Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 1916

Dated 11th Sept: 1895

INDEXED

[Despatch Abstract.]

PETITION.

Declining to interfere on behalf of Chinnaswami Nayudu, late Head Constable No. 142 of the South Arcot Police Force, praying that he may ~~be~~ at least be given the post of a constable on Rs. 8 or 7.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

CURRENT NO. 293

"Duplicate"

To

His Excellency The Right Honorable The Governor
in Council
Madras

Most Excellency

The humble petition presented by Chinnasawmy Naidoo late Head Constable No. 142 of the South Arcot Police is as follows:—

The petitioner humbly begs to present this memorial to your Excellency in Council against the order of the Inspector General of Police No. 1997/4.4.95 (a copy of which is sent with the original through the Police Department) and humbly begs to bring the following matters to the favourable kind consideration of your Excellency in Council

(1) That the petitioner was Head Constable and Station House officer at Vadampuliyoor, Panrutty Division, South Arcot District;

(2) That on the 29th of July 1894 your petitioner received a report from the Village Munsiff of Batharakottai belonging to Vadampuliyoor Police Station that one Shylammai, a wife of one Sababathi Padiachy, Forest watchman committed suicide by hanging herself on the branch of a Cashew nut tree and that the said Village Munsiff prevented her people from taking her corpse away to the Cremation-Ground such that your petitioner might go and hold an inquest there;

(3) That the Village Munsiff did not in his report make mention of any matter fitted to arouse suspicion in your petitioner's mind; and that your petitioner having sent the Village Munsiff's report to the Sub Magistrate of Panrutty went to the scene of offence at about 4 P.M. that day;

(4) That your petitioner had to wait a long time to assemble the respectable people of the place several of whom had gone to superintend the work in their fields; and your petitioner had also to wait long for the arrival of one Ramasamy Padiachy who untied the corpse from the branch on which it hung and who subsequently went to buy rice and other articles to feed the people who had come to attend the funeral;

(5) That in consequence of the delays caused as said forth in the previous paragraph, your petitioner was unable to hold inquest on the same day;

(6) That the petitioner in the inquest held by him on the next day found only the marks of suicide and no marks of violence; and that your petitioner's inquest report was then and there signed by 25 respectable villagers and by the Village Magistrate who thereupon allowed the corpse to be taken away to the burial ground;

(7) That if suicide take place in villages, the villagers fearing that they may get into trouble hastely dispose of the corpse; but that there were no other suspicious circumstances in the present case;

(8) That the mother and brother of the deceased were present during the inquest; and when they were asked to sign the Mazar, they said that they would sign it if the petitioner restored to them the jewels given to the deceased at the marriage of the latter who had no issue to inherit her property;

(9) That the petitioner said that he had no control over that matter, and that the mother and brother consequently refused to sign the inquest report;

(10) That the petitioner being convinced that it was a case of suicide did not send the corpse for post-mortem examination, and there is a Police order to that effect that all cases of suicide need not be sent to the post-mortem examination unless there is any suspicion;

(11) That if there was really any suspicion the parents or other relatives of the deceased would have complained; but that they have not done;

(12) That the husband of the deceased being a Fore -watchman impounded the cattle of several villager's in the neighbourhood while trespassi upon Forest Ground and thus made them his enemies;

(13) That 4 of such persons who were living a mile off from the village where the offence took place wrote an annonymous petition to the Sub Magistrate of Panrutty and sent it by post with an intention to injure the husband of the deceased saying that the husband murdered his wife by beating her and that your petitioner took a bribe and suppressed the case;

(14) And that the annonymous petitioners concocted false evidence brought false witnesses and that 20 days after they persuaded the mother and brother of the deceased to give evidence against the accused offering to pay their expenses;

(15) And that these false witnesses gave evidence just as they were tutored and thus brought suspicion to attach to the case;

(16) That they failed to ruin the husband of the deceased and that their evidence ~~qu~~ turned against the petitioner;

(17) That the Superintendent of Police suspecting the petitioner suspended him and prosecuted him for suppressing a murder case, for having taken a bribe and forgery;

(18) That the case against the petitioner went up before the Court of Session and that the petitioner was acquitted, but that the Sessions Judge remarked that the petitioner should be punished in his department;

) That in the course of the trial against the petitioner the mother and brother of the deceased deposed to the effect that they asked the petitioner to send the corpse to a Hospital and that your petitioner refused to do so and also threatened them;

