$\left[\frac{\text{G.}}{11}\right]$
300—14-4-98.

Judicial (189) Department.

①

ORDINARY Mis

G.O., No. 1328

Confidential No. 111

DATED 19-8-99.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr. G. H. Hunt Directing that — Supdt of Police, be removed from the service of Govt. for gross of neglect of duty and for deserting his post without leave and in defiance of express orders

BACK PA

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.
Con	62	Judl	1899	
"	71	"	1899	

1816/15.11.99

8

FURTHER P

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G
Co 3566 Con	154 5	Judl	1899	
Con No 8	of 1900		16-1-00	
Con 25	of 1900			

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர் மு. [illegible]

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 2/05

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த நாள் 4/05

15/4/05 26/4/05 21/4/15

சரிபார்க்கும் மு.நி.பா.எ. கையொப்பம்

ஆராய்ச்சி உதவியாளர் கையொப்பம்

Confidential

Judicial (1899) Department.

2c

CURRENT No. 2846

Con C No 248

Order

From

W. J. A. Sullivan Esq.
Ag Inspector General of Police

Camp No. 4 Extra

Dated 8th July 1899.
Received 11 - 7 - 99.
Registered 11 - 7 - 99
Enclosures 3 (Exhibits A, B & C)
Spare copies one and 2 enclos to C No 1538 of 99 returned

SUBJECT.

Submitting with remarks the explanation of Mr. G. H. Hunt Superintendent of Police South Canara district in answer to the charges pending against him.

(3)

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit B

Enclosure No. 2
To letter No. 1327/29-3-09
From Inspector-General of Police.

1909
Just
2
1538

supervising

Form No. O.-47.

~~124~~/a 5/1 9.

Chief Office of the Inspector-General of Police,

Madras, 10th January 1899.

Current No. 96.

(4)

I.G. S.R. 13 JAN.99

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Mr. Hunt is directed to explain why his weekly reports for the weeks ending December 3rd, December 10th and December 17th were not despatched by him until the 21st December.

Mr. Hunt will further state the amount of inspection done by him since he joined the district of South Canara and he will explain why more has not been done. He will also give the number of stations in each division which were not inspected during the year 1898.

A. Douglas Robertson

for Ag. Inspr. Genl. of Police.

To

G. H. Hunt Esq.
Supt. of Police, S. Canara
thro' the D. I. G. G
supervising

A.O.R

FORM No. 167.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
South Canara DISTRICT,
No.
Dated 26 January 1899.

FROM

G.S.R. 31 JAN. 99

G. H. Hunt Esqr
SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
South Canara District,

TO

THE Inspector General of Police
Madras
through the Dy Inspector General of Police
southern Range,

SIR,

Enclosures.

1 In reply to chief office memo no. 96 do 10th January 1899 I have the honor to submit explanation accounting for backward inspection up to 11th December; after that date I have no official explanation to offer beyond remarking that I was too much upset by private trouble to continue my work properly for the time being. My weekly reports were not despatched regularly for the same reason.

2. Having been transferred at a moments notice; and ordered to join forthwith I landed with nothing but my personal effects; havi left instructions for my kit to be packed an despatched by the first steamer. It was not delivered until 14th october.

or 16th
per W. R.
1-10-98

?

3. Up to the 26th october I was closely supervising

From

THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,

S. Canara District

To

The Insp: General

Mdo. by: Insp Genl

Dated }
Despatched } 26. 6. 99 189
Received }

No.

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

Submitting explanation for not completing Inspection and delaying weekly Repts.

189—
District No.

Took charge forenoon of 17th Sept 1897

Confidential.

C

Madras

26th June 1899.

72

From

G.H. Hunt Esq.,

Madras Police.

28/6

To,

The Inspector General of Police,

Madras.

Sir,

As directed in your confidential memoranda dated 4th & 5th instant I have the honor to submit my explanation to the questions therein contained.

In the Memorandum dated 5th instant I am directed in clause (a) para 2 to submit an explanation for neglect of duty for which I have already admitted having no official explanation to offer; I presume therefore I am required to state my private reasons in defence of my conduct.

When I first commenced to do so I found it so difficult to describe in semi-official languages the various circumstances which in time reduced me to such a state of anxiety that my official position and prospects became for the time being of secondary consideration, that I wired soliciting a personal interview with H.E. the Governor, ~~H.E.~~ His Excellency having been unable to grant my request I must do the best I can on paper.

