration of my own impression and in justification of my conduct induced by and following on those impressions. This gentleman's views are further supported by the report of the Inspector-General of Police, to which, I have already referred, endorsing the report of Mr. Macartney, the Superintendant of Police, dated the 5th June 1894 (Appendix IX). Lastly, on this point I annex the following letter from Mr. Moberly, the Acting Collector of Malabar which accompanied my rejected petition for a reconsideration to the Government of Madras.

MALABAR COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Camp Lakidi,
17—11—94.

From

H. MOBERLY, ESQRE.,
Ag. Collector and District Magistrate of Malabar.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MADRAS.

SIR,

I have the honor to forward for favourable consideration the Memorial of A. Chathu, late Tahsildar of Kurumbranad, dismissed from the Public Service by G. O., dated 30th August 1894, No. 2107.

2. When this order was passed Government was apparently not aware that in June Messrs. Bradley, Ayling, and Macartney had made further enquiry regarding the shooting of Kadiri Kutti.

I herewith forward

(1) Copy of Mr. Ayling's report, dated 19th June 1894, No. 196 M./Gl.

(2) Copies of enclosures 1 to 13 in same.

(3) Plan.

(4) Copies of Mr. Macartney's report No. 803, dated 5th June 1894, and its enclosures.

3. The brothers of the deceased say that he was not mad. Mr. Ayling in his letter of 19th June declares that the man was dangerously mad and that "the madman's natural tendency would of course be to attack Hindus in preference to his co-religionists". With this last statement I cannot agree. A mad man would have gone for all alike. This conduct of the deceased shows that he was possessed of religious frenzy probably tinged with fanaticism and it is not surprising therefore, that the Tahsildar and Police regarded him as a fanatic. I think that most people when charged by a man brandishing a kinfe and apparently mad with fanaticism, would shoot him down.

4. No charges have been framed against A. Chathu and he has had no opportunity hitherto of showing cause why he should not be punished. A brother of the deceased complained to Mr. Bradley that deceased had been shot by the Tahsildar. Inquiry has shown this charge to be false and malicious and Mr. Bradley dismissed it as such.

The statements made by the Moplah witnesses lead (*sic*) to show that deceased was labouring under fanaticism; of course the Moplahs will not admit this as they are afraid of the "Moplah Act" and so they were compelled to invent some ridiculous story as to why the deceased was shot. I understand that a lamp has on several occasions been burned on the spot where Kadiri Kutti fell. This shows that Kadiri Kutti is regarded as a fanatic.

5. In these circumstances I most respectfully ask the Government to reconsider its order.

(Sd.) H. MOBERLY.

---

16. To this recommendation on my behalf the Government of Madras has given no attention. To this uncontradictable statement that no charges were framed against me and that I had been afforded no opportunity of defending myself the Government has paid no heed.

17. The Government order states that my "explanation of my conduct is extremely unsatisfactory." I have in truth never been called upon for any explanation. Up to the time when the Government passed its *ex parte* order I had made three statements, none of which was addressed to the Government, and in none of which did I enter upon any explanation of my conduct, because till the Government dismissed me unheard, no one had ever questioned that conduct. Two of my three statements are dated 25th May 1894, and the third 26th May 1894 (Appendix III, Exh. A. & App. IV & V.) Of these, the first was written a few minutes after Kadiri's death and despatched to the Joint Magistrate in a great hurry to save the post. The second was

made about half an hour afterwards and is a deposition to the Stationary Magistrate. The third was made on the day following in the shape of a deposition before the Joint Magistrate. A perusal of these will show that each and all are limited to giving a brief account of the circumstances under which Kadiri met his death. None of these was an explanation. No explanation was needed. None had been called for. The Government of Madras condemned me without asking me to submit any explanation. Yet in its order it refers to an explanation which never existed. The Government of Madras first evolved the charge of cowardice. No one else had questioned my behaviour. And the Government never afforded me any chance of explaining this particular charge before it satisfied itself of my guilt.

18. I append a record of my services (Appendix III, p. 5). I would mention that for 15 years I had exercised Magisterial powers without censure or rebuke: that more than once the Government of Madras had publicly eulogised my services as one of their servants: and that in the long record of my career there has hitherto been no mention of disapproval or of dissatisfaction save in one solitary instance to which, in self-defence, I make short reference. The unfortunate controversies which sprang up between two Madras Civil Servants, Mr. Dumergue the Collector of Malabar and Mr. Castlestuart Stuart the then Special Settlement officer of Malabar, in the year 1891-1892, threw their shadow over me. I was at the time serving as acting Huzur Sheristadar under Mr. Dumergue. An escheat case which I had reported on 7 or 8 years previously was said by the Board to look suspicious, though as a matter of fact my superior Mr. Castlestuart Stuart had confirmed and ratified it. The Board reduced me to a 4th grade Tahsildar. Within one year I gained my lost ground and was made a 3rd grade Tahsildar. I have nothing to fear by any scrutiny into my career which I willingly lay open, Sir, to your strictest investigation. Yet no recollection of this survived to ensure me either a hearing or punishment, if any were deserved, more in accordance with the admitted facts of the occurrence.

19. In conclusion I appeal to your sense of justice. No charge has been framed against me. No evidence taken. No opportunity given me of explanation or for defence. I have been condemned unheard, dismissed without trial. Loss of pension, loss of place, loss of character have followed upon an adjudication to which I was no party. An honest service of twenty-four years, has stood me in no stead. A character hitherto unblemished has been of no avail. I ~~feel~~ *put* it, respectfully but plainly that I am the victim of a grave wrong. You have yourself, Sir, upon a memorable occasion publicly gloried in the avowal that you are an "Indian Minister," and I turn, in your own language, for hearing, for redress, for justice to yourself who, as a unit of the House of Commons to which you declared "has been committed all the interests of India—personal, political, commercial, financial, and social," and yourself appealed to that House that it should "discharge that gigantic trust with wisdom and justice and generosity."