(20) That they must have known how post-mortem examinations are conducted and that they would not have liked to send the corpse of their nearest relative (that is daughter to mother and sister to brother) to be dealt with in that way;

(21) That even if the petitioner wished to send the corpse to a Hospital they would be sure to prevent it and that this matter is known to every body;

(22) That since the corpse was disposed of they could say now anything they like;

(23) That they deposed to having seen some marks of violence on the corpse;

(24) That if there were such marks, your petr. would have sent it to the Hospital, the villagers would not have signed the inquest report nor would the Village Munsiff have given permission to dispose of the corpse;

(25) That since the witnesses deposed falsely in the manner shown above those who heard them began to entertain suspicion;

(26) That the Supt of Police acted upon the false statements of these witnesses suspended the petitioner and reported to the Inspector Gen of Police that your petr. suppressed an ac Murder case;

(27) That this report of the Supt. is made the reason for your petitioner's present dismis regardless of the fact that your petitioner would have been punished if the offences we proved against him in the Court of Session

(28) That the fact that the petitioner was acquitt itself shows that your petr. was not to blame and that the murder did not take place;

(29) That in the proceedings of the Inspector Gener it is said that the Supt. of Police went to the scene of offence and did not find that the rope had strongly pressed against the branch of the tree

(30) That when your petitioner held his inquest he found that the rope was wound 4 tim round the branch and that owing to this the branch was not pressed and that the bark of that tree was very strong;

(31) That it is said that a woman could not climb such a tree, but that your petr. submits that a rustic woman could climb such a tree as the Supt. of Police himself saw a ~~m~~ woman climb the same tree during the time of his inspection;

(32) That in this country if a woman has a misunderstanding against her husband or her mother-in-law she usually commits suicide:

(33) That it is said in the proceedings that your petitioner did not prepare his inquest report by the side of the corpse; but your petr. humbly submits that since it was a

windy season and since wind blew strongly at the time under that tree your petr was obliged to go to the nearest field to prepare his request and get the signiture:

— Your petitioner humbly begs that your Excellency will have great Mercy on your poor petitioner who begs to appeal on the following grounds:

(1) The Session Judge has remarked that your petr should be punished departmentally; but since your petitioner was prosecuted and found not guilty, he submits that it is improper to punish him after his acquittal.

(2) Even if your petitioner should be punished it would be considered that he had to spend about 250 Rs (Vakeel fees etc) and that he was under suspension from 28.8.94 to 3.4.95 and that on the 4th April an order was passed for dismissing your petitioner from the date of suspension, and that he had to lose all his pay for such a long time; this itself your petr submits is a heavy punishment on him.

(3) The Supt of Police and Deputy Inspector-General of Police have recommended that your petitioner should be restored to the service with a reduction and that it is not just and proper to dismiss him; and that if a reduction takes place your petr will be sufficiently punished since he would lose 10 Rs every month if he is reduced from being an Head Constable to the post of an ordinary Constable.

(4) And your petitioner submits that such reduction itself would very sufficient punishment according to the view of the Session Judge and that is too har~~d that~~ he should be so severely punished and dismiss him from Govt service not withstanding his acquittal in a judicial tribunal.

(5) Your petr had to lose almost all his property to meet the expenses of his defence and has thereby ~~become~~ very poor. Your petr has served in this Department for 10 years. He is not acquainted to any other business. He has no money to engage in trade or any land to cultivate. Your petitioner and his family find it very difficult to maintain themselves and are obliged to starve. Your petr does not insist on being restored to his previous post. Your petr has learnt a good lesson and he will be cautious hereafter.

(6) Your petitioner most humbly requests that your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to give him at least a Constable's place on Rs 8 or 7 and thus save him and his family from starvation.

6.6.95
Tindivanam

He begs to remain
Most Respected and honored Sir
Your Excellency's most obedient
and humble servant.
M [illegible]
Late Hd Const No 142 of
South Arcot Police
residing at Tindivanam

The original Appeal petition with dismissal order copy has sent through the Police Department.

That the Superintendent [illegible] Inspector

Judicial Dept. 20-5-95 1083

CURRENT NO. 293

From, Chinnasamy Naidoo
Late Head constable No 142
of the South Arcot Police

petn

No.-

Dated 6th
Recd 18th } June 1895
Regd 19th

Encl: 1

CHIEF SECRETARY
18 JUN. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Subject

Submitting a duplicate copy of his petition appealing against the order of the I.G. of Police directing his dismissal from service and praying that for the reasons given by him he may be provided at least with a constable's post on Rs 8 or 7.