I will avoid detail as much as possible, but shall be compelled to allude to certain incidents which may perhaps be taken exception to as out of place even in a confidential and semi-official communication, as these incidents caused me to act as I have done.

In September 98 I was suddenly transferred by wire from South Arcot to South Canara for reasons which I can but believe were principally non-official.

My transfer created fresh difficulties which became for me fresh anxieties. Towards the end of the year i.e. from the 11th December, I had reason to believe that the lady for whose future welfare I considered myself responsible, rendered half desperate by her own intolerable position and desirous of protecting my official position and prospects, contemplated saving the situation by an act of sheer madness. It was to prevent this and to make other arrangments to avoid if possible a glaringly public scandal that I applied for leave in December; it was refused me in spite of several urgent appeals by wire, and

I then narrowly escaped being compelled in my anxiety to leave my District without permission; fortunately for me on that occasion the extreme urgency of the situation was relieved by a wire received at the last moment, but I was still left in torturing doubt what the immediate future would produce. I cannot convey an adequate idea of the state of mind I was in; corresponding by post took many days each way, and I simply could not bring myself to leave Mangalore and so cut myself off from communication by wire if necessary. In South Canara there are only two lines, one up the Coast commencing at Mangalore, and the other to Mercara which is tapped by one Office only - at Pultur - the stations which remained to be inspected were South of Mangalore and inland.

These are my reasons for having remained at Mangalore until 26th January -.

In reply to clause (b) I respectfully submit that I went into camp as soon as circumstances permitted.

A few days prior to 27th January I am unable to give the exact date, I received a copy of the Judges proceedings upholding the Deputy Magistrates Judgment discharging 13 of the men of the "Treasure escort", I had then to deal with them departmentally, and at once issued until late in the afternoon under the supervision of the assistant in charge of the School, and so far as they knew, I might have returned at any moment. The men of South Canara are not in touch with men of other districts, and from their papers, which I examined myself I am sure that none of them received intimation by wire of the questions set. I may add that the arrival of the steamer on that particular day was unforeseen, and unfortunate for me, she had been expected for several days.

In clause (c) I am charged with having proceeded "to Udipi on 6th February on my own private affairs". Being unaware that I was credited with having done this, I applied for a copy of the report upon which the charge was based.- the Inspector General has declined to give me a copy -

I presume that Mr. Stuart Inspector General at the time, was misled by information supplied by the acting Collector demi-officially.

I did not go to Udipi on my own private affairs.

My predecessor had issued an order forbidding the German Missionaries at Udipi to preach within the precincts of the temple at that town during festivals; this gave rise to considerable correspondence between the

Missionaries and the then Deputy Inspector General - finally the present Deputy Inspector General referred the Missionaries to me . Two of the leading men of the mission called upon me in Mangalore on 26th January,their complaint being about the conduct of the local police. and in objection to the legality of my predecessors order, I considered it necessary to reserve it for personal disposal.- the Missionaries requested me to hold my inquiry as soon as possible and I promised to do so, bearing this in mind I arranged my first tour up the coast. At that time I had not the least idea that the lady of whom I have spoken would return to South Canara at all. On my way to Udipi I had reason to change my plans and from Kaup I wired to her on 10th February to join me at Kundapur - I was however unable to get to Kundapur in time, so bicycled from Udipi to Kundapur on Sunday 19th, and meeting the steamer came down in her to Udipi *in the evening* - thus I made my private affairs fit in with my official tour, but I did not make an excuse of the missionaries complaint to further my private convenience.

I have now to pass on to the incidents which led up to my having to leave my district without permission.

On or about 11th March I received a Demi-official from the Inspector General who, presuming that the husband

13c

of the lady before mentioned would immediately commence proceedings, desired me to apply for leave and remain on leave until matters were settled, if I refused he would have to consider whether he should recommend me to be suspended.

I replied that I had no reason to believe that the husband intended to apply for a divorce but should be glad to go on leave if I could get it - two days afterwards I heard from a personal friend of the husband's that he intended to commence proceedings as soon as possible - upon this I wired to the Inspector General suggesting separation until matters were settled, instead of going on leave which I could ill afford; the Inspector General had no objection and the lady left me on 30th March.

