

Judicial (189) Department.
21

ORDINARY *Ins*

G.O., No. 822

Confidential No. 62

DATED 25-5-99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr. G. H. Hunt . Requesting the Inspector
General of Police to call upon ———, Supdt
of Police, S. Canara. to show cause why he
should not be punished ~~in connection with~~
~~and in charge of alleged~~ ^{the} ~~neglect of duty~~
for neglect of duty.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Depart
20	961	Ind	22-6-99			
	2896		9-7-98			
740			10/5/99			

FURTHER PAPERS.					
G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.
Gen	71	Ind	1899		
	111		19-899		

பாடகாப்பு பரிசு-ஈ
 உயர்கல்வனியை பெயர்
 இயற்றுவதற்காக எடுத்தல்
 இயற்றப்பட்ட நான்
 பெயரில் எடுத்த நான்

[Handwritten signature]
 18.5.2006
 4.7.2006

[Handwritten signature]
 ராஜ்குமார்
 மதுரா. தி. பா. ஏ.
 கையாப்பம்

[Handwritten signature]
 ராஜ்குமார்
 மதுரா. தி. பா. ஏ.
 கையாப்பம்

R.A.

not to be opened in the office.

Con fiden liel

The Hon^{ble} Mr. Underhill.

— Dr. A. T. Arnold C.S. 18

At. K. Gower

21

37

CONFIDENTIAL

Judicial
Financial (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 1538

Conc No 131

Submitted for orders

Volun
10-4-99

Order

From

W. J. A. Sullivan Esquire,
Asst. Insp. Genl of Police
Madras.

No. 1327.

Dated 29th March/99.

Received 30 - 3 - 99

Registered 5 - 4 - 99

Enclosures 2.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Brings to the notice of
Government the misconduct
of Mr. G. H. Hunt Superin-
tendent of Police South
Canara.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

No. 0-48.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Ind. c. no 153
4/1/1900
con c. no 15

DEPARTMENT.

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,

No. 1327.

Madras, 29th March 1899.

From W. J. A. Sullivan Esquire,
M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S.,

Ag. INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras,

To

THE Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

Enclosures.

Swa

I regret to be obliged to bring to the notice of the Government the conduct of Mr. G. H. Hunt the Superintendent of Police South Canara, &c. I consider that his neglect of duty requires something more than a reprimand from me which is the only punishment I can award. Mr. Hunt was transferred from South Arcot to South Canara in September last, and he took charge of the latter district on the 17th of that month. Shortly after he joined, it became necessary to provide a police escort for the conveyance of two lakhs of treasure from Mangalore to Mercara. In consequence of reference I quote in extenso the Police Order on the strength of treasure escorts:

at 74. Strength of Treasure Escorts. (a) It is improper to lay down a hard and fast rule as to the requisite strength of treasure escorts; much will depend upon the length of journey, safety of road, means of transport, wh

Cart, Cookies, &c.,

Constables, however, should never be sent in sole charge of treasure or currency notes; a petty officer must in all cases accompany and command the escort.

The following scale is given as a general rule to be varied as local experience may prove an increase or decrease necessary.

Head Constables.

Sums under Rs 2000	1	2
over Rs 2000 and under Rs 6000	1	3
6000 " 10,000	1	4
10,000 " 20,000	1	6
20,000 " 50,000	2	10
50,000 " 100,000	2	12
Sums exceeding Rs 100,000	2	15

with an Inspector in charge.
b) The full escort need rarely accompany treasure when sent by rail.

An Inspector or petty officer, as the case may be, and two Constables for each wagon should suffice in almost all cases as escort of treasure once placed in the train. The Officer despatching the escort should send notice, and care must be taken by the officer of the district in which the destination, by rail, of the treasure lies, that the full escort is ready to support the petty officer and his

Small guard on the arrival of the train.

Every caution must be taken on the one hand, to prevent waste of men and money, and prompt co-operation must be manifested on the other."

It will be seen that when the treasure amounts to a lakh or more an Inspector should be sent in charge, but at the request of the Reserve Inspector Mr. Hunt ordered European Head Constable Gones to go instead of an Inspector. This man appears to have been drunk from the start and many of the escort were in the condition; every rule laid down for the conduct of treasure escort was disobeyed; and when the party arrived at Sullia it was discovered that a box containing Rupees 60,000 was missing. No trace of this box has been discovered up to date and there is now, I fear, very little prospect of recovering any part of the money. The members of the escort have been prosecuted and some of them convicted. In respect of those who were acquitted the Sessions Judge has called for the record and the matter is still sub judice.