I beg to subscribe myself, Sir,
Your most obedient respectful servant,

MADRAS,
30th March 1895.

FROM

A. CHATHU,

Late Tahsildar, Kurumbranad Taluk,

Malabar District,

Madras Presidency,

INDIA.

To

THE RIGHT HONORABLE

THE SECRETARY OF STATE

FOR INDIA IN COUNCIL.

(Through the Government of Madras).

Dated 30th March 1895.

Received.....1895.

Jud. G.O. dt 1306-97
1-7-95 - Print.

UNDER SECRETARY
22 JUL 95
PUBLIC & JUDL DEPTS.

ENCLOSURES II.

With authenticated Copies.

UNDER SECRETARY
22 JUL 95
PUBLIC & JUDL DEPTS.

Begs to appeal against the order of the Madras Government, dismissing Memorialist from the Public Service without a hearing and without being given an opportunity of explanation.

To

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE HENRY FOWLER, M.P.,

Secretary of State

For India in Council.

The respectful Memorial of A. CHATHU, late Tahsildar, Kurumbranad Taluk, Badagara, Malabar.

SHEWETH,

For a little over 24 years I had been serving the Government of Madras loyally and, if I may place any reliance on the Certificates (Appendix XI) of those under whom I had held office, with honesty, with energy, and with zeal, when suddenly, without warning and without hearing, that Government on the 30th August 1894 summarily dismissed me from its service. (Appendix I).

2. Against that dismissal I appeal as well with reference to the procedure adopted as with reference to the merits of my case. The former, I respectfully submit, equally contravenes the sense of natural justice and the rules which both the Imperial and the Local Government have repeatedly published for the security and well-being of their subordinate officials. The latter will, I trust, in their mere unfolding, recommend me to that alone to which I desire to appeal, your sense, Sir, of strict and impartial justice.

3. If the Indian subjects of Her Majesty the Queen have any claim to the application and protection of those principles which are presumed to safeguard the liberties of their English fellow-subjects, then I pray that I, too, may now be permitted the practical benefit of the maxim that no man shall be condemned unheard, or be punished before trial. The Government of Madras has both condemned me unheard, and punished me without trial.

4. I subjoin in an Appendix (II)extracts from Government Orders shewing how stringent in theory are the precautions enjoined by executive authority in the interest of officials against whose conduct there has arisen any cause for complaint, investigation, and censure. These precautions have not been adopted by the Government of Madras in its treatment of myself.

5. As to the merits of my appeal, the facts, briefly stated, are as follows:—

About 6 P.M. on the afternoon of Friday the 25th May 1894, whilst I was engaged in verifying the cash balance in the Taluk Treasury, a Moplah, named Kanamvalli Hassan, ran in and informed me his brother Kadiri had gone mad, was stabbing people with a knife, and would, unless seized, commit more serious mischief. Unable to leave the Government cash unchecked, I ordered the Head Constable to proceed at once to the spot. The counting of the cash over, I heard that Kadiri intended to set fire to the bazar. I adjourned the verification of the stamp stock till next day, and hurried off to the bazar. On my way I met a crowd of people running and shouting of Kadiri's attack on a Sanyasi (a religious devotee) and the Police. I turned off the narrow path by which I was advancing, and getting on to the high road collected some men and armed them with stakes pulled out of the adjacent fence. A little further on I met a constable, wounded by Kadiri in a fainting condition and covered with blood, who was being carried by his fellow constables. The constable's arm was cut open as far as the wrist right down to the bone, an artery being severed. Immediately sending back word to the Stationary Magistrate and the Inspector of Police, I pushed on to the spot where Kadiri was reported to be, fol-

A Chathu

13. What, I respectfully ask, were the responsibilities I failed to understand or discharge? Such precautions as an intelligent man could take I had taken. I had manifested my desire to avoid the shedding of blood by collecting and arming my followers with stakes. At the approach of danger that following forsook me. I had consented to a preliminary discharge of bullets on the ground by way of warning. Unfortunately the warning was misunderstood. In an instant Kadiri was upon us. In an instant he was shot. Surely some allowance is due for the peril of the moment, the fast succeeding events, the unexpected impetuosity which no sense of impending danger could arrest, the impulse of the moment under which men who, finding their own lives in jeopardy, acted without reflection under the pressure of a sense of self-preservation! If it be counted to my discredit that I gave no orders to charge, I can only reply that the events followed with such rapidity that it was impossible at the time to give commands which seem so easy and so natural to my judges in the quiet and the seclusion of their libraries. I have already stated that in directing the Police to shoot Kadiri my intention was to maim, not to kill him. At all hazards it was absolutely essential in my view to secure Kadiri before nightfall. What would have been my position had Kadiri escaped that night and aroused the ignorant and inflammable ardour of his co-religionists by stating how he had braved the bullets of the Police and was therefore destined to lead his people to victory against the useless weapons of their common foe?

14. Malabar is a district which periodically suffers from fanatical outrages committed by Moplahs (*Muhammadans*) who have not hesitated to signalize their outbreaks by assassinating the highest executive officer of the district. The barbarous death, under most painful circumstances, of the lamented Mr. Conolly, the District Magistrate of Malabar, is fresh in the minds of the public to this day. It has always been considered the imperative duty of public servants of all grades in Malabar to nip Moplah outrages in the bud. Any servant, failing to act promptly and energetically, and affording opportunity by his vacillation for Moplah outrages to develop in any shape, has been looked upon, as undeserving of a place in the service: whilst private parties, who dispose of fanatics, have been rewarded and those who failed to give information of intended outbreaks, have been punished, even by deportation. In April 1894, a serious Moplah outbreak occurred in Pandicad, within about 60 miles of Badagara, which caused terrible panic throughout the district and which necessitated costly military operations to quell it. Though the fanatics were all shot down, and the outbreak quelled for the time, the public mind remained, as usual, alarmingly agitated. Rumours of smouldering outbreaks, here and there, were rampant in the district, so much so, that about the middle of May following, Mr. Bradley, the District Magistrate, forwarded to me, demi-officially, for confidential enquiry, a petition in which it was stated that some of the Moplahs, who had participated in the Pandicad outbreak, had gone in the direction of Badagara, a Moplah Town, where I was the Tahsildar-Magistrate, and that the Moplah High Priest of Karakad in the vicinity of Badagara was countenancing them. The recent arrest of a Moplah Priest, suspected to be concerned in the late Pandicad outbreak, and harboured by the Moplahs in the neighbourhood of Badagara, also emphasises the fact that Badagara was not an unlikely place wherein to expect troubles from Moplahs. I made enquiry into the petition referred to above, and reported the result confidentially to Mr. Bradley. This fact is the most important precursor of what followed. These facts were present in my mind when I found myself called on to deal with Kadiri on the 25th May 1894.