I waited in vain for the commencement of proceedings, and finally wrote to the Inspector General that I could not leave the lady to live alone under exceptionally trying circumstances merely upon the chance of her husband releasing her some day - She returned to Mangalore on 11th May.

The journeys to and from Bombay, and the uncertainty of everything following upon the trying events of preceeding months broke her health, and she arrived at Mangalore very ill, ~~and~~ the peculiarly damp climate of the place made her worse every day, to have kept her there during the monsoon would have been to court almost certain disaster.

The assistant Surgeon in charge advised me to remove her at once to Madras - I wired for leave on 27th May adding that I had arranged to leave Mangalore on 29th, leave was refused and I was directed to make other arrangements. At my request the assistant Surgeon then wired to the Inspector General, and the District Surgeon who returned to Mangalore the following day, after seeing her also wired confirming his assistant's opinion. I also wired that I was unable to make other arrangements and applied for special leave mentioning I was entitled to it under the new rules. (I find upon reference to the A. G. that the special leave granted me in 95 can be commuted into furlough leaving me entitled to apply for it now.)

I left Mangalore on 29th May feeling sure that the District Surgeon's wire would have convinced the Inspector General of the urgency of my application, but upon arriving at Calicut on 2nd June the wire I received was to the effect that no one would relieve me, and my absence from the District would be reported to Government. I once more wired that I was compelled to proceed for reasons already given and begged that I might not be driven to do so without permission - in reply to this I was informed that Government had suspended me -

The lady was not in a fit state to travel alone from Mangalore to Calicut by land, more particularly as the monsoon was expected to burst any day - communication with steamers had already become impossible.

My social transgression has, owing to the attitude of the lady's husband, driven me to expose myself to official ruin, I did my best to prevent it interfering with my work, but circumstances have proved too strong for me, and in the end I had to expose myself to dismissal to be able to protect the lady from becoming dangerously ill in a place from which I could not have removed her for 3½ months.

I beg that the Inspector General will be pleased to refer H.E. the Governor in Council to my past services. South Arcot is the first district I had charge of for any length of time, and although I was found fault with for insufficient inspection, I solicit a reference to the Administration Reports for 97 and 98. I did my best to improve the district and I leave it to you Sir to say whether I succeeded -

Vol for 1897 put up and marked with tape. vide page 42
Extract from I.G.'s remarks for 1898 put up & flagged

In South Canara, though I neglected inspection, I did what I could in other ways to get the constabulary into better order, the acting Collector would I believe support me in this -

Praying for a generous and merciful consideration of the circumstances which have driven me into my present position.

I have the honor to be ,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

G. L. Brent

Confidential

1

C

From

G. H. Hunt Esq.
Madras Police

To The Insp: Genl: of Police
Madras

Submitting his explanation for having neglected inspection, & leaving his district without permission:

1909
Judl Dept.
Enclos. No 1
To
G. No 2346

Confidential [illegible]

Conf. No. 24

No. O-49.

DEPARTMENT.

~~CHIEF~~ OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

Camp No. 4 Extra Ootacamund ~~MADRAS~~, 9th July 1899.

(18c)

FROM

W. J. A. Sullivan
~~M. HAMMICK, I.C.S.~~, ESQ.,
Ag INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras,

TO

THE Chief Secretary
to Government,
Ootacamund

SIR,

ENCLOSURES.

I have the honour to submit the explanation (Exhibit C) of Mr. G. H. Hun Superintendent of Police, South Canara district, in answer to the charges pending against him and embodied in G.Os. Nos 82-864, J.D., dated 25th May and 3rd June 1899, respectively.

2. In the first of the aforementioned Government orders there are four charges viz. (1) neglect of duty in having failed to inspect any stations between the 11th Decem 1898 and the 26th January 1899 (2) not proceeding on tour of inspection between th 26th January and 6th February 1899 i spite of the Inspector General's oft-rep

ders to do so (3) proceeding to Udipi
the 6th February on his own private
ffairs instead of going southwards
rom Mangalore and visiting the stations
ninspected in 1898 (4) gross neglect of
uty in failing to hold the Station
House officers' examination on the
rescribed date and thus facilitating
the commission of frauds by the candi-
dates.

In answer to the first charge the
ist of Mr. Hunt's defence is that he
was obliged to remain in Mangalore
nd be within easy reach of a telegraph
ffice, because he anticipated at any
moment that news of an alarming
nature in connection with his private
ffairs might reach him. I cannot
onsider the explanation satisfactory.