To await receipt of the original petition.

21 VI 95

Encl 1 to letter No 3803 from Inspector

CURRENT No. 430 of 1895

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
14 JUN. 95
MADRAS.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
JUN. 95
SOUTH ARCOT DISTRICT

Petition No 699
South Arcot

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor
in Council
Madras

Through
The Superintendent of Police
South Arcot

Your Excellency

The humble petition presented by Chinnasawmy Naidoo late Head Constable No 142 of the South Arcot Police is as follows:-

The petitioner humbly begs to present this memorial to your Excellency in Council against the order of the Inspector-General of Police No 1997 dated 4.4.1895, (a copy of which is herewith submitted) and humbly begs to bring the following matters to the favourable and kind consideration of your Excellency in Council:-

(1) That the petitioner was Head Constable and Station House Officer at Thadampuliyoor, Laurutty Division, South Arcot District;

(2) That on the 29th of July 1894, your petitioner received a report from the Village Munsiff of Bathirakottai belonging to Thadampuliyoor Police Division, that one Thylammal, wife of one Sababathi Padiachy Forest Watchman committed suicide by hanging herself on the branch of a Cashew nut tree and that the said Village Munsiff prevented her people from taking her corpse away to the cremation ground such that your petitioner might go and hold an inquest there.

forwarded

10.6.95

Suspicion in your petitioner's mind;

(4) That your petitioner having sent the Village-Munsiff's report to the Sub Magistrate of Panrutty went to the scene of offence at about 4 P.M that day; that your petitioner had to wait a long time to assemble the respectable people of the place several of whom had gone to superintend the work in their fields; and your petitioner had also to wait long for the arrival of one Ramasamy Padeachy who untied the corpse from the branch on which it hung and who subsequently went to buy rice and other articles to feed the people who had come to attend the funeral;

(5) That in consequence of the delays caused as said forth in the previous paragraph, your petitioner was unable to hold inquest on the same day;

(6) That the petitioner in the inquest held by him on the next day found only the marks of suicide and no marks of violence; and that your petitioner's inquest report was then and there signed by 25 respectable villagers and by the Village Magistrate who thereupon allowed the corpse to be taken away to the burial ground;

(7) That if suicide takes place in villages, the villagers fearing that they may get into trouble hastily dispose of the corpse; but that there were no other suspicious circumstances in the present case;

(8) That the mother and brother of the deceased were present during the inquest, and when they were asked to sign the Mazer they said that they would sign it if the petitioner restored to them the jewels given to the deceased at the marriage of the latter who had no issue to

the pro

(9) That the petitioner said that he had no control over that matter and that the mother and brother consequently refused to sign the inquest report;

(10) That the petitioner being convinced that it was a case of suicide did not send the corpse for post-mortem examination, as there is police order to the effect that all cases of suicide need not be sent to the post-mortem examination unless there is any suspicion;

(11) That if there was really any suspicion the parents or other near relatives of the deceased would have complained, but that they have not done so;

(12) That the husband of the deceased being a Forest-watchman impounded the cattle of several villagers in the neighbourhood which trespassed upon Forest ground and thus made them his enemies;

(13) That 4 of such persons who were living a mile off from the village where the offence took place wrote an anonymous petition to the Sub Magt of Panrutty and sent it by post with an intention to injure the husband of the deceased, saying that the husband murdered his wife by beating her and that your petitioner took a bribe and suppressed the case;

(14) And that the anonymous petitioners concocted false evidence brought false witnesses and that 20 days after they persuaded the mother and brother of the deceased to give evidence against the accused offering to pay their expenses

(15) And that these false witnesses gave evidence just as they were tutored and thus brought a suspicion to attach to the case;

(16) That they failed to ruin the husband of the deceased and that their evidence all turned against the petitioner;

(17) That the Superintendent of Police suspecting

the petitioner suspended him and prosecuted him for suppressing a murder case for having taken a bribe and forgery;

(18) That the case against the petitioner went up before the Court of Session and that the petitioner was acquitted, but that the Sessions Judge remarked that the petitioner should be punished in his department;

(19) That in the course of the trial against the petitioner the mother and brother of the deceased deposed to the effect that they asked the petitioner to send the corpse to a Hospital and that your petitioner refused to do so and also threatened them;