15. In his letter, dated 26th May 1894 to the Joint Magistrate (Appendix VII), the Stationary Magistrate says that when he inspected Kadiri's body immediately after he was shot there were "nearly 200 Moplahs present who all expressed great relief and satisfaction saying that if the "man was not then killed there was no knowing what would happen in the night." He adds "from the information I got yesterday on the spot and from what I observed yesterday I am "perfectly satisfied that if the Police had not shot down the man before dark, he would have "destroyed the whole bazar by fire and the lives of several persons." This is a statement made by one over whom I had no control. I rely on this in corroboration of my own impression and in justification of my conduct induced by and following on those impressions. This gentleman's views are further supported by the report of the Inspector-General of Police, to which, I have already referred, endorsing the report of Mr. Macartney, the Superintendant of Police, dated the 5th June 1894 (Appendix IX). Lastly, on this point I annex the following letter from Mr. Moberly, the Acting Collector of Malabar which accompanied my rejected petition for a reconsideration to the Government of Madras.

Aghathen

MALABAR COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Camp Lakidi,
17—11—94.

From

H. MOBERLY, ESQRE.,
Ag. Collector and District Magistrate of Malabar.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MADRAS.

SIR,

I have the honor to forward for favourable consideration the Memorial of A. Chathu, late Tahsildar of Kurumbranad, dismissed from the Public Service by G. O., dated 30th August 1894, No. 2107.

2. When this order was passed Government was apparently not aware that in June Messrs. Bradley, Ayling, and Macartney had made further enquiry regarding the shooting of Kadiri Kutti. I herewith forward

(1) Copy of Mr. Ayling's report, dated 19th June 1894, No. 196 M./Gl.

(2) Copies of enclosures 1 to 13 in same.

(3) Plan.

(4) Copies of Mr. Macartney's report No. 803, dated 5th June 1894, and its enclosures.

3. The brothers of the deceased say that he was not mad. Mr. Ayling in his letter of 19th June declares that the man was dangerously mad and that "the madman's natural tendency would of course be to attack Hindus in preference to his co-religionists". With this last statement I cannot agree. A mad man would have gone for all alike. This conduct of the deceased shows that he was possessed of religious frenzy probably tinged with fanaticism and it is not surprising therefore, that the Tahsildar and Police regarded him as a fanatic. I think that most people when charged by a man brandishing a kinfe and apparently mad with fanaticism, would shoot him down.

4. No charges have been framed against A. Chathu and he has had no opportunity hitherto of showing cause why he should not be punished. A brother of the deceased complained to Mr. Bradley that deceased had been shot by the Tahsildar. Inquiry has shown this charge to be false and malicious and Mr. Bradley dismissed it as such.

The statements made by the Moplah witnesses lead (*sic*) to show that deceased was labouring under fanaticism; of course the Moplahs will not admit this as they are afraid of the "Moplah Act" and so they were compelled to invent some ridiculous story as to why the deceased was shot. I understand that a lamp has on several occasions been burned on the spot where Kadiri Kutti fell. This shows that Kadiri Kutti is regarded as a fanatic.

5. In these circumstances I most respectfully ask the Government to reconsider its order.

(Sd.) H. MOBERLY.

---

16. To this recommendation on my behalf the Government of Madras has given no attention. To this uncontradictable statement that no charges were framed against me and that I had been afforded no opportunity of defending myself the Government has paid no heed.

17. The Government order states that my "explanation of my conduct is extremely unsatisfactory." I have in truth never been called upon for any explanation. Up to the time when the Government passed its *ex parte* order I had made three statements, none of which was addressed to the Government, and in none of which did I enter upon any explanation of my conduct, because till the Government dismissed me unheard, no one had ever questioned that conduct. Two of my three statements are dated 25th May 1894, and the third 26th May 1894 (Appendix III, Exh. A. & App. IV & V.) Of these, the first was written a few minutes after Kadiri's death and despatched to the Joint Magistrate in a great hurry to save the post. The second was

Aghathen

made about half an hour afterwards and is a deposition to the Stationary Magistrate. The third was made on the day following in the shape of a deposition before the Joint Magistrate. A perusal of these will show that each and all are limited to giving a brief account of the circumstances under which Kadiri met his death. None of these was an explanation. No explanation was needed. None had been called for. The Government of Madras condemned me without asking me to submit any explanation. Yet in its order it refers to an explanation which never existed. The Government of Madras first evolved the charge of cowardice. No one else had questioned my behaviour. And the Government never afforded me any chance of explaining this particular charge before it satisfied itself of my guilt.

18. I append a record of my services (Appendix III, p. 5). I would mention that for 15 years I had exercised Magisterial powers without censure or rebuke: that more than once the Government of Madras had publicly eulogised my services as one of their servants: and that in the long record of my career there has hitherto been no mention of disapproval or of dissatisfaction save in one solitary instance to which, in self-defence, I make short reference. The unfortunate controversies which sprang up between two Madras Civil Servants, Mr. Dumergue the Collector of Malabar and Mr. Castlestuart Stuart the then Special Settlement officer of Malabar, in the year 1891-1892, threw their shadow over me. I was at the time serving as acting Huzur Sheristadar under Mr. Dumergue. An escheat case which I had reported on 7 or 8 years previously was said by the Board to look suspicious, though as a matter of fact my superior Mr. Castlestuart Stuart had confirmed and ratified it. The Board reduced me to a 4th grade Tahsildar. Within one year I gained my lost ground and was made a 3rd grade Tahsildar. I have nothing to fear by any scrutiny into my career which I willingly lay open, Sir, to your strictest investigation. Yet no recollection of this survived to ensure me either a hearing or punishment, if any were deserved, more in accordance with the admitted facts of the occurrence.

