[L. & M. 28.]

10,000—15-10-00.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Referencer.

Press / Ordinary / Routine No. 1336, dated 11/8/96 190 .

Date taken out.	FOR WHAT PURPOSE. Department.	C. No.	Year.	Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
9/8/96	Mn.	2313	01	[illegible]		

[7]

INDEXED.

Miscellaneous.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPT.

G.O., DATED 11-8-96.

No. 1337 M.

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition

Recording, with remarks, explanation of the Chairman Municipal Council, Ellore regarding certain charges brought against him by M. R. Ry Sundara Siva Rao Garu & three Councillors and requesting the Collector to obtain the explanation of the Sub Assistant Inspector Schools for Signing the petition and submit it to Government.

Rec'd. 11th Aug 1896

BACK PAPER, No. OF 189 .

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
189 , No. , MISCELLANEOUS.

FURTHER PAPER, No. OF 189 .

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—
A — Copy in full.
B — Not to be copied.
P — Copy abstract only.
Q — Copy heading only.

Copied by 12/98.

Examined by

Ellore Municipal Office.

Dated the 10th January 1898

Despatched on the 11th January 1898.

No. 141

FROM,

M-R-Ry,

C. SITARAMAYYA PANTULU GARU;

CHAIRMAN,

MUNICIPAL COUNCIL ELLORE.

To,

The Chief Secretary to Government
Fort Saint George
Madras

Sir:

Ref 1756/98

In Continuation of this Office letter No 119/17-5-96
I have the honor to forward the written statement
of C. Chendrayya Subadar Major Bahadur Garu
one of the Signatories to the referred petition No 344/17-5-96
which would show the circumstances under which
he signed the petition and his unconditional
withdrawal of his signature to the said petition.
Owing to the absence of this Councillor from town,
when I received the petition under enquiry to the
Signatures, I could not submit his statement with
my letter No 119/17-5-96 nor could I postpone the submission
of the said letter for this as I had already received
a reminder from Government for early despatch to
of my remarks on the said petition. I request
therefore that this statement may be taken and
read along with the statements already made
by

by three of the signatories to the referred petition which were submitted to Government with my letter no 119/17-5-96

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

C. Subbaramayya.
Chairman

To

M.R.Ry C. Subbaraidu Garu
Chairman, Municipality
Ellore

Sir

With reference to your endorsement dated 20-4-96, sent to me for remarks on the petition submitted to the Chief Secretary to Government, Madras, by some of the Councillors, I have the honor to state that when the petition was brought to me for signature, my wife was seriously ill, I could not read the whole of it, and read only the last para of it. As the portion I read contained certain matters work that the whole petition represented correct facts. As I have read it now in detail carefully, I find that it contains matters discussed in my absence, which I do not like to mention in the petition. As I could not attend the meetings held after 20th Dec 95 I do not like to sign the petition containing the matters discussed in those meetings, I, therefore hereby withdraw my signature attached to the petition under reference.

The delay in giving the above remarks is due to my absence from town, it is only on the 24th instant that I returned to Ellore. The petition under reference is here with returned

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
(sd) C. Chendraiah
Subadar major &
Municipal Councillor

Ellore
26th May 1896

/Inw. Copy/

Electric Light Office
10th January 1898

C. Sitaramayya.
Chairman

Mr
2nd Clerk
S. In

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Chairman.

Local & Municipal Dept.
Ext 347/96
Cont 421/96

From

The Chairman

Municipal Council

Ellore.

To

The Chief Secretary to
Government Fort
St George, Madras.

Dated 10-6-96
Despatched 11-6-96
Received 15 JUN. 96

Encls. 1

No

Subject.

Reference. forwarding a written statement from the signatory to the petition ref No 347/17-3-96 received from

Local & Municipal Dept
From
CURRENT No. 3935/96

M. R. Ry K. Krishnamurty Pantulu Garu, Sub Assistant Inspector of Schools, Ellore Rural Nominated Councillors

to C. Chendriah Bahadur Pensioned Subadar Major Nominated Councillor

do Muhammad Beg Jurdar Bahadur Pensioned Subadar Major Nominated Councillor

do E. Kachapeswara Sharma Sastry Garu Pleader & an elected Councillor

do Dugivada Sundara Siva Row Garu Pleader & an elected Councillor

do Muhammad Hafeezully Saheb Garu, Elected Councillor of Ellore Municipality

To The Chief Secretary to the Government of Fort St George Madras

L. & M. Department

Through

15 years service in this office and that the office would suffer much by the transfer. Mr. K. Krishnamoorty Pantulu supported the objection and put certain arguments and convinced the most part of the Council. Mr. L. G. Moore, Head assistant collector supported the objection remarking that the Chairman proposed the transfer not for the good of the Office but for appointing a favourite to the Managers post. At the request of a Councillor it was put to vote, all the Councillors except the Chairman, Mr. Mouty Venkataswamy and S. Seetharamiah saw unanimously supported the objection. The meeting was then adjourned. This days proceedings too were not written in the book.

On the 6th December, meeting began at 8 A.m with 16 Councillors, the largest attendance in the Year. Grant II was discussed, and the Chairman's proposals about the increase of salaries of some Masters

To
The Chairman
Eluru Municipality

We, the undermentioned Councillors of Eluru municipality regret to bring the following irregularities regarding the resolutions passed in considering the Budget of Eluru municipality for 1896-97. The following is a brief history of facts regarding the Consideration of the Budget.

The meeting was called for and held at 8 A.M on the 7th December 1895, on that day Revised Estimate for 1895-96 was discussed and passed and the meeting was adjourned. But the Resolutions were not written in the Proceedings Book on the 5th December at 8 A.M meeting began, all the proposals sent by different Councillors were read and explained. Probable receipts for 1896 and 1897 were discussed and settled. The Chairman leaving the other grant aside then proposed to increase the pay of the overseer from Rs 30 to Rs 60 and to transfer Mr. Chapman, the manager to the overseers post reducing the Managers pay from Rs 50 to Rs 40. Thereupon Mr. D. Gundaraviah now objected to the proposal on the ground that no other man can so efficiently manage as Mr. Chapman who had had considerable experience

and contengencies of the Municipal
Lower Secondary School were passed
though reasonably protested by the
minority. Then the expenditure
under Grant III was placed before
the Council. The recommendations of
the Medical authorities about the
increase of pay, of Hospital Compounder
and appointing an assistant compounder
were discussed. The Chairman strongly
objected to the increase and the appoint-
-ment urging other Councillors to
follow him. Some of the Councillors
first yielded to him. Then Mr. Moore
asked to explain the grounds on
which the recommendations were
based and further said that if
the majority were not willing to
comply with the recommendation
he would write to the Surgeon General
to move the Government on the subject
Then Messrs K. Kristnamoorty
Pantulu, D. Sundarasiva Rao,
C. Katchepeswara Sastry referring
to certain G.O on the subject explained
the necessity for the increase and the
appointment of an assistant
Compounder. Then it was put to vote
The Chairman's objections were voted
and the increase of the pay by Rs.

and the new appointment were
sanctioned. Then the Chairman read
proposal of Mr. S. Seetharamiah to
reform thoroughly the Conservancy
Establishment when Mr. Moore
remarked that in accordance with
Government Policy the men in service
should not be disturbed. The salaries
of Conservancy supervising staff
were proposed to be reduced from
Rs 16 to Rs 8 and so on with a view
to create footings to some other new.
One of these sub-inspectors has had
an experience of 25 years in this Munici-
-pality while the others have got nearly
10 years services. The proposal is to
appoint peons with low salaries as
supervisers over the scavenging
Establishment and an Inspector over
these peons. The Chairman and Mr.
Moutley Venkataswamy supported
this proposal whereas Messrs Moore,
K. Kristnamoorty Pantulu, C.
Katchepeswara Sastry, D. Sundara
siva Row and C. Chundriah Subdar
objected to the proposal. Messrs Moore
and others fully explained that the
policy of reducing salaries of men
in service without any fault or
otherwise is highly objectionable,
after much discussion it was put to

voted and the majority of 13 ruled that the salaries of Sub-Inspectors shall be uneffected.

Then the Chairman observing all his proposals voted began to put in proposals of increasing expenditure in every grant without condering the financial condetion of the receipts

Firstly, for an aditional establish-ment of scaavengers and sweepers and increase of two thousand Rupees (Rs 2000) was proposed. Many Councillors asked reasons for the increas Neither the Chairman nor the office Establishment were able to give satisfactory answers without having sufficient knowledge of facts the Councillors were constrained to give their opinions about the proposals regarding this increase. Then the meeting was adjourned. This days proceedings too were not written in the book.