(20) That they must have known how Post-mortem examinations are conducted and that they would not have liked to send the corpse of their nearest relative (i.e. daughter to mother and sister to brother) to be dealt with in that way;

(21) That even if the petitioner wished to send the corpse to a Hospital they would be sure to prevent it and that this matter is known to every body;

(22) That since the corpse was disposed of they could say now anything they like;

(23) That they deposed to having seen some marks of violence on the corpse;

(24) That if there were such marks your petitioner would have sent it to the Hospital. The villagers would not have signed the inquest report nor would Village Munsiff have given permission to dispose of the corpse;

[illegible]

(25) That since the witnesses deposed falsely in the manner shown above those who heard them began to entertain suspicion;

(26) That the Superintendent of Police acted upon the false statements of these witnesses suspended the petitioner and reported to the Inspector General of Police that your petitioner suppressed an actual murder case;

(27) That this report of the Supt of Police is made the reason for your petitioner's present dismissal regardless of the fact that your petitioner would have been punished if the offences were proved against him in the Court of Session;

(28) That the fact that the petitioner was acquitted itself shows that your petitioner was not to blame and that the ~~[illegible]~~ murder did not take place;

(29) That in the proceedings of the Inspector General it is said that the Supt went to the scene of offence and did not find that the rope had strongly pressed against the branch of that tree;

This is false
The bark of
Certain tree
is hard
[illegible]

(30) That when your petitioner held his inquest he found that the rope was wound 4 times round the branch and that owing to this the branch was not pressed and that the bark of that tree was very strong;

(31) That it is said that a woman could not climb a tree, but that your petitioner submits that a rustic woman could climb such tree as the Supt of Police himself saw a woman climb the same cashew nut tree during the time of his inspection;

(32) That in this country if a woman has a misunderstanding against her husband or her mother-in-law she usually commits suicide;

(33) That it is said in the proceedings th

petitioner did not prepare his inquest report by the side of the corpse, but your petr humbly submits that since it was a windy season and since wind blew strongly at the time under that tree your petr was obliged to go to the nearest place to prepare his report and get the signature;

Your petitioner humbly begs that your Excellency will have great mercy on your poor petitioner who begs to appeal on the following grounds.

(1) The Session Judge has remarked that your petr should be ~~punished~~ departmentally; but since your petr was prosecuted and found not guilty, he submits that it is improper to punish him after his acquittal.

(2) Even if your petr should be punished it should be considered that he had to spend about 250 Rs (Vakeel fees etc) and that he was under suspension from the 28.8.94 till 3-4-95 and that on the 4th April an order was passed for dismissing your petitioner from the date of suspension and that he had to lose all his pay for such a long time; this itself your petr submits is a heavy punishment on him.

(3) The Superintendent of Police and Dy Supr General of Police have recommended that your petitioner should be restored to service with a reduction and that it is not just and proper to dismiss him, and that if a reduction takes place your petr will be sufficiently punished since he would lose Rs 10 every month if he is reduced from being an Head Constable to the post of an ordinary Constable.

(4) And your petr submits that such reduction itself would be very sufficient punishment according to the view of the Session Judge and that is too hard that he should be so severely punished and dismissed from Govt. Service notwithstanding his acquittal in a judicial tribunal.

(5) Your petr had to lose almost all his property to meet the expenses of his defence and has thereby become very poor. Your petr has served in the Department for 10 years. He is not acquainted to any other business. He has no money to engage in trade nor any land to cultivate. Your petitioner and his family find it very difficult to maintain themselves and are obliged to starve. Your petr does not ~~insist~~ insist on being restored to his previous Head Constable post. Your petr has learnt a good lesson and he will be cautious hereafter.

(6) Your petitioner most humbly requests that Your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to give him atleast a Constable's post on Rs 8 or 7 and thus save him and his family from starvation.

He begs to remain
Most Respected and Honored Sir
Your Excellency's most obedient,
and humble servant.

P. Chinnasawmy Naidoo
Late Hd. Consl. No 142 of
South Arcot Police

Address
P. Chinnasawmy Naidoo
Late Hd Consl No 142
residing at Tindivanam
Care of Supr of Police
Tindivanam Dn

No. O-49.

CURRENT NO. 3025

DEPARTMENT.

No. 3803

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
MADRAS, 22d June 1895.

FROM

M. HAMMICK, ESQ., I.C.S.,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras,

TO

THE Chief Secretary
to Government,
Ootacamund.