19. In conclusion I appeal to your sense of justice. No charge has been framed against me. No evidence taken. No opportunity given me of explanation or for defence. I have been condemned unheard, dismissed without trial. Loss of pension, loss of place, loss of character have followed upon an adjudication to which I was no party. An honest service of twenty-four years, has stood me in no stead. A character hitherto unblemished has been of no avail. I feel it, respectfully but plainly that I am the victim of a grave wrong. You have yourself, Sir, upon a memorable occasion publicly gloried in the avowal that you are an "Indian Minister," and I turn, in your own language, for hearing, for redress, for justice to yourself who, as a unit of the House of Commons to which you declared "has been committed all the interests of India—personal, political, commercial, financial, and social," and yourself appealed to that House that it should "discharge that gigantic trust with wisdom and justice and generosity."

I beg to subscribe myself, Sir,
Your most obedient respectful servant,

A. G. Kathu

MADRAS,
30th March 1895.

FROM

A. CHATHU,

Late Tahsildar, Kurumbranad Taluk,

Malabar District,

Madras Presidency,

INDIA.

To

THE RIGHT HONORABLE

THE SECRETARY OF STATE

FOR INDIA IN COUNCIL,

(Through the Government of Madras).

Dated 30th March 1895.

Received.....1895.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
1 APR 1895

ENCLOSURES II.

With authenticated Copies.

Begs to appeal against the order of the Madras Government, dismissing Memorialist from the Public Service without a hearing and without being given an opportunity of explanation.

REVENUE
losure I... 1
rrent No. 2350

Madras
1st April 1895.

5 To

PETITION
462
REVENUE DEPT

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Judicial Department
Madras.

Sir,

I humbly beg to enclose a Memorial addressed to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India in Council, appealing against the order of the Madras Government dated 30th August 1894, No. 2107, Judicial, dismissing me from the public service, and to request that it may be duly submitted.

The enclosures of the above with their authenticated Copies I have forwarded per packet-post registered.

I beg to remain
Sir
your most obdt servant

A. Chathu

My address.
A. Chathu
Late Tahsildar
Tellicherry
Malabar.

CURRENT 1721

Calicut
2nd April 1895.

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St George.

Sir,

I beg most respectfully to send herewith another copy of my appeal to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India in Council. In the copy I submitted yesterday there are some misprints which I have duly corrected and initialled in the present one - I beg this may be substituted for the other and that copy kindly returned to me.

I beg to remain
Sir
your most obedient servant

M Ghabba

address

A. Chathu
Late Tahsildar
Tellicherry
Malabar.

0/18 —5,000—7-9-93.

ABSTRACT.

(1895)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current Number. 2552

Endt

—

Transferred to the Judicial Department

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
6 APR. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From

A. Chathu

late Tahsildar of Kurumbra-nad Taluk

Malabar Dist

W. Stephenson
ag Asst Secretary

Fort St. George
5th April 1895

Dated 1st April

Received 2 —

Enclosures 1

No.

(Vide G.O. No. 1721)

SUBJECT.

Submitting a memorial and enclosures to be forwarded to the Secretary of State.

P.T.O

[G. / 25.]
600—8-3

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

C. Nos 1721 + 1721A.

FOR ORDERS.

2nd note.

On further consideration I think that Chattu's petition should go through the Govt: of India - at the same time as that from the Head Constable. This will put them in fuller possession of all the facts of the case, and the manner in which we have dealt with them

At all events, they will have no cause for complaint - if they see them both.

W
25 May

As to whether Chattu's memorial to the Secretary of State may be forwarded? Attention is invited to Hon's note under cover of G.O. of 21 Febry. 1895, No. 390, Judl & the note for orders under cover of G.O. of 12 Jany 95, No. 81 Judl.

2. The memorial contains no new matter except perhaps the statement at the close of para 14. - Govt. was however of course fully aware of the Pandikkad rising when it passed orders. The rest of the memorial follows very closely the review petition disposed of in G.O. No 81 of 12.1.95. - It is not liable to be withheld under any of the classes of (A.) Memorial Rule XII & under Rule IV must be forwarded direct to the Secretary of State "with "a full statement of facts and an "expression of opinion", as the case has not been previously under the consideration of the Govt. of India. It is true (vide linked file) that the Govt. of India has received a memorial from one of the Constables concerned, the Ist., it is thought

M.
29.4.95

as this does not necessitate the forwarding of Chatha's petition through that Govt.

Orders are now solicited as to the form which (a) the "statement of facts" & (b) the "expression of opinion" should take.

The statement of facts may be taken from G.O. of 30 August 1894 No. 2107 & from Mr. Butterworth's note for orders on G.O. No 81 of 12. 1. 95. which summarizes the enquiry into the question whether Kadiri was a fanatic or lunatic. As Mr. Moberly's letter of 17 Nov. 1894 has been incorporated in the petition, care will be taken to point out the inaccuracies noted in it by the Hon. Mr. Bliss

As to the expression of opinion, it will presumably be necessary to explain that the Govt. is ~~constituted~~ now ~~differently from~~ is now differently constituted by reason of the abolition of the ~~Commander-in-Chief~~ office of the Commander-in-Chief, but, explicit orders are solicited as to whether the opinion of the Govt. still coincides with that set out in G.O. of 30 August 1894 – or whether any recommendation should be made ~~whether ... be stated that the Govt. as now constituted considers~~ in the petr. behalf. the ~~sentence~~ punishments to have been excessive

D
30-4-95

[initials]
17/5/95

1st. note.