In reply to the second charge he
says that a departmental enquiry into
the conduct of a "treasure escort"
etained him at Mangalore from the
th January until the 6th February

It is to be observed here that a

Superintendent may always have work a
his headquarters of more or less impor
-ance, but that such work could not
possibly justify his ignoring the several
warnings administered to him by his
superior officers to go out and attend to
the inspection of stations which had
hitherto been sadly neglected.

5. Mr. Hunt meets the third charge
by saying that he did not go to Udipi
on his own private affairs but in o
to interview some German missiona
who had complained of the conduct of
the local police. His weekly reports sho
that he was at Udipi from the 12th to 20
February inclusive and that he was more
or less engaged during that period in
conferring with the missionaries and
settling their grievances. I find also,
that he inspected the police station a
this place. His halt on this duty need
not have taken up nine days, and
is obvious to me that Mr. Hunt mu
have lingered here for private reason

However I consider his explanation to this charge may be accepted as partially, though not wholly, satisfactory.

6. The answer to the fourth charge is practically an admission by Mr. Hunt that he spent the greater portion of the day i.e. 30th January, on board a steamer, when he ought to have been in his office personally conducting the Station House officers examination. It seems to me immaterial whether the candidates, aking advantage of Mr. Hunt's slackness, committed any fraud or not. The fact remains that Mr. Hunt neglected his duty in a very culpable manner.

7. In the foregoing paragraphs I have disposed of the charges in G.O. No. 822, J.D., dated 25th May 1899. It now only remains to deal with the charge in G.O. No. 864, J.D., dated 3rd June 1899, which is separate and distinct from e others. This viz. "leaving his district without permission", is, to my mind,

the

the most serious charge of all, involving as it does, a very gross breach of discip Mr. Hunt, as might be expected, has no satisfactory explanation to offer on this point. He can only urge that private considerations compelled him to have recourse to this hazardous action. Mr. Hunt, as I have already informed Government, knew very well at the time how short of officers I was, but, bent upon achieving his own ends, he attemp to surmount the difficulty by adva the extravagant suggestion that he should be allowed to hand over charge of his district to the Superintendent of Police, Malabar. When he found that I would not assent to this, he brushed aside all official rules and restrictions and left his district.

8. As Deputy Inspector General of the Northern and Central ranges I have knowledge of Mr. Hunt's official career for the past seven years. When I have

[G. / 25 A.]
500—8-12-97.

C 13-7-99 C 24-7-99
R 21-7-99

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

C. No 2846.

22

SUBJECT.

Explanation of Mr G. H. Hunt, Supdt of Police, S. Canara

H.M. & arc

FOR ORDERS.

Submitted for orders with reference to the notes & orders just before it.

Ar
12.7.99.

12/7

I am of opinion that for gross neglect of duty, repeated and continued in spite of warnings, and for finally deserting his post in defiance of express orders Mr. Hunt should be dismissed from the service of Govt.

W.S.
13-7-99.

I have kept these papers for a week hoping to be able to reach a different conclusion from that of my Hon. Colleague so that the penalty of dismissal might be avoided. I regret I have been unable to do so.

The different cases of neglect of duty regarding which Mr. Hunt was first called on for his defence were serious, and I consider that ~~they~~ his misconduct was aggravated by his assigning "private trouble" as the cause, when he was able to take part in social festivities at Mangalore.

para 5 of I.G.'s letter in G.O. No 822 of 25.5.99.

With regard to the second & far more serious charge - leaving his district not only without leave but in defiance of orders, the case is far worse.

Mr. Hunt wired on the 26th May from Mangalore asking for a month's leave to accompany Mrs. Hunt to Madras as she was seriously ill & had to remove to escape the monsoon.

The Inspr. Genl. wired on 27th May, "Cannot possibly grant you leave, make other arrangements." On the same day Mr. Hunt wired "Respectfully submit other arrangements impossible, I must take Mrs. Hunt away at once, intend applying six weeks leave".

The Asst. Surgeon & the Dt. Surgeon, evidently at Mr. Hunt's request for the matter was no concern of theirs, wired to the I. G. that Mrs. Hunt's immediate removal to Madras was necessary & that she could not travel alone.