On the 7th December meeting again began at 8 A. M additional expenditure of Rupees about 1000 for the grant II. The result of the above increments is that very little is left to grant I. Communication which is important of all the grants. At the request of the Chairman the Council was constrained to reconsider the Budget. The meeting was adjourned to the 14th December. This days proceedings too were not written in the book.

On the 14th December though so many Councillors attended, the Chairman adjourned the meeting to the 20th December on the ground that the Divisional Officer could not attend This was not communicated to paper ever.

On the 20th day receipts were appointed under different grants as proposed by Mr. D. Sunderasiva Rao and the meeting was adjourned to the next day

On the 21st December some of the Councillors attended the meeting. The Chairman did not attended though it was the last day on which the meeting ought to be held before Christmas vacations consequently it was adjourned. A pack meeting consisting of certain Councillors specially invited, was held on following Sunday to pass the Chairman proposals in the absence of Councillors who took an active part in the discussions. Out of the six Councillors present one declined to vote another dissented throughout while the third proposed ammendments so that the Chairman had recourse to his casting vote to upset the reso-lutions passed at meeting attended

by twelve more members.

CHIEF SECRETARY'S GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 1 FEB. 1896

We therefore request your honors to move the Government that the Budget be considered a fresh and that no unnecessary changes be introduced into the conservancy staff which is working well and that the pay of the Hospital Compounders be raised by Rs3 and that an assistant compounder on Rs 8 be appointed as passed at the previous meeting on the Budget.

17th January 1896
Ellore

We have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient
servants.

(sd) K. Krishnamoorty.
(sd) C. Chendriah.
(sd) Mohomed Beg.
(sd) D. Sundarasiva Rao.
(sd) E. Katchepeswara Sastry
(sd) Hafizulla.

(True Copy only)
~~Original~~ has been
~~Duplicate~~ already submitted
through the Chairman.

25th January 1896
Ellore.

D. Sundaraiwaru
Municipal Councillor

[9]

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 395/M

Received 19/3/96.

From

M.R.Ry.D.Sundarasiva Rao Garu
& others, Ellore.

No. 347
Referred to the Chairman, municipal Council, Ellore for remarks.

/ By order
W.D.Phillips
Ag Assistant Secretary.

No.

Dated 25th January 1896.

Received 1st February 1896.

Enclosures

1/B
14/3/96
Fort Saint George
17th March 1896

SUBJECT.

Bringing to notice the irregularities regarding the resolution passed in considering the Budget Estimate of the Ellore Municipality.

—

To
The Chairman mc Ellore.

✓
Lodged pending receipt of the original petition, which is said to have been forwarded through the Chairman.
W.D.

1/B
25/2/96

Ellore Municipal Office
6th November 1895

Circular Letter

No. 91 mis.

From
M.R.Ry C. SitaRamayya Pantulu garu
Chairman Municipal Council
Ellore

To
The Municipal Councillors
Ellore Municipality
Ellore

Gentlemen,

I have the honour to request that You will be good enough to let me know at a very early date, what dates You are willing to do in connection with Municipal work. I also request that You will inform me before the end of the current month any proposals and improvements You wish for consideration at the Budget meeting to be held in the early part of December next.

I have the honour to be.
Sir.
Your most Obedient Servant
/Signed/ C. SitaRamayya
Chairman

(True copy)

Signed/ E/6.
Manager

E/6

C. SitaRamayya.
Chairman

(Signed) M. P.

12-11.

C.C.

S.R. 5-11.

mak.

Municipal Councillors

(True copy)

Chairman.

E/K

1/1755

L. & M.

II

Ellore Municipality Office

16th November 1895

Circular Letter

Revenue Dept.

No. 97 dated

To

The Municipal Council

Ellore Municipality

Ellore.

Gentlemen

Adverting to this office letter No 91 of 6-11-95 I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to let me know at a very early date, what duties you are willing to do in connection with municipal work and to also request that you will inform me before the end of the current month any proposals and improvements you wish for consideration at the Budget meeting to be held in the early part of December next.

I have &c

(Sd) C. Seetaramiah

Chairman

/True Copy/

C. Seetaramiah

Chairman

Ellore Municipality

E/K

L.&M. 7
47

Ellore Municipal Office
27th November 1895

No. 111 bis

To
The Members of the
Municipal Council
Ellore.

Sir

Referring to this office
circular letter No 91 of 16-11-95
and reminder No 97 of 14-11-95
I have the honor to request
that you will be so good as
to send to this office your
Budget proposals before the
end of this month in order
to enable me to know
the nature and probable
cost of such proposals —
otherwise I will be unable
to place them in the Budget
meeting which will be held
on the 4th December 1895

I have &c.

137/96 /Sd/ C. Subramaniah
Chairman

/True Copy/
C. Subramanya.
Chairman

EK

L.&M.
A

V

The following Councillors were present on the 4th December 1895 at S. A. M.

1. H. R. R. Cherukuvada Setaramayya Pantulugaru Chairman.

Councillors

2. L. G. Moore Esquire.
3. H. R. R. K. Krishnamurty Pantulugaru.
4. " S. Sitaramayya Pantulugaru.
5. " D. Sundaramma Raogaru.
6. " E. Katchapiswara Sastrygaru.
7. " Motai Venkataswamy garu.
8. " Chutturi Subbarazudu garu.
9. " Jawaji Krishnayya garu.
10. " Seeram Venkata Krishnayyagaru.
11. " Subedar Major C. Chandrayya Bahadur garu.
12. " M. Sattayya Naidu garu.
13. " Poota Sobhanadri Naidu garu.
14. Memoohu Mahamad Yakub Sahib garu.
15. Subedar Major Mahamad Beg Sahib Sirdar Bahadur
16. Memoohu Mahamad Abdul Khayyum Sahib garu. Saru.

(Sd) C. Sitaramayya
Chairman.

(True Copy)
C. Sitaramayya
Chairman

L. & M.
A

V

The following Councillors were present on the 4th December 1875 at S. A. M.

1. H. R. R. Cherukuvada Seetaramayya Pantulugaru Chairman.

Councillors

2. L. G. Moore Esquire.
3. H. R. R. K. Krishnamurty Pantulugaru.
4. " S. Seetaramayya Pantulugaru.
5. " D. Sunderasiva Rao garu.
6. " E. Katchapeswara Sastry garu.
7. " Motai Venkataswamy garu.
8. " Chuttuni Subbarayudu garu.
9. " Javaji Krishnayya garu.
10. " Seeram Venkata Krishnayyagaru.
11. " Subedar Major C. Chandrayya Bahadur garu.
12. " M. Sattayya Naidu garu.
13. " Jonta Sobhanachi Naidu garu.
14. Mounshi Mahamad Yakut Sahib garu.
15. Subedar Major Mahamad Beg Sahib Sirdar Bahadur
16. Mounshi Mahamad Abdul Khaiyum Sahib garu.

(Sd) C. Sitaramayya
Chairman.

(True Copy)
C. Sitaramayya
Chairman

L. & M.

A

Present on Thursday the 5th December 1895 at 8 A.M.

1. The Hon'ble Chenkuvada Sittaramayya Pantulu garu
Chairman.

Councillors

2. L. G. Moore Esquire.
3. The Hon'ble Krishnaswamy Pantulu garu.
4. " S. Sittaramayya Pantulu garu.
5. " D. Sundara Siva Rao Pantulu garu.
6 " E. Katchapeswara Sastry garu.
7 " Motai Venkataswamy garu.
8 " Chenduri Subbarayudu garu.
9 " Seeram Venkata Krishnayya garu.
10 " Subadar Major C. Chandrayya Bahadur garu.
11 " Mettapally Sattayya Naidu garu.
12 " Poola Sobhanadri Naidu garu.
13 Mounshi Mahamad Yakub Sahib garu.
14 Subdar Major Mahamad Beg Sahib Subdar Bahadur garu.
15. Mounshi Mahamad Abdul Khayum Sahib gar.

(Sd) C. Sittaramayya
Chairman

C. Sittaramayya
Chairman

(True Copy)

Present on Friday the 6th December 1895 at 8 A.M.