We must forward this to the Sec. of State setting out the facts mentioned above – & in Butterworth's note – showing exactly that the petitioner stated his own case – and that his explanations were all before Govt. which showed that the party of which he was in charge brought about the madman's death, unnecessarily and that his conduct on the occasion showed him to have exhibited a most culpable amount of cowardice.

Mr. Moberly's statements must also be controverted.

[initials] 22/5

Chatha's memorial to the Secy of State

FOR ORDERS.

Hm & Circ.

My opinion remains unaltered, vizt., that the Tahsr. & the Police displayed gross cowardice & committed murder & are lucky not to have been prosecuted criminally

[initials]
20/5/95

I think it would have been sufficient to suspend the Tahsildar – say for 12 mos. I originally suggested 6 mos. but I now think that would not have been a sufficient punishment

But See over

W
25 May

C 18/5 R 24/5
C 23/5 R 27/5

[G. / 24.]
600—8-3-95.

Papers to be read in proceedings:— printed

DEPARTMENT.

18

P. Again G.O., dated 30 August 1894, No. 2107
P. Again G.O., dated 12 January 1895, No. 81
p Current No. 1721 of 1895, dated 5 from A Chatha

Current No. of 189 , dated from

ORDER.

P.S.

The memorial will be forwarded to the Rt Hon. the Secretary of State through the Govt of India

(from orders)

~~Memorial sent~~
D
12.6.95

To Petr. A Chatha.

Letter to the Secy. to the Govt of India, Home Dept.

Sir

I am directed to submit the accompanying memorial addressed to the Rt. Honble the Secretary of State by A. Chatha, late Tahsildar of Badagara in the district of Malabar, in which he appeals against the order of this Govt. directing his dismissal for cowardice & mismanagement resulting in the unnecessary sacrifice of the life of a lunatic Moplah under No. IV of the memorial rules relating to the transmission of petitions

..r this ..

..f ..

..ressed to the Secretary of State, this .. a memorial which should, strictly speaking, be transmitted direct to the Secretary of State, as the case has not been previously under the consideration of the Govt. of India. I am to say that this rule has been deviated from, because the general facts ~~relating~~ of the case, though not the conduct of the memorialist, must be brought to the notice of the Govt. of India in connection with another memorial* addressed to that Govt. by one P. Samati a head constable who was dismissed for the part which he played in the same incident.

* submitted with my letter no. dated June 1895

2. The facts of the case will now be set out.

On the afternoon of the 25th May 1894, a moplah named Kanamvalli Kadiri Kutteri, resident in Badagara, a town which is the headquarters of a taluk of the same name in the district of Malabar, appeared in the streets of that town in a state of frenzy brandishing a table-knife & announcing the intention of taking the lives of his enemies. At about 6 p.m. the moplah's elder brother brought word of this to the memorialist who as Tahsildar &

[G. / 24.]
600—8-3-95.

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. of 189 , dated from

Current No. of 189 , dated from

ORDER.

Taluk magistrate was responsible for the maintenance of law and order. The memorialist sent his information to the Station House Officer, Head Constable P. Samati, who, under his orders, proceeded to the bazaar accompanied by four constables armed with batons. They found Kadiri Kutti in ~~a~~ his shop knife in hand, & the head constable directed him to lay ~~it~~ ~~do~~ the weapon down & follow him. Kadiri refused to obey & the head constable then appealed to some Moplahs standing close by for assistance but they declined to help. At this moment a Sanyasi or religious mendicant passed by & Kadiri beckoned to him, upon which he approached & sat down beside Kadiri who said to him "Where is my gold mureda*? If you do not give it, I w..

* ~~an~~ a religious ornament

murder you at once", — a causeless
remark which was sufficient to show
that he was insane. The Sanyasi was
alarmed & ran away but was pursued
by Kadiri, slightly wounded ~~by~~ with
the knife & knocked down. The police
followed, & one of them struck Kadiri
on the head with his bâton, whereupon
Kadiri turned & stabbed him twice
in the arm. The attempt to arrest him
was then for the time abandoned, the
wounded constable was sent off to the
hospital with ~~one~~ another constable
& the station house officer with the other
two men returned to the police station
a quarter of a mile distant — in order
to get fire-arms; — Kadiri was left at
large in the bazaar. In the meantime
the memorialist, who had received fur-
ther information had started out with
his duffadar & two peons. On his way
he was met by an excited crowd ~~who~~
and was so alarmed at the story
of Kadiri's attack on the police &
the Sanyasi that as he himself
says he "receded for self-preservation"
At the same time the head constable &
his two companions came up on their
way to get fire-arms ~~the police station~~; & four carbines
& forty rounds of ball ammunition were

(Constable no. 896)

[G. / 24.]
600—8-3-95.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

DEPARTMENT.

36

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. of 189 , dated from

Current No. of 189 , dated from

ORDER.

procured from the police station which
was close by & the ~~late~~ memorialist,
~~and the head constable & three~~ the
station house officer & four constables
proceeded to the bazaar where they
found Kadiri in front of his shop with
the wounded constable's turban on his
head brandishing his knife & shouting
out defiance. The memorialist called
on Kadiri's relatives to seize him
but the crowd fled in terror & the
memorialist himself (as he deposed before the stationary submagistrate) "receded ten
"paces for self preservation and ran
"into a lane". The police then called
on Kadiri to surrender under pain of
being shot but he advanced towards
them crying out that the bullets would
not hit him. When he was about
thirty yards off, two constables fired
at him, but without effect probably be-

[G. 24.] 699—8-3-95.

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

48

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. of 189 , dated from

Current No. of 189 , dated from

ORDER.

the head Constable says the shots were fired at the ground, under his orders but without the approval of the memorialist who was close behind the police. Kadiri continued to advance until close to one of the constables - No. 551 - who fired again without orders & hit him in the stomach. He continued to advance however and was brought to the ground by shots fired by Constables Nos. 674 & 675 who fired without orders & killed him. When these shots were fired the police had retreated against a wall & could retire no further.