Even if it had been Mr. Hunt's duty to secure the lady's removal to Madras, there was no need for him to desert his post in defiance of orders. He could have kept the lady where she was until a nurse could be procured if necessary from Madras. The journey from Mangalore to Calicut by boat & palanquin is quite feasible after the monsoon has set in.

But the excuse cannot be admitted at all. There is no Mrs. Hunt, and Mr. Hunt deserted his post in defiance of an emphatic prohibition in order to take to Madras another man's wife with whom he was living.

Mr. Hunt's past record as a Police Officer is not in his favour. The I. G. says (para 8 of his letter C. No. 2846") "that he is an officer of some ability, & that he has turned out good work, and is capable of doing well if he chooses; but that is all that can be said in his favour. "As an official he is very unreliable. He works by fits & starts, & if any pleasurable attractions present themselves, he slacks off in the most reprehensible manner". A Court martial would cashier any officer guilty of such flagrant disobedience as Mr Hunt's. On page 9 of his Explanation Mr Hunt realizes that he has exposed himself to dismissal for his action. I reluctantly concur with the Hon. Mr Winterbotham's opinion that Mr Hunt ought to be dismissed from the service of Govt

KA 21.7.99

I accept the opinion expressed by Hon. Member.

A.H
12.8.99

24

MALABAR CLUB,
CALICUT.

5/8/99

My dear Sim.

I forget if it was you or Mr Arundel or both who asked where Hunt was at present.

I hear he is now staying with Mrs Graham at "The Links Hotel" Bangalore which is kept by a sister of Mrs Labouchere Thornton. I hear Mr L. T. is also there.

Hamnett (with whom I stayed on my way down) was my informant.

Yours sincerely
Arthur [illegible]

xceptional secrecy. H 15787

[G/24]
500—28-6-99.

H.E. orders

(Draft orders)

C 16-7-99
R 15-8-99

Judl. Department.

25c

C. No. 2846 From the Inspr. Genl. of Police, No. Camp 4 orders, dated 8-7-1899.

Issue as amended

H 17/8/99

Order No 1328 D/ 19-8-99

See below. H.A. 16.8.99

x Please see G.O. No. 552 Judicial d. 5.7.95, paragraph (5)

With his letter above read, the Inspr. Genl. of Police submits the explanation of Mr. G. H. Hunt, Supt. of Police in answer to the following charges brought against him by the Inspr. Genl.:

(1) Neglect of duty in having failed to inspect any stations between the 11 Decr. 1898 & the 26 Jany. 1899.

(2) Continuing to neglect inspection after the last mentioned date, notwithstanding repeated warnings

The H.E. has used the word "dismissed". The effect+ of this will be to prevent Mr. Hunt's being ever again employed in any capacity under the Govt. of India. If he be removed from service he might again be employed in any capacity which might be suitable. I have ventured therefore to substitute the word "removed" for "dismissed" in the order as I do not believe that H.E. has desire to treat Mr. Hunt with exceptional severity.

H.L.

H. 15/7/99

from the Inspr. Genl.

(3) Proceeding to Udipi on the 6th February 1899 on his own private affairs instead of proceeding southwards from Mangalore, where the missionaries stations lay.

(4) Gross neglect of duty in failing to hold the Station House Officers' examination on the prescribed date

5) Leaving his district without permission.

2. ~~Except with regard to the third Charge,~~ H.E. the Governor in Council is ~~of opinion~~ unable to accept Mr Hunt's explanation, and is of opinion that for gross neglect of duty, repeated and continued in spite of warnings, and for finally deserting his post, in defiance of express orders, he should be ~~dismissed~~ removed from the service of Govt. Mr Hunt will accordingly be removed to ~~from the~~

(The I.G. says that Mr. H. obviously lingered at Udipi for private reasons. It cannot be admitted that his conference with the Mission au[illegible] need have occupied over a week. To accept Mr. H's explanation is to concede a good deal in his favour
H.S.)

The order may run
"with a partial exception in regard to the third charge
A.S.H.

I wd. insert after "post"
not only without leave, but
A.S.H.

~~services~~ with effect from the date of this order.

26c (From orders)

Cn
14.8.99

15/8/

H.S.
16-8-99

A.S.H.
17.8.99

To the Inspr. Genl. of Police with enclosures & returns } G.O.

Acct. Genl. (G.O.)

Despd.
15-8-99