SIR,

4 *Enclosures.*

I have the honor to submit an appeal from one Chinnaswami Nayudu, late Head Constable No. 142, South Arcot District. He appeals against my order, dated 4th April 1895 ordering his dismissal.

2. I have nothing to add to my order, which gives in full my reasons for ordering the dismissal of the appellant. The judgment of the Sessions Court should be read with my order. The man states no new facts in his appeal which have any important bearing on the case, and on his own admissions in his appeal his conduct was clearly scandalously negligent. I do not consider that a man about whose conduct there is such grave or

Suspicion

suspicion should remain in the force.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servt,

Inspector General of Police

A4.

No. 1997.

Chief Office of the Inspr General of Police
Madras, 4th April 1895-

Enclosure No. 1
To letter No. 4373 dt 24-7-95
From Inspector-General of Police.

Memorandum

In this case Head Constable, No. 142, Chinnaswami, South Arcot, has been tried by the Sessions Court, South Arcot, for Forgery - 465 I.P.C, Bribery - 161 I.P.C and giving false information - 203 I.P.C. -

The man was acquitted by the judge and Assessors, but the Sessions Judge noted that the Head Constable had been guilty of a "grave dereliction of duty for which "he merited severe departmental "punishment."

The case was that on the 29th July 1894 the Village Magistrate of Bandracotta in Panruti Division reported the suspicious death of one Tylammai in the village - The Head Constable Chinnaswami reached the village in the afternoon of the 29th July, but did nothing on that day - He slept in a house in the Village that night and next day held an inquest far away from the place of death — He never sent the body for post mortem and so neglected his enquiry that the true facts of the death never came to light — Colonel Porteous on a report of the Case from the Superintendent remarked: —

"Everything points to murder having been
"committed — One of those vile murders
"which it is to be feared are too
"common in this country where an un-
-fortunate is quietly put out — The Head
"Constables conduct has been atrocious" —

The man having been tried and acquitted, the question now is what punishment does he deserve —

The facts as they appear seem to me to be as follows against the Head Constable.

(1) In the Case of a very suspicious death by hanging — and alleged beating — the Constable although he reached the Village in the afternoon of the 29th July 1894 — did not hold the inquest until the second day — viz

viz. the 30th July —

(2). Although the orders are that an Inquest is to be held over the body, this inquest was held a long way from the place on the pial of a private house in the Village

(3). Although the Constable himself admits that the relations of the deceased, accused certain people in the Village of having murdered the deceased and although an examination of the tree on which the deceased was said to have hung should have shown him that the story of accused's party in the Village that the deceased hanged himself was most improbable, yet he never insisted that the body should be sent for post mortem —

(4). Among the signatures attached to the Inquest Report none of the signatures of the relations of the accused appear except a very suspicious signature "Luchmi" —

The only "Luchmi" who has appeared is the Mother of the deceased and she denies that she ever signed the Inquest Report, and the Sessions Judge although he declined to to convict the prisoner of having forged this name was clearly of opinion that the signature was a false one and that the Constable's story that the signature belonged to another Luchmi was quite false - I have not seen the Inquest Report as it cannot be obtained from the Court - But the Superintendent says that he is perfectly certain after inspecting the document that the signature is a false one - It is made in a different ink from the rest of the signatures. The only person who could have made this false signature is the Constable Chinnaswami -

I have given the Constable 3 questions to answer to shew cause why he should not be dismissed and his reply is most unsatisfactory - When asked why he did not send the body for post mortem, he replies that he found the death to be one of suicide - An examination of the tree from which the girl was hung should have shown him that the case was one of suspicion - It was almost impossible for a girl to have climbed the tree and hung herself

there

there (vide photograph of the tree by the Superintendent) and the tree bore no marks of the rope having rubbed on it as it would have done had the girl thrown herself down from it - The fact that the deceased was carried out to be burnt in such haste after death was further clear proof that there was something behind the case - He says there were no marks on the body but the fact that the Inquest was not held at once takes away all value from the report then made -

The very fact that the village was a factious one was further a reason for making a post mortem examination - He says the Village Magistrate signed the Mahazar, but the Village Magistrate's conduct seems to have been as suspicious as his own -