1. The R.R. C. Seetaramayya Pantulu garu Chairman

Councillors

2. The R.R. K. Krishnamoorty Pantulu garu.
3. " S. Seetaramayya Pantulu garu
4. " D. Sundara Siva Rao Pantulu garu.
5. " C. Katchaeswara Sastry garu.
6. " Mootai Venkata Swamy garu.
7. " Chenduri Subbarayudu garu.
8. " Jaraji Krishnayya garu.
9. " M. Sattayya Naidu garu.
10. " Seeram Venkata Krishnayya garu.
11. Munshi Mahamad Yakub Sahib garu.
12. Subdar Major Muhamad Begu Sahib Sirdar Bahadur garu.

Present on Friday the 6th December 1895 at 3 P.M.

1. The R.R. C. Seetaramayya Pantulu garu Chairman.

Councillors

2. " K. Krishnamurty Pantulu garu.
3 " S. Seetaramayya Pantulu garu.
4 " Munshi Muhamad Yakub Sahib garu.

Postponed

C. Seetaramayya.
Chairman.

VIII

At Meeting of the Municipal Council for the Town of Ellore dated 4th, 5th, 6th, & 7th December 1895.

I Read Revised Estimates for 1895-96 and Budget Estimates for 1896-97.

Postponed to the 11th Instant to reconsider and review the Budget, as from the several proposals and provisions made in draft Budget it was found that Rs 190 only was left for New Works & Repairs Communications.

(True Extract)

C. Sitaramayya
Chairman

Present on the 7th December 1895

1. Dr. R. R. C. Sitaramayya Pantulu garu Chairman
Councillors
2. Mr. R. K. Krishnamurty Pantulu garu.
3. " S. Seetaramayya Pantulu garu.
4. " D. Sundara Siva Rao Pantulu garu.
5. " M. Venkataswamy garu.
6. " Javadi Krishnayya garu.
7. " Seeram Venkata Krishnayya garu.
8. " Subedar Major C. Chandrayya Bahadur garu.
9. " M. Sattayya Naidu garu.
10. Subedar Major Muhammad Beg Sahib Sirdar Bahadur garu.
11. Munshi Mahamad Yakub Sahib garu.

C. Sitaramayya.
Chairman

[L. & M. 8,000-8-4-96.]

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

(Sd) K.R. Iyer
2-12-95

(Sd) K.R. Iyer
Secretary

(Sd) S. Govinda Pillai

(Sd) Krishna Pillai

(Sd) A. Chinna

(Sd) Illegible

(Sd) C. Chinnaiah

(Sd) E.K. M.C

(Sd) D.G.R.
28-11-95

(Sd) Illegible

(Sd) Illegible

(Sd) Q.P.C.M.
2/12

(Sd) in Kannadam
Appr Guha Sahib

(Signed) Illegible

Illegible
7.9.

Illegible
Illegible 1895

Illegible

Illegible

Illegible

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Office
7th December 1895

No 9

No 73 Eng.

To

The Hon. Asst. Collector
Gooranari.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that a special meeting of the Council will be held on the 16th instant to examine and review the Budget proposals as after providing for Grants I, II, III & VI, only Rs 8310 remained for Grant I excluding the closing balance provision of Rs 2540.

Out of Rs 8310 the following works should be necessarily provided for.

Rs 1720 — — — For Establishment
400 — — — Iron dust-bins
1,000 — — — — Iron latrines
1,500 — — — — Hospital Asst. quarters
600 — — — — Repairs to ~~existing~~ fencing
1,000 — — — Re-tarring & repairing roads
2,000 — — — Compensation for lands.
8,120 — — — Total.

Thus you will observe that only Rs 190 is left for new works, communications and repairs communications

(signed) C. Sita Ramayya

Chairman

(True copy)

C. Sita Ramayya.

Chairman

VI

Date 12th/1895

Asst. Collector

IX

Notice

A special meeting of the Municipal Councillors for the Town of Elure will be held on Saturday the 14th Instant at 9 A.M. as the Budget proposals require review and reconsideration.

Elure Municipal Office
7th December 1895

(signed)
Manager

(signed)

C. Sita Ramayya
Chairman

(True copy)

C. Sita Ramayya.
Chairman

be helpful at the same time. This may be highly interesting and instructive as well as amusing but does not conduce to a business like discussion of important

/signed/ C. Sita Ramayya

Chairman

(True copy)

C. Sitaramayya.

Chairman

E/K

/Signed/ Geen
C.C. 10-12-95

30 to 30.

M. R. 10-12-95

no ou Rs.

M.R. 11-12-96

Geen C.C. 13-12-95

mc

Mark

C.C. 30

Municipal Councillors

True copy

C. Sitaramayya.

Chairman

Municipal Office
11th December 1895.

(True copy)

Chairman

Date 9/12/95

Rao

Asst. Collector

Gudivada

Municipal Councillors

Ellore

Eng 9-12-95

Reply

I regret to state that I am unable to be present at the meeting of the Municipal Council for the consideration of the Budget proposals. I understand that the meeting has been postponed to 17-12-95 when I shall attend.

In the meantime I would suggest that the Municipal Councillors might conduct this proceedings in a more orderly and business-like way. At the meetings one Mr. & Mr. taken & attended, I noticed that many of the Councillors desired to speak at the same time. This may be helpful interesting and instructive as well as amusing but does not conduce to a business-like discussion of important

[illegible] which are deemed
a [illegible]

3 It is of course essential that attend
to town should be provided [illegible]
to the Communications &c. The claims
of Kotor for attention, from that [illegible], can
[illegible] appear to be very pressing and
should be carried [illegible] the settlement of these
for [illegible] can only be with advantage
when [illegible] by help.

4 I request that the Budget as [illegible]
[illegible] to Government may
be sent through me. This is the usual
practice [illegible] accordance with

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant.

(Sd) [illegible]
Assistant Collector.

True Copy/

(Sd) [illegible]
Chairman

XV.

At a meeting of the Municipal Council for the Town of Ekma held on Friday the 20th December 1895 at 8 A.M.

x x x

I Read again Revised Estimates for the current year and Budget Estimates for the next year together with connected statements.

(Sd) G.R.
16/12

(Sd) [illegible]
17/12

Estimates for 1895-96 and
Receipts for 1896-97.

[illegible] ments be
[illegible] Budget:-

[illegible]

(Sd) C. Sabaratnam
Chairman

True Copy/

(Sd) [illegible]
Chairman

[illegible]

Rs.
Rbda [illegible] 200.

2 — — Pelawegoodem Road
from Mr. Auzum's Rubber house 20
to lamp post — — — —

11

proper [illegible] which are deemed
a [illegible] charge.

3 It is of course essential that all
the town should be provided [illegible]
with Communications &c. The claims
of Roads for Assistance, from Rates, can
seldom appear to be very pressing and
should be [illegible] The settlement of these
for such [illegible] certainly be with economy
and [illegible] by help.

Budget expenditure
recurrent heavy
and is the usual
[illegible]

XII. Solicitor

[illegible]

(Sd) C. Saravanamuttu
Chairman

True Copy
C. Saravanamuttu
Chairman

XV.

At a meeting of the Municipal Council for the Town of Ellene held on Friday the 20th December 1895 at 8 A.M.

x x x

I Read again Revised Estimates for the current year and Budget Estimates for the next year together with connected statements.

Passed Revised Estimates for 1895-96 and Budget Estimate Receipts for 1896-97.

Resolved that the following amounts be allotted to the following Grants in the Budget:-

Grant I Rs. 12,000.

Grant II Rs. 4,500.

Grant III Rs. 13,500.

Grant IV Rs. 4,000

Grant V Rs. 2,280.

Pnis Rs. 250.

Total Rs. 36,530.

Grant I (Public Works)

1 New Works.

(a) Communications

	Rs.
1 Constructing Kummaragurtaz Road	200.
2 ——— Pilaiyadeem Road from Mr. Arumugam's house to lamp post	20

proposed that estimates which are discussed

a. [illegible] hereinafter.

3 It is of course essential that attend
to boss should be provided for
with Communications &c. The items
of Rs 100 for Anathans, Rs 50 for Cam
latrans appear to be very excessive and
should be reduced. The Chairman of Rs 100
for [illegible] Cash Contingencies be with estimates
reduced by half.

Budget report
recommend being
sent to the usual
[illegible]

XII. Sd/-

[illegible]

(Sd) C. Sabaratnam
Chairman

True Copy /

C. Sabaratnam
Chairman

/ Sd [illegible]
[illegible]
Acting Collector.

/ True [illegible]

[illegible]
Secretary

XIV.

At a meeting of the Municipal Council
for the Town of Ellore held on Friday the 20th
December 1895 at 8 A.M.

x x x

I Read again Revised Estimates for the current
year and Budget Estimates for the Next Year
together with connected statements.