3. I called upon Mr. Hunt to explain why he had disobeyed Police Order No. 74 in not sending an Inspector in charge, and his explanation is enclosed. It will be seen that the drinking habits of Head Constable Gones were notorious and that Mr. Stoddart, Mr. Hunt's predecessor, had ordered that he was never to be sent in charge of a treasure escort. The Reserve Inspector, therefore

Mr. Hunt did not know that he was a drunkard

vide linked file

Exhibit A

of grave neglect of duty in proposing
man for the Command of the escort with-
at the same time laying all the facts
Mr Hunt and the Headquarters Inspector
so blameworthy for not warning Mr Hunt
he saw the latter's order. The conduct of
two officers will be dealt with as soon
the Criminal proceedings are concluded.
though Mr Hunt was badly served he
himself guilty of negligence. It is true,
pointed out by him, that Police Order No. 44
is a certain amount of discretion, that it
not unusual for a European Head Constable
the place of the Reserve Inspector is
Supported by my short experience of the
department nor by the result of the inquiries
I have made. I consider, therefore, that
Hunt showed a grave want of discretion
Sending any Head Constable in charge of
large an amount and that he was guilty
most culpable negligence in permitting
particular man to go without making
single inquiry as to his character and
bits. Had he done so, he would have
ited the facts which came to light
sequently and the Government would
been saved the loss of Rupees 6000.

The next charge I have to bring against
Hunt is his complete neglect of inspection.
order calling on him for an explanation
his reply thereto are enclosed. When Mr
nt joined, 19 Stations remained to be
ected and both Mr Stevenson and myself
ntly urged him by remarks on his weekly
to get on with his inspection. Mr Hunt's

Explanation

Exhibit B

61
Explanation for doing nothing before
September and the 14th October is that
did not arrive from Cuddalore until
date. I remarked at the time that he
received his orders of transfer on the 5th
September and that his goods had taken
very long time in transit, but be this as
may, there was nothing to prevent Mr Hunt
holding, during this period, the inspection of
the Mangalore town and taluk Stations.
instead of putting them off until November.
Moreover it was quite unnecessary for Mr
Hunt to be present in person at each hear-
ing of the charges against the treasure escort
and if he had the will he would have
found no difficulty in completing the
inspection of the Mangalore and Puttur
divisions by the end of November and at the
same time keeping the requisite control
over the proceedings in the treasure case.
This would have left him the Kasaragod
division for December and the inspection
of the district would have been completed
within the year.

5. It will be seen that Mr Hunt states
that he has no official explanation to offer
for his neglect of inspection after the 11th
December beyond remarking that he was
too much upset by private trouble to
continue his work properly. It is this
"private trouble" the nature of which is known
to you, that has ruined Mr Hunt's work
for many months, and whatever view
the Government may take of the matter
question on its own merits, it cannot

accepted as a legitimate excuse for neglect
regret to say, however, that I am unable
Mr Hunt's Statement for the mental
which rendered him unable to continue
work properly, did not prevent him, on his
to Mangalore, from attending dinner,
is, picnics and a fancy dress ball.

Mr Hunt's incapacity for inspection continued
till the 6th February, though I had impressed
him, in my remarks on his weekly reports
the consequences of his neglect of duty
would be very serious. When he did go out,
instead of proceeding to Kasaragod or Pultur
and visiting the Stations which had been left
uninspected in 1898, he went northwards to
Kape. ~~He took this course, I have no doubt,
because he wished to visit the lady who is
connected with his "private troubles", for she
came down by sea from Bombay and joined
him while he was on this tour. Thus between
17 September 1898 and the early part of
February 1899, Mr Hunt inspected only 8
stations, two of which are Mangalore itself,
while two of the others had already been in-
spected by his predecessor. Mr Hunt has
bad reputation for neglecting inspection,
and I find that during the nine months
that he was in charge of South Arcot in 1898
inspected only 14 stations in his range,
and in some cases his inspections were so
brief that I had to draw his attention
to his acting as Inspector General during the
part of 1898 to the perfunctory manner
in which he was performing this important
duty. In forwarding his application for
leave~~

leave last year Mr Hannich also referred to this
neglect of inspection and the Government is aware
Mr Hunt in its order dated 22nd June 1899
No 961, Judicial.