3. When dealing with the case,

The memorialist was the Senior magistrate present & it was his duty to see that no extreme measure of shooting Kadiri was resorted to until every other means had been tried. The Govt considered that, had the most ordinary degree of resolution been shown, the lunatic could easily have been seized and disarmed by the police; they were five to one, armed with carbines which might have been used to such effect as clubs, and with bâtons, while the lunatic had nothing but a table-knife; there was thus no excuse whatever for firing upon him. In this duty, as the Govt held,

he entirely failed, being more concerned with thoughts of his own safety than with his responsibility as a magistrate. - In consequence it was decided that For his cowardice and entire failure to act up to the responsibility of his position he was therefore dismissed from the public service.

4. The Govt Board of Malabar subsequently requested Govt to reconsider this order - vide his letter 9/17 Nov. 1894 No. 1340 M. - on the ground that further light had been thrown on the incident by an enquiry conducted in June which tended to show that Kadiri was not a lunatic but a fanatic. There was however nothing in the letter which in the opinion of Govt afforded ground for reconsideration & the original order was therefore af

heed. As the memorialist relies upon it for his defence, it is necessary to point out certain inaccuracies which it contains

The District Magte considers that "most people when charged by a man "brandishing a knife & apparently mad "with fanaticism would shoot him "down". — Not it was not a case of a single man being "charged" by a fanatic. The Head Constable & the memorialist both speak of the Moplah as "advancing with measured steps" "and continuing to advance slowly". There was thus plenty of time in which to concert a plan of action

Again the District Magte speaks of the Memorialist as having had the opportunity of showing cause why he should not be punished. The statement is misleading as the memorialist on ~~his occasion~~, gave an after account of what he had to say to the Divisional Magte Mr. Arling, on two occasions, & made a formal deposition before the Stationary Sub Magte.

It is hardly necessary to controvert [illegible] broad assertion that a "madman "would have gone for all alike"

[illegible] now remains to discuss the grounds on which the appeal is based

To [illegible] SECRETARY

[G. 21.] 600—8-95.

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. of 189 , dated from

Current No, of 189 , dated from

ORDER.

The memorialist contends

(i) that the best reasonable grounds for believing that Kaderi was a fanatic & not a mere lunatic

(ii) that it was consequently necessary to dispose of him before night fall

(iii) that Kaderi was a man of great strength and activity

(iv) that he was armed not with a mere little knife but with a weapon having a blade seven inches long

(v) that the only way of disposing of him was to shoot him, & that the memorialist could not have acted otherwise than he did

(vi) that the Moplah outrages which had occurred in April justified the strongest action taken in this case, or at least formed extenuating circumstances

(vii) that the memorialist had no

7

[op]portunity of defending himself,
(iii) that his previous long & good service
[sh]ould have been taken into consider-
ation.

As regards point (i) which is not
pressed it may be observed that the
balance of evidence is in favour of the
theory that Kadiri was mad. Both
the Divl. Magte. Mr. Ayling, & the Asst.
Supdt. of Police, Mr. Macartney who en-
quired into the matter came to this
conclusion & the Govt. accepted it as
correct. The memorialist himself
~~as to point (ii)~~ stated before Mr. Ayling
"judging from his (Kadiri's) ap-
"pearance I should say he was
"terribly mad" and again "I have
"since heard that he was mad for
"some time & was shut up by
"his brothers in an upstairs room
"from which he escaped just before
"the offence". It appears plain there-
-fore that the memorialist had
little doubt of Kadiri's madness
until he found that it would serve his
interests to describe him as some
what fanatical.

The second contention may ~~perhaps~~ be
admitted; it was certainly desirable
to secure the lunatic before night.

To

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. of 189 , dated from

Current No. of 189 , dated from

ORDER.

fall, not because he was a Mop-
-lah fanatic but because he was not
unlikely to do more mischief in the
dark

As regards the third contention vizt.
that Kadiri was a man of great strength
& activity, it is to be observed that
the divisional magistrate describes
him in these words " ~~He was a~~
"His physique was by no means
"out of the common and a huge
"scrotal hernia which he suf-
"fered from must have considerably
"impaired his fighting powers"

It is thus improbable that he
could have made any effectual
resistance if simultaneously attacked by four or
five determined constables.

The fourth contention ~~is refuted~~
by, may be disposed of with the

following quotation from Mr Arling's report

"[It was] an ordinary table knife of medium size with a bone handle, & "blade slightly bent"

The fifth contention was that the "one way of disposing of Kadir was to shoot him & that the memorialist could not have acted otherwise than he did as may be answered by the reiteration of the statement that 'had "the most ordinary degree of resolution "been shown, the lunatic could easily "have been seized & disarmed". It was the memorialist's duty as a magistrate & have taken command of the police & directed them to make a combined assault with clubbed carbines or with their bâtons. Instead of doing this, he "receded into a lane for self-preservation", ~~took refuge & concealed himself~~ behind the police & permitted them to shoot at the lunatic as he was advancing slowly & deliberately towards them.

The Govt cannot admit the sixth contention viz: that the Moplah outrages which had occurred shortly before in a distant part of the district were any excuse for an

3

To

The Secretary

[G. 24. 690—8.95.]

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. of 189 , dated from

Current No. of 189 , dated from

ORDER.

~~had a formal deposition before~~

He had also made a formal deposition before the Stationary Sub-magistrate

deposition and the

necessary violence towards a mere lunatic, although a Moplah. The seventh contention - viz: that the memorialist had no opportunity of defending himself calls for but few remarks. The memorialist had given a statement before Mr Arling on the 25th ~~of~~ May last in which he admitted the correctness of a detailed account given by the head constable & said "on our way to the place "I told the head constable that as it was "getting dark, if the man could not "be arrested, he must be shot". The head constable's story, agreed with ~~as to~~ about the account of the incident which has been given above, the facts in general accuracy of which is not disputed & does upon these admitted facts that the Govt found the memorialist to

guilty of cowardice & inefficiency such as to warrant his dismissal from the public service. He was therefore in no way prejudiced by not being given a further opportunity of explaining himself. It is to be added that he ~~subsequently present a lengthy review petition to the Govt.~~ subsequently made a more detailed statement before Mr. Ayling, & presented a lengthy review petition to the Govt., both of which were carefully considered with the result that the Govt. saw no reason to modify its order.