Passed Revised Estimates for 1895-96 and
Budget Estimate Receipts for 1896-97.

Resolved that the following amounts be
allotted to the following Grants in the Budget:-

Grant I Rs. 12,000.

Grant II Rs. 4,500.

Grant III Rs. 13,500.

Grant IV Rs. 4,000

Grant V Rs. 2,280.

Fines Rs. 250.

Total Rs. 36,630.

Grant I. (Public Works)

1 New Works.

(a) Communications

	Rs.
1 Constructing Kummaraguntah Road	200.
2 " " Pilaregoodem Road from Mr. Ayyam Saheb's house to lamp post	20

	Rs	
3 Constructing Road to Jayanallivanka Tank	200.	
4 —"— Road from Burra well to Kishtna canal	200.	
5 Raising and sanding Road No 4 Powerpetta.	300.	
6 Gravelling & Metalling Road No 2 Powerpetta upto Visiwabrahma Agraharam	400.	
Total Communications	1500.	1,500

(b) Buildings

1 Constructing Hospital Assistants quarters	1500.	
2 —"— Cow slaughter house	200	
3 —"— Market sheds	600.	
4 —"— Latrines	1000.	
5 —"— Dust bins	200.	
Total Buildings	3,500.	3,500.

(d) Water Supply 300

Total Water supply 300. 300.

2 Repairs.

(a) Communications	3,000.	3,000.
(b) Buildings	500	500.
(c) Drainage		
(i) Repairs to Works	300	
(ii) Establishment &c	600	
Total Drainage	900	900.
(d) Water Supply		
(ii) Establishment &c	70	70.
c/f		9,770

		c/f 9,770.
3 Establishment	880	880
4 Tools & plant and other Stores	100	200
5 Requisition of land for quarrying gravel and metal for public works	1250	1250
Total Rs		12,000.

xx Adjourned to to-morrow at 8 A.M.

20-12-95

(True Extract)

Cuncd Municipal Office
May 1896

C Sitaramayya
Chairman

The following Councillors were present at the above meeting held

1 M R R C Seetaramayya Pantulu garu Chairman

Councillors.

2 L G Moore Esquire
3 M R R P Seetaramayya Pantulu garu
4 —"— D Sundaraswarao Pantulu garu
5 —"— C Kotiahpramanandam garu
6 —"— M Venkataramayya garu
7 —"— P Venkata Krishnayya garu
8 —"— J Krishnayya garu
9 —"— M Lakayya Naidu garu
10 —"— Subadar Major C Chandrayya Bahadur garu
11 Munshi Md Affizullah Saheb garu
12 Subadar Major Mahomed Beg Subadar Bahadur garu

C Sitaramayya
Chairman

E/K

At a meeting of the Municipal Council
for the Town of Ellore held on Saturday the 21st
December 1895 at 8 A.M.

× × ×

XIII Notice

The Budget Meeting of the
Ellore Municipal Council adjourned
to this day, will be held on 22nd
December 1895 at 8 A.M.

Ellore Municipal Office
21st December 1895

(signed)
C. Sitaramayya
Chairman

(sig) E.C.
Manager

(True copy)

C. Sitaramayya.
Chairman

5 M. Salleyya Naidugaru

C. Sitaramayya.
Chairman

EJK

/signed/ C.

E.R.

Asa K

Jun 24

Municipal Commissary.

Recorded

S.R.

28-1-96

(True copy)

C Sittambalamyya.

Chairman

V.S.
17/5/95

X.V.A.

At a meeting of the Municipal Council for the Town of Ellore held on Saturday the 21st December 1895 at 8 A.M.

× × ×

Adjourned to 22nd Instant for want of quorum. 21-12-95

(True Extract)

Ellore Municipal Office
May 1896.

C Sittambalamyya.
Chairman

The following Councillors were present at the above meeting.

Result

1 mRR C Seetaramayya Pantulu garu Chairman
Counsellors.

2 mRR C Kalesapatruva Sastri garu

3—a— D. Sundaramarow Pantulu garu

4—a— M. Venkatarama garu

5—a— M. Satteyya Naidu garu

C Sittambalamyya.

E/K

Chairman

~~A~~
~~XIII~~ B.

At a meeting of the Municipal Council for the Town of Ellore held on 22nd December 1893 at 9 A m.

x x x

I Grant I

Resolved that the amount allotted in the Budget under Grant I Repairs Communications be spent on the following repairs:-

1 Repairing High Road from Razzy sahebs house up to Mallikharjanudu's well. } Rs 1,000.

2 Repairing Chintalapoody Road } 800.

3 —" — Jammidevu Embankment Road

2 & 3 Mr. D. Gundraopanthulu garu dissenting.

4 Repairing petty Roads in different wards 1200

Total Repairs 3,000.

II Grant II.

Resolved that the pay of the Telugu Pundit of the Lower Secondary School be raised by Rs 2-8-0 per mensem and only Rs 238 be allotted for its Contingencies and that the amount estimated to be spent under Results Grants be reduced to Rs 750 and the amount thus saved be utilized in improving the teaching staff of the Lower Primary school at Rs 12, 8 & 7 to the Head Master, 1st Asst & 2nd Asst respectively and that the school fees

Head Clerk.

At the bottom of each resolution, write down the names of all Councillors who attended the meetings. These four copies would do well. Then only add the names of Councillors under each resolution:

C.S
11/5

XII

Memo

1. Remarks made on the Municipal Budget for 1896-97 are not true.
2. In the meeting held on the 4th December/95, it was agreed that the revised estimate might be passed & that was put on paper.
3. As it was proposed by some Councillors and agreed to by all that after settling income we should first Consider as to what are important expenses and how much would be needed, the proposals were discussed till finally agreed to in the Budget & in the end we found that there remained only Rs 4 odd for Grant I & so the meeting after 4 days meetings was adjourned to 14th December when it was proposed to fix a certain amount to every Grant & then discuss details.
4. On the 14th December/95 as the Head Assistant Collector going on circuit, specially requested us to postpone the meeting to some other date so that he may also attend it, it was postponed to the 20th December.
5. In the meeting held on the 20th December after determining the amount to be spent under each Grant as was resolved before, we postponed the meeting the next day with a view to discuss the details.
6. In the meeting held on the 21st as there was no it was postponed to the next day, then we entered into the detailed expenditure, discussed various fully, & finally settled.
7. On each & every occasion the meeting Notice has been circulated among all the Councillors and signed by us all.
8. In this state of things it is nothing but a mistake to state that on the last

... was passed & meeting was held."

Signed

1. Mootai Venkataswamy.
2. Chendni Subbarayudu.
3. Kanigolla Swamykyaw.
4. Mahamad Abdul Khayyum.
5. Seeraw Krishnayya.
6. Jawraji Krishnayya.
7. Mettapalli Satkayya Naidu.
8. Mahamad Yakub Sahib
9. S. Sitharamayya.
10. Josta Subbaudu

True Translation.

C. Ratnamayya.
Chairman

Memo. 16-4-96

Manager. Have you read the petition

Mr. [illegible]

From [illegible] Collector's letter dated 28-11-95 to No. 3188 of 95 to the Chairman Municipal Council, Ellore.

Para II That the Council should secure the services always an experienced Engineer. 50 Rs is not too much to pay a good man. I greatly distrust non-professional supervision and the Statute the Municipal roads, although Rs 5000 was spent on them last year, a sufficient sum, as Government have pointed out, to have put the roads in excellent order, shows how useless the well meaning supervision by persons with non-professional knowledge is.

X X X

(Sd) L. G. Moore
Hd Asst Collr

/True copy/

C. Ratnamayya
Chairman

Memo. 16-4-96

Manager. Have You read the petition presented by Messrs. D. Sunderaswaran & five other Ratepayers against the Budget and the Revised Estimate for 1896-97?

Reply. Yes. It was presented to me by Mr. D. Ramachandram at Office on behalf of D. Sunderaswaran.

Manager. Is this Ramachandram known to the Proprietor of Vibudharanjini Vs petition of Mr. D. Sunderaswaran

Reply Yes he is the same.

Manager. Have You attended the various meetings held in connection with the Budget and Revised Estimate and to Your Knowledge was any meeting adjourned for want of information

Reply I attended every meeting in connection with the Budget and was ready with every information that was necessary for the Budget. To my Knowledge no Budget Meeting was adjourned for want of information.

Manager. What was done on the 4th 5th & 6th of December at meetings held for the Budget.

Reply. Only various proposals were discussed without arriving to any definite conclusion and no resolutions were passed.