7. The next instance of neglect of duty which
I have to bring to the notice of the Government
is connected with the Station House Officer's
examination. This examination is held twice
a year throughout the presidency, the papers
being the same for all districts. This year it
commenced on the 30 January, but Mr Hunt
reported in his weekly diary that he was
unable to hold the examination on that day,
he gave no reason ~~but I learnt from a
petition that the "inability" was caused by
Mr Hunt having spent the day in visiting
a passenger on the Coasting Steamer that
arrived from Calicut. The passenger in
question was the lady already referred to,
and we have here yet another instance of how
this "private trouble" has been permitted to
interfere with public duty. With Mr Hunt's
private affairs I am not for the moment
concerned, but it is obvious from the nature of
them that they cannot be accepted as an excuse
for gross neglect of work, for such an excuse
would not be admitted even if the private
affairs were reputable and legitimate. It is
stated in the petition that the questions
were telegraphed to Mangalore from other
Stations and it has yet to be decided after
a perusal of the answer papers, whether
Mr Hunt's callous indifference to everything
but this unsavoury intrigue has not made
it necessary to hold a fresh examina-~~

~~the South African Candidates~~

As one more instance of Mr. Hunt's attitude towards his official responsibilities I may mention that instead of writing the annual administration report himself he has submitted draft of his head quarter inspector with equal notes by himself. In deciding what punishment to recommend, I have kept in mind the fact that Mr. Hunt is an officer of considerable ability and that he would only overcome his laziness and overweening conceit he may yet become a useful police officer. I think therefore that the punishment should take the form of a substantial fine, and I accordingly suggest that he should be permanently reduced five places in the list but be allowed to continue to officiate as a Superintendent, it being clearly understood that he will not be confirmed in his conduct and work are reported to be thoroughly satisfactory.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt Servant,

J. H. Sullivan
Ag. Inspector General of Police.

I beg to state for the information of Government that the above letter was drafted by Mr. H. A. Stuart and handed over to me.

C
Issue: 11.10.95

do. 210-5-95

By Mr. Sullivan

Let. 21/4. 10/95

Official letter no 1327

d. 29/3/99 regarding Hunt, I wish to say that Government consider that all reference to his name should be omitted from his official papers. Will you please therefore revise your official copy of his letter by omitting his words "He took this course ... on this his" in para 6, and his words whole of para 7 from his words "let I leave from a petition" to the end of his para. In leaving from you that this has been done an order on his subject will issue.

H. J. Sullivan Esq

Ag. I.S. of Police Dated 10-5-95

(for order)

AT
9/5/99

11/5/99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Confidential

600 c no 183



Notacommend
May 19th 1899

My dear Stokes,

I am now able
to report that, in compliance
with the orders of Govt.
concerned in y. d. o.
(Confidential) of the 10th
instant, I have eliminated

the several passages to which
 objection was taken from
^{the office copy of}
 the official letter W.P. 1327
 dated 29th March 1888
 regarding Hunt.

Yours sincerely
 J. J. Holman
 The Honble G. Stokes B.A. J.C.L.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

Mr Hunt, Supot of Police

C. No. 1538 From the L.G. of Polu No. 1377, dated 29/3 1899

For Orders

HK. 4 curc

Submitted for orders.
The first charge against
Mr. Hunt, that of disobedience
to no 74 of the Police orders,
in sending the remittance in
charge of a European Head
Constable, is, it is submitted
in the circumstances not a
very grave one. The rule itself
lays down a scale of escorts,
to be varied as local experience
may suggest. Mr. Hunt ^{was} ~~was~~ ^{with the} ~~at~~
at Mangalore on Sept. 17th &
the remittance was despatched
on the 27th of the same month
The Reserve Inspector recommended
H^d Constable Jones to be for company

of the escort that he knew the
latter's character - The H. O.
Inspector did not enlighten
Mr. Hunt as to Gomes habits.
The I. O. says that he will deal
with him as an officer.

As for Mr. Hunt the question
is whether he was justified in
interpreting rule 7 as permitting
him to send a H. O. Constable
instead of an Inspector. It is
submitted that it does. That
while there may have been a
want of discretion in doing so
in this instance than a large
remittance had to be sent a
long distance by road, Mr.
Hunt can hardly be found
guilty of wilful disobedience
of the police order. The I. O.
says that Mr. Hunt was guilty
of culpable negligence in not
making inquiries about Gomes,
but it is submitted that having
been only a few days in the
St. Mr. Hunt need only be
considered to have shown a
want of discretion in trusting
too much to the recommendation

of his Inspector. The
members in support
plea that he was just
in entrusting the duty
to him, that at the
time the police order in
question was issued there
were two classes of Inspectors
the lowest drawing Rs 40
per month. Jones drew Rs 50
and was therefore in many
more reliable than the some
of the men to whom the
order originally contemplated
that important escort work
should be entrusted.

The second charge, that
of neglect of inspection
work appears to be more
serious. The I. O. letter
explains the case fully
in regard to this, & also
in regard to the third
charge, that of omitting for
purely private reasons to
hold a station house officer
exam: on the prescribed
day. With regard to

Mr. Stanton is
in G.O. no 961 Jan
- 6-98 in which he
is neglect of his part
his duty in S. Arrest
is unfavorably which
and he Hunt was warned
against its recurrence.
In connection with the L.G.'s
remains upon Mr. Hunt's
account his neglect
of duty Stanton is limited
to this matter in the attached
sealed cover.