The petrs previous service does not appear to have been particularly good; & it is to be noted that he was reduced for misconduct some three years since. ~~The Govt. considers that there was no~~ & there is ~~nothing~~ nothing in his previous record to ~~such as to warrant~~ justify his being treated with exceptional leniency.

H.E. the Govt. in Council has therefore no recommendation to make in the memorialists behalf.

In conclusion I am to state that after a reconsideration of the ~~my~~ conduct of the police, the punishment of dismissal originally ~~ws~~ meted out to them

Chattu's memorial

~~Ex. H.M.~~

(for orders)

has since been converted into an order directing their suspension for a period of six months.

Thence

D
13.6.95

To

Kr. [illegible]

The Secretary

NOTE FOR THE UNDER SECRETARY.

Papers relating to Badagara shooting case are submitted to U.S. with fair copy of the despatch for signature of H.M.s. A copy of G.O. 1386 / 1.7.95 & the despatch in Chattu's case is also put up with the linked file. Perhaps the despatch may now be circd for HK signatures.

8.7.95

Yes D
5.7

To

THE SECRETARY T

1st July

JUNE 1895, No.

, JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers :—

G.O., dated 30th August 1894, No. 21[illegible]7, Judicial.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on reports relating to the recent shooting by the police of a Moplah at Badagara.

G.O., dated 12th January 1895, No. 81, Judicial.

ABSTRACT.—Informing the late Tahsildar A. Chathu, Head Constable P. Sumati and the several constables who were dismissed in connection with the shooting of a Moplah, that the Government sees no reason to reconsider its previous orders.

READ—also the following paper :—

Endorsement of the Revenue Department, dated 5th April 1895, transferring a memorial addressed to the Secretary of State by M.R.Ry. A. Chathu, late Tahsildar, Kurambranad taluk, Badagara, Malabar district, appealing against the orders of Government dismissing him from the service in connection with the Moplah shooting case.

ORDER—dated 1st ~~June~~ July 1895, No. 1386, Judicial.

The memorial will be forwarded to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State ~~through the Government of India.~~

[Here enter No. , dated June 1895].

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To Memorialist A. Chathu.

Proofred 6 P.M. 21/6/95

1386

C. No. 1721, 1721A.

To

THE SECRETARY

SIR,

FC

VERNMENT OF INDIA,

HOME DEPARTMENT.

ng memorial addressed to the Right
ıu, late Tahsildar of Badagara, in the
the order of this Government direct-
gement resulting in the unnecessary
No. IV of the Memorial rules relating
Secretary of State, this is a memorial
direct to the Secretary of State, as the
ation of the Government of India. I
because the general facts of the case,
ust be brought to the notice of the
vernment of India in connection with
ther memorial * addressed to that
vernment by one P. Sumati, a head
ıstable, who was dismissed for the part
ich he played in the same incident.

, a Moplah named Kanamvalli Kadiri
s the head-quarters of a taluk of the
in the streets of that town in a state
ıcing the intention of taking the lives
elder brother brought word of this to
Magistrate was responsible for the
t sent his informant on to the Station-
, under his orders, proceeded to the
ith batons. They found Kadiri Kutti
able directed him to lay the weapon
nd the head constable then appealed
e, but they declined to help. At this
by and Kadiri beckoned to him, upon
diri, who said to him, "Where is my
d *murada* *? If you don't give it,
ill murder you at once"—a causeless
ark which was sufficient to show that
an away, but was pursued by Kadiri,
wn. The police followed, and one of
ead with his baton, whereupon Kadiri
attempt to arrest him was then for
sent off to the hospital with another
other two men returned to the police
et fire-arms; Kadiri was left at large
st, who had received further inform-
o peons. On his way he was met by

This I will require modification. See my remarks on draft order on the policeman's appeal. We have agreed that Sumati is to be suspended - so his appeal on the ground of dismissal is superfluous.

24/6

26 June

wardice an

To

THE SECRETARY T

SIR,

I am directed to submit the ac
Honourable the Secretary of State by
district of Malabar, in which he appeals
ing his dismissal for cowardice and m
sacrifice of the life of a lunatic Moplah.
to the transmission of petitions addresse
which should, strictly speaking, be trans
case has not been previously under the c
am to say that this rule has been deviated
though not the conduct of the memoria

* Submitted with my letter, No. , dated
June 1895.

2. The facts of the case
On the afternoon of the 25th May
Kuttiri, resident in Badagara, a town whi
same name in the district of Malabar, appe
of frenzy brandishing a table-knife and ann
of his enemies. At about 6 P.M., the Mopl
the memorialist, who as Tahsildar and Ta
maintenance of law and order. The memori
house officer, Head Constable P. Sumati, w
bazaar accompanied by four constables armed
in his shop, knife in hand, and the head co
down and follow him. Kadiri refused to obe
to some Moplahs standing close by for assista
moment a *Sanyasi*, or religious mendicant, pas
which he approached and sat down beside

* A religious ornament.

he was insane. The *Sanyasi* was alarmed and
slightly wounded with the knife and knocked
them, constable No. 896, struck Kadiri on the
turned and stabbed him twice in the arm. Th
the time abandoned, the wounded constable wa
constable, and the Station-house officer with th
station, a quarter of a mile distant, in order to
in the bazaar. In the meantime the memorial
ation, had started out with his duffadar and t

Stationary Sub-Magistrate, "
lane." The police then calle
he advanced towards them cry
was about thirty yards off, two
because, as the head constable
orders and with the approval o
Kadiri continued to advance unt
again without orders and hit h a
however, and was brought to the g ;
and 815, who fired without orders osi

3. When dealing with the c g
ordinary degree of resolution been w
and disarmed by the police ; they
have been used with effect as clubs
but a table-knife, there was thus
memorialist was ~~the~~ ~~senior~~ magis
extreme a measure was not resort
In this duty, ~~as the Government~~ he
thoughts of his own safety than
cowardice and entire failure to act u
~~therefore~~ dismissed from the public s

4. The District Magistrate of M
reconsider this order—*vide* his letter,
on the ground that further light ha
conducted in June which tended to sh
There was, however, nothing in this le
ground for reconsideration and the
memorialist relies upon it for his
inaccuracies which it contains.