Manager What took place on the 7th December meeting

Reply. The previous discussions resulted in leaving only

Rs.

~~postponed meeting~~

Rs 1 go under communications both new & old and the result of the previous discussions was useless and this was noted in the Resolution Book and communicated to all Councillors and a day was fixed for the disposal of the Budget.

Manager Was the meeting held on the 11th of December if not why not.

Reply. It was not held on the 11th December at the request of the Head Assistant Collector & the same was duly communicated to the Council by a special notice on the 13th December & so there was and could be no meeting on the 14th December. As a matter of fact no councillor attended the office on the 14th December as there was no occasion for them to come

Manager Was there any meeting on the 21st July was it not held

Reply The meeting was adjourned by the Chairman for want of quorum.

Manager: Did the Chairman attend that meeting?

Reply Yes. He did and it was he who adjourned the meeting.

Manager Were you ever forced by the Chairman to accept Overseers appointment and who proposed Rs 60 for Overseers appointment.

Reply I was not forced nor compelled to accept.

to accept Overseers post. The pay of Rs 60 for an Overseer was proposed by the Divisional Officer and the Chairman two days before the 1st Meeting asked me whether I would like to go out as an overseer on Rs 60 as a change & relief to me & as the state of the Public Works was sadly in want of proper management & supervision & gave me two days to think over the matter. I consulted my mother who advised to accept it as per Chairman's suggestions.

Manager What did the Chairman then propose to you.

Reply The Chairman promised to permit me to have a lien in office on Managers appointment and said that I could revert to my Managers post if I should not like to continue in the Overseers post. This was also expressed by the Chairman in the Council itself.

Manager What did you say to the Chairman both in private & at the Meeting.

Reply I said I would with pleasure take the exchange & try it for a year or two on the conditions stated above.

Manager What was then stated by messrs D Gunaratnam & D R Fernando only

Reply Gunaratnam & Munshee Mahomed Yakoob stated

and Chandrayya Subadar Major.

Reply. These Councillors objected to my going out as Overseer and strongly insisted upon my withdrawing from my promise to the Chairman to go out as Overseer. I then against my wish at the Meeting said I would withdraw my promise to go out as Overseer and the matter entirely dropped.

(signed) E. J. Chapman
Manager 16-4-96.

(True Copy)

Ettore Municipal Office
May 1896

C. Vitharaneyya.
Chairman.

XVIII

Translation of the statements made by Mr. R. Ry E. Katchaparavara Sastry Garu, one of the Six Signatories to the petition on the petition on 20-4-96.

I have this day read this report with the Municipal Chairman having taken it from him. I was not present at the last Budget Meeting. While I was one day bathing in oil in the Compound of my house, Mr. R. Ry D. Sundara Sivarayo Pantulu Garu brought the original report to my house and sent it to me stating that the Council decided against our opinion in the matter of the Conservancy Establishment, in not giving increase to the Hospital Compounder and in not appointing an assistant Compounder and that he had therefore prepared a report to Government about the same, that some of our fellow Councillors have signed it and requested me also to sign it, at the same time that I should not make any delay in signing it as he was on the point of going to some village on tour in that very day. As it was then inconvenient for me to read the report and as I saw the signatures of some Councillors on it, I signed the report in the belief that what Mr. D. Sundara Sivarayo had written was a correct report. As the Chairman has shown me all the Office papers connected with this report, I have now perused all the record and have come to the conclusion that the report I have signed was not a correct or proper report and regret to have signed that report without justifiable grounds and I, therefore, hereby withdraw my signature affixed to that report.

True translation
C. Vitharaneyya.
Chairman.

Signed E. Katchaparavara Sastry
Municipal Councillor and 2nd Grade Pleader.

XIX

Translation of the statements made by M. R. Ry Mahomed Baqi, Subadar Major - Sardar Bahadur, one of the Signatories to the petition on the petition on 24-4-76.

M. R. Ry D. Sundara Sivarao Pantulu - Garu, made by me brought the original report to me, and showing it to me said that it was a report to Government prepared by him about the Conservancy Establishment and about the increase to the Hospital Compounders and requested me to sign the report. I am not acquainted with English. The report was not therefore read out to me; nor was it translated to me into Telugu. Believing M. D. Sundara Sivarao's statement, I signed the report. I do not know what was written in the report. As the Chairman now has got the report read out to me and has got it explained to me in Telugu, I have heard it well and now consider that it is not a correct or proper report. I was not present at the last meeting. I now find that there are things mentioned in the report which I do not know. I, therefore, regret to have signed a report which contains things that I do not know and therefore hereby withdraw my signature affixed to that report.

(Signed) Mahomed Baqi, Subadar Major,
Sardar Bahadur, Municipal
Councillor.

True translation:
C. Sitharamayya
Chairman.

~~XX~~

Extract from the Statement made by one of the six petitioners Mr R Ry K. Krishnamurthy Pantulu dated 20-5-95 as regards Mr D Lundarasima Rau's conduct.

From
~~Now~~ the refusal of this Councillor (Mr D. Lundarasima Rau) to report on certain municipal papers referred to him and from the disconteous remarks passed by him in returning those papers I felt satisfied that he is bent on annoying the chairman.

The questions under consideration ~~service~~ an unbecoming spirit of party for which the Council is not the proper field. Councillors ~~to be~~ one expected to shew public spirit and co-operation. Where as Mr R Ry D. Lundarasima Rau Pantulu gave ~~is~~ striving evidently incidents to sow dissensions and lower the prestige of the Council and I feel it my duty to suggest that such a distenbering element be eleminated from the Council and greater harmony secured in the public interests.

(Signed.) C. Krishnamurthy
S.A. Assistant
20-5-95.

True Copy.
C. Krishnamurthy.
Chairman

XXI

Extract from the statement made by one of the six petetioners M. R Ry C. Chendraiah Subadar Major Bahadur of 26-5-95 as regards Mr. D. Tundarasina Rau's Conduct.

All this unbecoming and indolent conduct of this Councillor (Mr. D. Tundarasina Rau) I am satisfied is due to some personal grudge to the Chairman. The undignified and impertinent attitude of the Councillor (Mr. D. Tundarasina Rau) towards the chairman, the factious and spirit apparent in the questions put by him displays a spiteful and malicious attempt to injure the prestage of the Chairman in the eyes of the Council and the public.

Hitherto the Council was known to be in unanimity and in perfect harmony with the chairman, and I plainly see the object of this Councillor (Mr. D. Tundarasina Rau) is to ~~sow~~ sow discord and dissension in the Council and it is my opinion in the interests of the public and to secure an honest and sympathetic Co-operation in the Municipal administratio

Such a disturbing member should be at once eliminated from the Council.

(Signed.) C. Chemingga.
Genuine Labour Mayor
Potampul Commission
Ulene.

26.5.95 Inst Coly.

C. Chemingga.
Chairman

Copy of the Resolution of the Municipal Council
Ellore dated 22nd February 1896.

Resolution XIX

As Mr. D. Dundera Siva Row proposed to withdraw the suit, if the Council should desire it and as Mr. D. Sita Ramayya proposed the withdrawal of the suit, it is resolved that he be requested to withdraw the suit, and he has agreed to withdraw the same

[Sd] C. Sitaramayya
Chairman

True Copy

C. Sitaramayya.
Chairman

EJK

No 146 Mis 91 Ellore Municipal Office
24th February 96.

From
MR Ry
C. Sutaramiah Pantulu Garu
Chairman Municipal
Council Ellore

To
MR Ry
D. Sundaraiya Garu
Plaintiff in OS No 80/1894
and Municipal Councillor
Ellore

Sir

I have the honour to
forward herewith an extract from
the proceedings of the Municipal Council
Ellore dated 22nd February 96 for
your information. A copy of the said
proceedings has also been forwarded
to MR Ry V. Ramakoti Garu, Pleader,

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Svt
(Sd) C. Sitaramiah
Chairman

(True Copy)

C. Ritharamayya.

To

The Chairman

Municipal Council Ennis.

Memorandum presented by Peter Sobhanachi a Councillor.

Sir,

On reading the letter dated 5th March 1896 from

also agreed before us all to the resolution. After
he has agreed to the resolution the same was written
in the resolution book & read out to the Council in his
presence. It is now my desire that necessary steps

XXI

To

The Chairman

Municipal Council Elluru.

Memorandum presented by Sista Sobhanadri a Councillor.