In reply to my question why he delayed the Inquest, he merely says two men were away from the village who were witnesses. This reason is very insufficient The Inquest might have been perfectly well held in their absence and inquiries made

next

next day of them when they returned -

Every Police Officer must know the importance attached to the prompt holding of inquests - Clearly an inquest held the next day - in a factious village would be almost valueless -

In reply to my last question as to why Luchmi's signature was attached to the report, the Constable replies that he cannot recollect now about that matter -

The Superintendent has recommended that as this man has paid much for his defence in the Sessions Court, he should now be simply degraded - I cannot agree - Looking to the very serious nature of the circumstances, viz, that the Constable by his gross neglect of duty has hushed up a probable murder, I consider dismissal the only proper punishment - It is absolutely certain that the Constable did neglect his duty scandalously and it is *very* probable that he did so for a consideration - The circumstances are very suspicious against him - Such a man

is

is a most dangerous man to keep in the force and I order his immediate dismissal -

(Signed) M. Hammick

Inspr General of Police

To

The Supt of Police, South Arcot,
through D.I.G.

(True Copy)

M Hammick

Inspr General of Police

Exd. WH

Enclosure 1

FORM No. 90. To Petition No. 230/R of 1895 **DEFAULTER SHEET.** of late 4th G. H.C. No. 142 Chinnasamy Naidu.

Enclosure No. 2
To letter No. 4573/24-7-95
From Inspector-General of Police.

Number	Rank and Name.	Nature of Offence.	Date when committed.	Punishment. Black Marks.	Punishment. Other Punishments.	By whom ordered.	Date of order.
		Not seeing body of a man died of Cholera at Ry: Station was removed —	13.9.91		Fined one Rupee	Supt.	6.10.91.
		Absence from festival Bundobust duty at Mylam on 26.1.93 & lying.	26.1.93		Fd. one Rupee & warned for reduction	— do —	7.2.93.
		Gross neglect of duty in hushing up a probable murder	28.8.94.		Dismissed the Force from 28.8.94	— do —	17.4.95.

True ~~copy~~ Extract.

7 Adene

Sd/ Ag: Superintendent of Police.
South Arcot.

5,000—5-94.

5
Jud. Depn.
Enclo. No. 1
3573.

Number.	Rank and Name.	Nature of Offence.	Date when committed.	Punishment.		By whom ordered.	Date of order.
				Black Marks.	Other Punishments.		

1895
Jul
Enclos. No. 2
C 3573

No. O-48.

Department.

CURRENT No. 3573

No. 4373.

Chief Office of the Inspector-General of Police,
Madras, 24th July 1895.

From

M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S.,
Inspector-General of Police,
Madras,

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government,
Ootacamund.

Sir,

Enclosures. 2

With reference to your Memorandum, No. 1540, dated 5th July 1895, J.D., I have the honor to forward, as desired therein, a copy of my order dismissing late Head Constable, Chinnaswami Nayudu, No. 142 of the South Arcot Police and his defaulter sheet.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant,

M Hammick
Inspector General of Police

Exd. [illegible]

CURRENT NO. 3573.

Judicial (1895) DEPARTMENT.

FROM

M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S.,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras,

To

THE Chief Secretary
to Government,
Ootacamund.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
26 JUL 95

No. 4373.

Dated 24th }
Received 26th. } July 1895.

Encs. 2

SUBJECT.

~~Forwarding~~, a Copy of his order dismissing late Head Constable, Chinnaswami Nayudu, No. 142 of the South Arcot Police and the defaulter Sheet called for.

MR 29/7
Us. 31/7

Cover

MR
31-7-95

Refce. No. 1540/95
& papers

CS

For orders.

The discharge order & defaulter sheet of the petr. – Chinnaswami Nayudu late head constable of the S. Arcot Police are submitted for perusal with refce. to orders on No. 3025/95.

~~KR~~

~~Draft memo.~~

Subd.

What is a "discharge order"; I thought it was the "order of dismissal".

D
2-8

A discharge order is a ^brief^ certificate given to every Police officer "on discharge" & to a Police officer "on resignation" when demanded in writing. This certificate shows the previous character of the man: vide P.O. 248 (c) in page 119 of the Book marked with red tape.

A dismissal order is a detailed minute recording statement of reasons for dismissal & any explanation offered in defence. P.O. 248 (a)

MR
3.8.95

His discharge order has not been sent. I want to see what his character is set down at.

D
2/8

[G/69]
1,000—18-3-95.

Jud. DEPARTMENT.

N

Memorandum.