The District Magistrate conside
brandishing a knife and apparently r
Now it was not a case of a single ma
constable and the memorialist both spe
steps and continuing to advance slow
to concert a plan of action. Again, th
as having had no opportunity of sho
The statement is misleading as the m
say to the Divisional Magistrate, Mr.
deposition before the Stationary Sub-M
the District Magistrate's broad asserti
alike."

5. It now remains to discuss the g
The memorialist contends—

(i) that he had reasonable groun
not a mere lunatic ;
(ii) that it was consequently nec
(iii) that Kadiri was a man of gre

(iv) that he was armed, not with a
a blade seven inches long;
(v) that the only way of disposi
memorialist could not have a
(vi) that the Moplah outrages w
stringent action taken in
circumstances;
(vii) that the memorialist had no
(viii) that his previous long and
consideration.

6. As regards point (i), which is not
of evidence is in favour of the theory
Magistrate, Mr. Ayling, and the Assistan
who enquired into the matter, came to t
it as correct. The memorialist himself st
(Kadiri's) appearance I should say he wa
heard that he was mad for some time and
room from which he escaped just before t
the memorialist had little doubt of Kadiri
his interests to describe him as sane but f

The second contention may be admitt
lunatic before nightfall, not because he wa
unlikely to do more mischief in the dark.

As regards the third contention—viz.
and activity—it is to be observed that the
words:—

"His physique was by no means out of th
suffered from must have considerably impaired

It is thus improbable that he could h
taneously attacked by four or five determ

The fourth contention may be disp
Mr. Ayling's report:—

"[It was] an ordinary table-knife of med

The fifth contention—viz., that the on
and that the memorialist could not have ac
by the reiteration of the statement that '
been shown, the lunatic could easily ha
memorialist's duty as a magistrate to hav
them to make a combined assault with clu
of doing this, he "receded into a lane fo
police and permitted them to shoot at th
deliberately towards them.

The Government cannot admit the
rages which had occurred shortly before
excuse for unnecessary violence towards

The seventh contention—viz., that th
himself—calls for but few remarks. T
Mr. Ayling on the 25th May in whic
account given by the head constable ar
"head constable that, as it was getting
"must be shot." He had also made a
Sub-Magistrate. The deposition and th
account of the incident which has been
not disputed, and it was upon these ad
memorialist to be guilty of cowardice an

table-knife, but with a weapon having

f him was to shoot him, and that the
d otherwise than he did;
h had occurred in April justified the
is case, or at least formed extenuating

portunity of defending himself;
ood service should have been taken into

pressed, it may be observed that the balance
that Kadiri was mad. Both the Divisional
t Superintendent of Police, Mr. Macartney,
his conclusion and the Government accepted
ted before Mr. Ayling, "Judging from his
terribly mad", and again, "I have since
was shut up by his brothers in an upstair
e offence." It appears plain therefore that
s madness until he found that it would serve
natical.

ed; it was certainly desirable to secure the
s a Moplah fanatic, but because he was not

that Kadiri was a man of great strength
Divisional Magistrate describes him in these

common and a huge scrotal hernia which he
is fighting powers."

ve made any effectual resistance if simul-
ed constables.

ed of with the following quotation from

n size with a bone handle, blade slightly bent."

way of disposing of Kadiri was to shoot him
d otherwise than he did—may be answered
ad the most ordinary degree of resolution
e been seized and disarmed." It was the
taken command of the police and directed
bed carbines or with their batons. Instead
self-preservation," took refuge behind the
lunatic as he was advancing slowly and

th contention, viz., that the Moplah out-
a distant part of the district were any
mere lunatic, although a Moplah.

emorialist had no opportunity of defending
memorialist had given a statement before
e admitted the correctness of a detailed
said, "On our way to the place I told the
, if the man could not be arrested, he
rmal deposition before the Stationary
head constable's story agreed with the
above, the general accuracy of which is
d facts that the Government found the
efficiency such as to warrant his dismissal

N. Boucher

from the public service. He was therefo
a further opportunity of explaining himsel
made a more detailed statement before M
petition to the Government, both of which
that the Government saw no reason to mo

The petitioner's previous service does
it is to be noted that he was reduced fo
there is nothing in his previous record to
leniency.

7. His Excellency the Governor in
to make in the memorialist's behalf.

In conclusion I am to state that, on a
the punishment of dismissal originally met
an order directing their suspension for a p

OOTACAMUND,
12 ~~June~~ July 1895.

Copy Despatch sent to Govt
of India - 22/7/95

n no way prejudiced by not being given
It is to be added that he subsequently
Ayling and presented a lengthy review
ere carefully considered with the result
its order.

t appear to have been particularly good;
isconduct some three years since and
stify his being treated with exceptional

uncil has therefore no recommendation

onsideration of the conduct of the police,
out to them has since been converted into
iod of six months.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Chief Secretary.

22-VI-95

Office note

Be careful to see that
the right memorial is sent.
The Pol. sent two copies - one
at C. 1721 one with C. 1721 A;
it is that received with the letter
which must be sent

D
22-VI-95

together with the
11 enclosures.

Jul 9
1917.

E

H11 xcite

Draft order &
letter forwarding
Chalkis memorial
to Secy of State

X

22/11/55

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED 189

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. ..

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.