Sir,

On reading the letter dated 5th March 1896 from Duggirala Sundarasiva Raogaru, I understood the contents therein; but I regret to have to write that all statements therein contained are contrary to facts & to what he admitted before the meeting. In the meeting held on the 22nd February 1896 the subject of sanctioning some money towards the expenses of the suit brought by D. Sundarasiva Raogaru against the Council, was introduced by S. Seshaiawayya garu one of the Councillors as there was a letter from the Vakeel for the Council to the effect that the suit will be coming on for hearing in a day or two & some money was required to get copies of some papers in the suit. This was introduced in the meeting at a very late hour when the Chairman was just about to close the meeting. Then Sundara Siva Rao garu got up and said that he was ready to withdraw the suit if the Council desires it. Then S. Seshaiawayya garu proposed the withdrawal of the suit and we all agreed to the proposal. Then the Chairman wrote and read the resolution. Hearing this & discussing to some extent as to the wording of the resolution, Sundara Siva Rao garu also agreed before us all to the resolution. After he has agreed to the resolution the same was written in the resolution book & read out to the Council in his presence. It is now my desire that necessary steps

XXII

To

Sri Lukka

Lakshmanniah Pantulu garu

Vakeel in AS No 8 of 1894

and the Chairman of Ellore

Municipality

Sir

I have the honor to inform you that I did not agree to the resolution requesting me to withdraw the suit AS No 8 of 1894 sent by your letter No 146 MS dated 24-2-96.

Ellore
5th March 96

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servt
(Sd) D. Sundarasivarow

True copy
(Sd) Sista Subbayya.
Chairman

should be taken to enforce the resolution at least to maintain the prestiger of the Council

(Signed) T. Sobhanadri
Councillor.

I am also of the same opinion.

(Sd) Chundri Subbarayudu
Councillor.

I am also of the same opinion.

(Sd) Kanigolla Ananthyam.
Councillor.

I am also of the same opinion.

(Sd) Pensioned Subdar Major Bahadur
Mahomad Beg.
Councillor.

Tho'D

Memo

A.

In reference to your note off the letter of Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao regarding the withdrawal of his suit, I beg to remark as follows:-

When the subject of sanctioning money for expenses in Mr D. Sundarasiva Rao's case before the Council on the 22nd February, Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao expressed his willingness to withdraw the suit in case the Council so desired it & I then proposed the withdrawal of the suit to the Council and on the Council's adopting my proposal the resolution was read out (without the last expression that he has agreed to withdraw) to the Council and Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao after ~~wrangling~~ to some extent for the wording of the resolution and after necessary explanation to him about it agreed to withdraw the suit and to it was then, at my suggestion added to the resolution, ~~and~~ read out to the Council.

Now I regret to read this letter referred to me for opinion which is quite contrary to what he expressed and clearly admitted before this meeting after so much discussion; I feel sorry that the action of Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao in this respect is certainly below the dignity of

XXVI

The Manager is requested to state what passed when passing the resolution in connection with the withdrawal of Mr. D. Sunderaviarow in the meeting on 22-2-96.

When the subject of costs in Mr. D. Sunderaviarow's case was brought before the Council through its pleader Mr. V. Ramadow, Mr. D. Sunderaviarow said he would withdraw the case if the Council so desire. Then the Chairman wrote the resolution and read it upon which certain discussion arose regarding the wording. The resolution was corrected and read again. Mr. D. Sunderaviarow made no objection and agreed to the same. When the resolution was communicated to him under the orders of the Chairman for the purpose of withdrawing the case, then Mr. D. Sunderaviarow replied that he will not withdraw the case as he has not agreed to the resolution although he did not object to it at the meeting.

/Signed/ E.J. Chapman
Manager.

Ellore Municipal Office
May 1896.

(True copy)
C. Ratnasamy
Chairman

DXXII

XXXII

I was present before the Council when the letter from Mr. V. Ramiah was read stating that he was copies of plaint & Statements in C.S. No 8 of 1896 instituted by Mr. D. Sunderasivarow was against the Council, came into the meeting. I remember I read it and also expressed my wish that it should be compromised. Whereupon Mr. D. Sunderasivarow was said "I will gladly withdraw my Suit if the Council should desire it immediately Mr. P. Sitaramayya was made a proposal to that effect. I do not remember who seconded it. Mr. D. Sunderasivarow was gladly agreed to withdraw the Suit, the Chairman Mr. C. Seetaramayya Pantulu was wrote to that effect resolution in Mr. D. Sunderasivarow was wished that the 1st sentence should be placed last for which the Chairman did not agree, the other members, manager & I also said "there will be no difference in meaning if the wording is altered as requested. then he kept quiet and the resolution passed.

/Signed/ P.V. Subbarayudu
Ag. Hd. clerk
Municipal Office 9-5-96

(True copy)
Eluru Municipal Office
May 1896 E.K.

C. Sitharamayya.
Chairman

Ellore Municipal Office.

Dated the 17th May 1896.

Despatched 17th May 1896.

No. 119.

FROM,

M-R-Ry,

C. SITARAMAYYA PANTULU GARU;

CHAIRMAN,

MUNICIPAL COUNCIL ELLORE.

To,

The Chief Secretary

to

Govt Saint George

Madras

Sir.

In returning herewith the copy of the petition
No 347 dated 17th March 1896 from M. Ry. D. Sundara
Siva Rao and five others referred to me for remarks, I
have the honor to state that the Budget proposals were
discussed at several meetings of the Council held on
4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 20th, & 22nd December last and the
result of the Council's deliberations were fully & duly
recorded. With a view to arrange to have everything ready
for the Budget meeting and to curtail as much as
possible unnecessary discussions, I invited Budget
proposals from all the Councillors for 1896-97 by circular
letters Nos: 91, 97 & 111 Mis dated respectively 6th, 10th,
and 27th November/95 (Copies I, II & III enclosed) and
on receipt of their numerous proposals, the Budget
meeting was fixed to 4th December 95, which was duly
communicated to all the Councillors by a notice dated 25th
November/95 which was served upon all Councillors

17 in Number (Notice IV Copy enclosed). The first Budget Meeting was held on the 4th December when much of the time was wasted by some Councillors in discussing projects and proposals not in the least likely to be carried into effect and in discussing subjects which required no discussion. At the first Budget meeting held on the 4th December last, there were present 16 Councillors, on the 5th December 12 Councillors, on the 6th December 12 Councillors at the morning meeting, and only four at the afternoon meeting which was adjourned for want of quorum, and on the 7th December 11 Councillors who then adjourned the meeting to 14th December (Copies V, VI & VII enclosed). During meetings held on the above dates, almost all the Councillors who have signed the petition were present and knew that these discussions were being simply noted down on sheets of papers separately as these discussions were preliminary and were intended to be taken into Consideration at the final settlement of the Budget proposals. To show that that was a fact and the understanding of the Council, I refer to the resolution passed on the 7th December, Resolution I "Read Revised Estimate for 1895-96 and Budget estimate for 1896-97. Postponed to the 14th Instant to reconsider and review the Budget as from the several proposals and provisions made in the Draft Budget, it was found that Rs 190 only was left for new works and repairs Communications." (Copy VIII enclosed). It will thus be clear from this that up to 7th December practically nothing was done, that all the time was wasted

in unnecessary discussions and deviations. These petitioners Could not have denied the above resolutions, as the Notice issued to them on the 7th December for the adjourned meeting was served upon and signed by Councillors including these six petitioners and was worded as follows: "Notice" "A special meeting of the Municipal Councillors for the town of Ellore will be held on Saturday the 14th Instant at 2 P.M. as the Budget proposals require review and reconsideration". (Copy IX enclosed). My letter to the Head Assistant Collector dated 9-10-95 No 73 Engg. And his reply to the Dis No 3211/Rev of 95 in Connection with the Budget meeting will clearly show that the meeting on the 14th Instant was only "for the Consideration of the Budget proposals". (Copies X & XI enclosed). It is also admitted by the petitioners that Mr Moore the then Head Assistant Collector was present at the meetings held previous to 14th December. The petitioners themselves admit in para 4 that at the request of the Chairman the Council was constrained to reconsider the Budget. If the Budget had already been passed as alleged by them and if these deliberations and discussions at the four previous meetings were not preliminary but final, how did these Councillors Consent, even without a protest, to Cancel the

resolutions already passed about the Budget without
Conforming to the provisions of Sec 30 Clause 5 of the
Municipal Act. Why did not they even as much as
express their surprise at the unexpected and strange
procedure followed by the Chairman either when they
signed the meeting notice or when they attended the
next meeting. As Mr. Moore the Divisional Officer
wrote on the 13th December in his reply to mine Dis. No 3211
Rev.
of 95 that he was anxious to be present at the meeting
of the Municipal Council for the Consideration of the
Budget proposals, as he attended the previous Budget
meetings, as he sent in some Budget proposals and
as he also personally requested me when we both
attended the District Board Budget meeting at Rajahmundry
on or about 10th December that I should arrange to
have the Municipal Budget meeting sometime about
20th December to enable him to attend it after his inspection
at Tanuku was over, I felt it was my duty to adjourn
the meeting on the 14th December to 20th And I gave
timely notice of the same to all the Councillors on the
13th December which was seen & signed by 4 of the petitioners
on that very date. The statement of these Councillors that
many Councillors attended the meeting on the 14th Instant
And that the Chairman adjourned the meeting to 20th Idem
in spite of their attendance is simply false and untrue
to the knowledge of 5 of these signatories, Messrs D. Sundara Siva Rao