No. 1839
5-8-95

~~Read the following~~

The Inspector General of Police is requested to forward the discharge certificate of the late Head Constable, Chinnaswami Nayudu, No. 142 of the S. Arcot Police.

3-8-95

+ P.O. 248 (c)

To
the I.G. of Police.

MR
3-8-95.

CS's note not redrafted
office
MR
3/8

The Inspector General of Police is requested to forward the discharge certificate of the late Head Constable Chinnaswami Nayadu, No 142 of the South

---

8. 9. 1. D

Age 30. 7. 26

Height 5'. 8 1/4"

Eyes. Black.

Hair. Black.

Complexion. Fair.

Country. Tindivanam

Caste – Gentoo

Rank on Enlistment. 1st C.C

Rank on leaving the Force. } 4th Cs. H.C.

General Character. Formerly good but shewed himself in his true colors at the last –

Madras Police.

South Arcot District

Cuddalore. 31st August 1895.

I hereby certify that late 4th Cs: Head Const. No 142 Chinnasamy Naidu (Description as per margin) who joined the Police Force of the South Arcot District on 2.7.86 has been dismissed the Service from 28.8.94 the date of Suspension

H. E. Sullivan.
Superintendent of Police
South arcot

No. O-48.

DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 42

No. 4853.

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
MADRAS, 3rd September 1895.

FROM

M. HAMMICK, ESQ., I.C.S.,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras,

TO

THE Chief Secretary
to Government,
Ootacamund.

SIR,

Enclosure } One }

With reference to Memo No 1839 of 8th August 1895. J.D. I have the honor to state that late Head Constable Chinnaswami Nayadu, No 142 of the South Arcot Police was dismissed by me and that a copy of my order No 1994, dated 4th April 1894 was given to him. No discharge certificate was issued. A certificate now obtained from the Superintendent is herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. servt.,

M Hammick

Inspector General of Police.

CURRENT NO. 4223

Jail (1895) DEPARTMENT.

FROM

M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S.,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras,

TO

THE Chief Secretary
to Government,
Ootacamund.

CHIEF SECRETARY
4 SEP. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

No. 4853.

Dated 3rd } September 1895.
Received 4th }
Reg. 5
Enclos. one

SUBJECT.

Stating that late Head Constable Chinnaswami Nayudu, No. 142 of the South Arcot Police was dismissed by him.

Ms 5/9
Ws 6/9

Cover

Ref. No. 1839/95
& papers

C1

Cur. 2937, 3025, 3573 & 4223/95.

For orders.

Copy of the discharge certificate of the petr. – Chinnaswami Nayudu late Hd. Constable of the S. Arcot Police is submitted with refce to G.O.'s orders of 2 Aug last.

D
7.9.95

I have passed the original order. I think the I.G.'s right. The man has given no satisfactory explanation & there can be no doubt that he was either grossly careless or else worse

[illegible]
10/9/95

Ms
6.9.95

CURRENT NO. 3025

Jail (1895) DEPARTMENT.

FROM

M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S.,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras,

TO

THE Chief Secretary
to Government,
Ootacamund.

No. 3803

Dated 22d } June 1895.
Received 24th }
Encs. 4

CHIEF SECRETARY
24 JUN. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

SUBJECT.

Submitting an appeal from one Chinnaswami Nayudu, late Head Constable No. 142, South Arcot District, with remarks.

25/6

Wo

G.O. Ct. No. 2937/95
& papers.

CA
Ms

Cur. 2937 & 3025/95.
3573, 4223.

Order of 11th September 1895, No. 191

DESPATCH

The Govt. declines to interfere on behalf of the petitioner.

D
26.6.95

[illegible]
10/9/95

To
The I.G. of Police. Copies to with Encls. [illegible] } 14/9
despd 19/9/95

Ms
25.6.95

For Ws.

No discharge order or defaulter sheet. I want to see character & previous punishment. Call for these papers

Refce only } G.O. 1540 25.7.95

The I.G. of Police is requested to furnish Govt. with a copy of the petr.'s defaulter sheet & the discharge passed in his case

D
3.7.95

I.G. Police Govt. desp.

5/7

4/7

hen given for copying ____
hen copied ____
hen examined ____
hen signed ____ } 189 .

D AGAIN G.O., No. 189 , DATED

RENT No.

CLOSURES TO C. No.

RE OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

TER OF GOVERNMENT.

EMENT WITH DITTO.

ES 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.