Orders are requested.

MR
Jan. 4. 99

The Treasury report case is not
one of much importance and this mishap in connection with it
might have happened to any
man. But it is plain from this
appears that in two most
important particulars viz the
Station House Officers' Room &
inspection work that Hunt has
found his official duty to
be interfered. He admits this in his report of the 26th Jan.
The I.G.'s suggested punishment is not too heavy. Jan. 4. 99.

In my opinion the case
cannot be disposed of
on Mr. Stanton's report,
sent in by Mr. Sullivan.
The only explanation sent
in by Mr. Hunt is dated
Jan. 26th 99.

In that he gives an
unsatisfactory explanation
for short inspection from
Sept to Dec 11th
From Dec 11th to Jan 26th
he was "too much upset
by private trouble" to do
his work properly, or to
send in his weekly reports.

If his misconduct
ended there orders might
be passed; but it didn't.

The gravamen of the charge
against him is that
after submitting the above,
and in spite of warning
from the I.G. that his
neglect of duty would have
very serious consequences
he did no inspection
Feb 6th, when inspection

para 6 of report -

of proceeding Southwards
(Kasargod) where the
uninspected station
lay, he went north
to Udipi where he
had no business on
his own private affairs

Mr. Hunt has
not been called on for
explanation of this
further misconduct -

Nor has he been called
upon to show cause
why due notice should
not be taken of his
neglect to superintend
the Station House Officer's
examination on
Jan'y 30th

This is clear from
para 7 of Mr. Stuart's
report -

145
It is therefore in my
opinion necessary ~~that~~
(before Mr. Hunt can
be punished in the
manner recommended
or in any other way)
that he should be called
upon to show cause why
he should not be punished -

(1) For the neglect of duty
admitted in his
explanation of Jan'y 26th

(2) For continuing to
neglect inspection after
that date notwithstanding
repeated warnings from
the S. G.

(3) For proceeding to
Udipi on Feb. 6th
on his own private
affairs, instead of
proceeding Southwards
from Mangalore, where
the uninspected station
lay -

(4) For gross neglect
of duty in failing to
hold the Station

agrees but as the report has been
seized, filed &c. I think the simplest
course will be to write to the I. G. &
tell him that "considering all reference
to the lady should be omitted; that he
could obtainate from his office copy
sentence in para 6 beginning
"he took this course" and the whole
para 7 ^{from including} ~~including~~ the words "but I
amnt from a petition". (See the
pages marked with blue pencil.)
Heard from the I. G. that he has
done this, the corresponding passages
in the report on the file will be
amended. A G.O. can then
be telling the I. G. to draw
formal charges or suggestions
my Hon. Colleague, & call on
Mr. Hunt for any further expla-
nation he may wish to offer.

Officers examination
on the date appointed
for the exam - to be
held throughout the
Presidency -

All reference to the
"lady" should be
kept out of the
charge, which should
be carefully drawn
up by the Ag. J. C.
on the above lines -

Unless this is done
any order Ch. Govt.
may pass will be
open to objection -
I should instruct the
Ag. S. G. by d.o. to
with draw his report &
proceed as above -

I agree with C.S. Kai
the "Escort" case, so far
as Mr. Hunt is concerned,
may be dropped H.S.

25-4-89

Judicial DEPARTMENT.
157

CS

order no 822 of 25-5-99

Miss. Dr. Hunt's explanation
of his failure to inspect
his stations in his district
covers the period up to the
26 Jan'y 1899. It appears
from para 6 of the I.G.'s
report that Dr. Hunt's
attention had not been called
to the serious consequences
which would come on any
further neglect of his duty.
yet Dr Hunt did not leave
headquarters till Feb 6th
and then did not visit the
part of his district where
inspection was most necessary.
His explanation appears to
have been called for in re

James M. Smith

to their further ^{neglect} neglect.

2. In order that Mr. Port may
be in possession of Mr. Hunt's full
explanation of his charges against
him, Mr. L.G. will be requested
to call upon Mr. Hunt to show
cause why he should not be
punished.

(1) In his neglect of duty
admitted in his explanation
of Jan 26th.

(2) In continuing to neglect
inspection after that date
not understanding repeated
warnings from Mr. L.G.

(3) In proceeding to London
on Feb. 6th on his own private
affairs instead of proceeding
southwards from Bangalore
where his unscheduled duties
lay.

(4) In gross neglect of duty in
failing to hold Mr. S. H.
Officer's exam. on the prescribed
date.

A charge upon his above lines should
be carefully drawn up by Mr. L.G. &
sent to Mr. Hunt for ^{full} explanation
if any.

Mr. 20/5/98

(from notes)

20/5/98
To Mr. L.G. of Police
with enclosures returned