(Vide ~~XIX~~ K)
taken active part in the discussions, were absent. With the

E. Kachapeswara Sastry, C. Chandrayya Subadar, Mahamad
Beg, & Mahamad Hafeezulla (Vide Copy ~~XII~~ of the Notice dated
13th December 1895). Thus it will be seen that up to 20th
December every possible opportunity has been given to all the
Councillors to attend, to discuss, & to decide Budget
proposals. There could therefore be said nothing against
the Chairmen till 20th December for denying opportunity
to the petitioners to attend the Budget Meeting and
for granting it to the packed few. The next meeting was
held on the 20th December when there present 12 Councillors
of whom one was Mr L. G. Moore Divisional Officer
and five were the petitioners who signed the petition
under reference and at that meeting the revised estimate
was read & passed for the 1st time without much waste
of time. I had to intimate to these Councillors that
much time was wasted in all the four former meetings
in connection with this Budget ~~meeting~~ and that
the Council did ~~no~~ practically nothing in all the
previous meetings. To avoid unnecessary & costly
proposals and to confine ourselves to our means, I
first asked the Council to adjust and allot funds to
different grants and then consider the various items
~~item~~ under each grant. Mr Moore the Divisional
officer approved of the suggestion and said that we should
cut our cloth (coat) according to our cloth. Vide Ex 36, 530

were provided for different grants and the details under
Grant Ds were ~~decided~~ discussed and decided and
the Meeting there adjourned to the 21st Instant at
the request of the Council as it was then passed 11½ A.M.
On the 21st December, only 5 Councillors were present including
myself and two of the petitioners and Consequently I had
to adjourn the Meeting to 22nd December for want of quorum
(Vide enclosure XIII dated 21-12-95). The statement of
the petitioners that the Meeting on the 21st December had
to be postponed owing to Chairman's absence at the Meeting
though it was the last day before Christmas is another
untruth and, that to the knowledge of Messrs. D. Sundarasivarao,
E. Kotcheseswara Sastry (Vide enclosure ~~XII~~ XIII
for 21st December and the resolution ~~XIII~~ XII of the Council
adjourning 20th December Meeting to 21st Idem). I may also
mention here that this so called packed Meeting on 22nd December
was only a Continuation of the Meeting of the 20th December which
was adjourned to the 21st December to the knowledge of 12 Councillors,
including 4 of the petitioners and the Divisional Officer. At
the meting of the 21st December which had to be adjourned,
not, as alleged by the petitioners by the absence of the Chairman,
but for want of quorum, while Messrs. D. Sundarasiva Rao &
E. Kotcheseswara Sastry, two of the English knowing petitioners
were present and their Co-adjutors who are alleged to have

(Vide ~~XIV~~ XI)

taken active part in the discussions, were absent. With the
above facts before us we come now to the 22nd December Meeting
which the petitioners have styled "A packed Meeting Consisting
of certain Councillors specially invited, was held on the following
Sunday to pass the Chairman's proposals in the absence of Councillors
who took an active part in the discussions". The allegations
therein Contained are I that I as Chairman managed to
(held a packed Meeting, II invited specially certain Councillors
III excluded Councillors who took an active part in the discussions
and IV passed my own proposals. These are no doubt serious
charges with which I shall deal seriatim.

I The first and the foremost is that the Meeting was a packed
Meeting. This so called packed Meeting was attended by 6
Councillors including Mr. D. Sundarasiva Rao who is the prime
Mover and the Chief, if not the sole cause of this petition
as will be shown further down. Out of these 6, as admitted
by the petitioners, D. Sundarasiva Rao voted against and
strenuously opposed the passing of any resolutions at this
Meeting, another Mr. S. Sitharamayya declined to give
vote, the third a Naidu though agreeing in the main for
reduction of pay in the Conservancy staff, differed in
scale, and fourth a Mahamedan and fifth a Banyan
were the only two who fully voted for a Complete Change

in the Conservancy staff and thus there were three who no doubt agreed in passing the resolutions. As regards the Mahamadan Councillor I may mention here that a portion of his building on the main road has been ordered by Government on my recommendation to be removed as an encroachment. This the Council and these petitioners know for a fact. There is not thus much love lost between this Councillor and myself (Vide G. O. No 762 dt. 3.8.95.)

It requires no logic therefore to prove that my casting vote as Chairman was neither necessary nor called for in the above circumstances. Nor can I uphold resolutions already passed in Council without conforming to the provisions of Sec: 30 clause 5 of the Municipal Act. Thus it will be seen that there is not a shred of truth in the allegation that the meeting on the 22nd December was "a packed meeting"

II. That certain Councillors were specially invited;

III & That Councillors who took active part in the discussions were excluded. I shall deal these two together as they are in fact the same. The notice for this alleged packed meeting on 22nd December was served upon Messrs. E. Katchapeswara Sastry & C. Chandrayya Subedar Bahadur, two of the petitioners and they both signed the notice on the 21st December & yet they did not

attend this "packed meeting" (Vide meeting notice XIII of 95-96) Mr. D. Sundarasiva Rao who had neither seen nor signed the above notice attended this meeting. This meeting as was already stated was only a continuation of the meeting on the 20th December as that was adjourned to 21st which had again to be adjourned to 22nd Decmbr. If this was a packed meeting held to invite specially a select few and exclude these gentlemen with a motive (as alleged by these petitioners, it is really inexplicable why this notice should have been served upon two of them Messrs E. Katchapeswara Sastry, C. Chandrayya Subedar, and how they could have been successfully kept out by the Chairman from attending the meeting, though they had notice of the same, and how finally Mr D. Sundarasiva Rao, who had neither seen nor signed the said notice, had managed solely and singly to get into this packed meeting without his Communados. If Mr D. Sundarasiva Rao is one of the packed meeting and if "certain Councillors" & "Special invitation" referred to Messrs. E. Katchapeswara Sastry, and C. Chandrayya Subedar, two of the petitioners certainly the Chairman is guilty of the grave and serious charge laid at his door. The fact that Mr D. Sundarasiva Rao, Motyalenkata Swamy, S. Seetharamayya, & Sattayya Naidu who had not signed the meeting notice for 22nd Decmbr

have attended this meeting on the 22nd December, is proof positive that this meeting was only a Continuation of the meeting on the 20th December and that all the Commillors were aware of this fact. Hence the statement that certain Commillors were specially invited to this packed meeting and that certain Commillors who took an active part in the discussions were excluded from the same, is, as has been shown above, not only false but Contradicted by facts within the knowledge of the petitioners.

N. That the Chairman passed his own proposals.

It is necessary in this Connection to Consider what the important and unfair changes were that were effected in this so called packed meeting, which these petitioners so loudly protest against and to prevent which they so deliberately avoided to attend the meeting although they had knowledge of the same. As I have already pointed out, Grant I was already disposed of at the meeting held on the 20th December when 12 Commillors were present; and at the packed meeting, Grants II, IV, and V and Miscellaneous were allowed to stand as they were untouched and unchanged and the only Grant that received any changes was Grant III which Concerns the "Conservancy staff". (Vide XIV B.)

"With regard to the statement of the petitioners that the Conservancy staff is efficient, under no

Additions and Changes, I would simply refer to G. O. No. 801 Dn. Local & Municipal dated 6th May 1895 paras 2 and 6 and 1478 Dn. Local & Municipal dated 12th September 1895 paras 5 & 6. In para 2 of the former G. O it was stated that the state of the Conservancy Arrangements as described in paragraphs 5 of the Sanitary Commissioner's report are most discreditable to the Commil and the Municipal executive. The Chairman will report without delay what action the Commil proposes to take with regard to the points noted above." Government further observed in para 6 that should the report then submitted by the Sanitary Commissioner not show Considerable improvement in every respect, the Government will be Constrained to Consider the question of exercising the powers which it holds under the District Municipal Act. In the latter G. O No 1478 Dn. para 5, it was stated that "the Hospital Assistant, the Revenue Divisional Officer and the Sanitary Commissioner were unanimous in pronouncing the existing states of things (as to the Conditions of the town) to be unsatisfactory to the last degree. The matter has been fully recalt with in the order last quoted (G. O [illegible] translations, XVIII & XIX)

warned that immediate and energetic action must
be taken to improve matters. The Chairman of the
Municipal Council will now be warned that
unless a marked improvement is shown in each & every
one of these directions, the Government will consider
the desirability of taking steps under Sec: 130 of the Act to
deprive the Council of previlege which it now enjoys
of electing its own Chairman, and to reduce the
proportion which the election seats bear to those to which
nominations are made". I may also mention here
that for want of sufficient number of sweepers and
public carts, parts of the town are swept only twice
a week and the sweepings removed also twice a week
to the public depôt.

In the face of such a severe reproach and threat
from the Government to withdraw certain previleges
from the Council, and in the face of the Council's
promise and duty to consider the subject at the next
Budget Meeting (Vide G. O. Nos 801 &c. dated 6th May
1895),

I am afraid I shall be found sadly wanting in my
duty if I had not, as an executive officer, drawn the
attention of the Council to this crying want in the
that the Conservancy staff is efficient, and to the

orders in the interests of the Municipal administration
I should be considered interested and zealous in these
petitioners, I see no reason why I should deny that
interest which I rightly take and which I am proud
to admit. Yes in this case, the Conservancy proposal
is mine, asked by the petitioners and there is no
reason why I should not; if funds permit, I push
the proposition right through the Council. In fact
there was no choice, there was no alternative but
to carry out the strict injunctions of the Government
in their Resolution, the primary object of the former
Sanitation — and to fulfil promises which the Council
had made in this Connection. Here I venture to
state that I do not deserve any discredit for pointing
out the necessity for the arrangements in the Conservancy
Establishment which has been occupying the serious
attention of Government for sometime. The delay
of nearly a months in submitting this petition to Govern-
ment after the Budget meeting was over is another fact
which throws sufficient light on Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao's
powers to get up such petitions. The first petition was

meeting and the resolution thereon requested to be cancelled was passed on the 22nd December. This petition was addressed to Government through the Chairman and there seems nothing objectionable for this direct submission of the same to Government except they thought that by my forwarding it as requested by them, there would be my indirect admission of facts therein mentioned. But on a careful reading of the petition and on Comparing statements therein Contained with facts as disclosed by office records, I felt it my duty to refer the matter to the Council and the whole Council except these petitioners expressed their regret and surprise at the misrepresentations of facts. The Deputy Collector in charge of the Head Assistant Collector's Division being a new Comer, the matter Could not be referred to him (Vide XI Copy of Councillor's statement). The original petition under these circumstances was recorded and not forwarded to Government. Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao on Coming to know of this, sent a Copy of that petition now under reference to Government. I may observe here about the petitioners' statement that I wanted to send the office Manager out from office to waiting room to some of my own choice & seeking, that during four years that I have been a Chairman with regards to the staffing of our petitioners that the Conservancy staff is efficient, needs no

: his connection with the Council are
obstacle certainly and he then could
... work from the Council ...

as a rule and need not delay for reading the same.
This Councillor is an English knowing Councillor
And would not have signed the petition with so
many misstatements but for the circumstances stated
by him. The other two Mahamadan Councillors
who signed the petition but who have now withdrawn
their Signatures, are persons who do not know a word
of English And who Cannot therefore read for
themselves what was Contained in the petition
And they state that they signed the petition on
representations made to them by Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao
that it was a petition to Government not to reduce
the pay of the Conservancy Establishment and to
Cancel the resolutions of the Council passed at the
last Budget meeting during their absences. They
further state their regret from what has been
explained to them as to the Contents of the petition,
that it Contained a number of statements
incorrect and untrue And their if only com-
municated to them they would have been the last
persons to sign the names. (Vide enclosures, Translations, XVIII & XIX)

meeting And the resolution therein requested to be Cancelled

17

in whose handwriting the petition is And the petitions Copy now under reference is sent by Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao alone (Vide petition No 347 dated 17th March 1896 & Copy of Manager's statement ~~XVII~~ dated 16th April 1896). That this petition was the result of Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao's exertions is further fortified by the statements made by three of the Signotaries to the present petition who state that this petition was one day brought to them by Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao and that on his assurances and representation that the petition Contained a prayer to Government not to reduce the pay of the Hospital Compounder And to grant an Assistant Compounder, they signed the petition but now they feel to their regret that it Contains many things which are incorrect And therefore they unconditionally withdraw their Signatures to the present petition which they affixed under a Mistake And under no justifiable grounds. Mr. E Katchapeswaraswamy one of the Signotaries, a brother pleader of Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao & a Councillor of some standing states that on a certain day when he was bathing in the Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao Came to him And represented to him that the petition under reference was written to Government to give Veterinary staff to efficient, needs no

: his Corrections with the statements are distinctly contained and he then could [illegible] the Council

16

of the Signotaries to this petition prevented him from actually accepting the Charges And Compelled him to break his promise to go out as an Overseer. This is borne out by the Manager's statement (Vide Copy XVIII) Strange to find that these gentlemen in spite of such stern facts within their knowledge should state that I wanted to send the Manager out to make room for my Junr. P. Krishnamurty Pantulu is a public servant of some standing And ought to have known better than And his signature to such a petition Containing so many incorrect statements. As an Educational officer he should have had more regard to accuracy of facts. I may also mention here that as Chairman I had submitted four Budget Reports And four Administration reports And that I am not new either to the Council or to this branch of work.

Having thus explained facts And having shown by documentary evidence that every statement Contained in the petition was untrue to the knowledges of these petitioners, I beg to bring the following facts to the notice of Government with a view that it will be pleased to take serious notice of the Conduct of Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao for having made unfounded, untrue, and malicious statements. The original petition was presented to the Municipal Manager by Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao

meeting

Some of whom have been in the Council for longer periods than myself Could not venture to impeach a single appointment either on the grounds of interest or influence. I now file enclosed Copy of the Head Assistant Collector's Budget (vide XV) Bobbili and from the statement of the Manager himself the Government will be pleased to find that the statement made by these Councillors petitioners about the transfer of the Manager to Overseer's post was not only false but directly opposed to truth. This Municipality had been sadly wanting in a Competent overseer and this Manager was for a long time both a Manager and an Overseer but on the recommendation of the Council, Government Considered it objectionable that one person should hold two appointments and Consequently separated the Overseer's appointment from the Manager. The Council as a special favour, however raised the pay of the Manager from Rs 40 to Rs 50 (Vide G. O. No 278 Mn. Dt. 8-8-94.) The Manager is an old servant of the Municipality and I thought he would do better for out door work than office work. When there was a proposal from the Head Assistant Collector to have an Overseer on Rs 50, I asked the Manager whether he would be willing to go out as an Overseer for a year or two with a view over his office appointment and he took time and ~~many~~ staff is efficient, and do no

Explanation was satisfactory & that Govt. considered the charges made unfounded & regretted to have again to forward an unfavourable opinion of this Committee

DS
6/8/96

his connection with the unfortunate affair is certainly and he then could be legally removed from the Council It seems a pity that the Chairman has left him alone. He can all be well to talk of such washing dirty linen in public - I quite agree with this sentiment generally speaking - but it is at the same time to be observed that the proceedings is at times not as bad as it looks and that upon this occasion meeting a public scramble of Sudarsana Rice would have a considerable effect upon municipal Councillors & take kidneys check indiscriminate conduct in future Some considerable time and Some trouble thrown away. Failing action on the part of the Chairman all the Govt. can do is express their regret at the displeasure at the conduct of this Councillor & remark that if the last H power is would call upon him to show cause why he should not be removed from the Council and would in the event of his failure to show sufficient cause remove him accordingly.
He has done the remarks not been called upon by the Chairman's letter. I do not see however

answers he can have as the Chairmans statements are supported by documentary evidence of the correctness of which there can be no doubt

Ld 25/7/96

Complaints against the Chairman, Ellore mun.

FOR ORDERS.

Delayed as I asked a question on another paper which was linked with this Ld 4/8/96

28.

Order. No. 1337 Mmis dy 11/8/96

Recorded with the remark that the Chairman's explanation is satisfactory, & that the Govt considers the charges to be unfounded, & regrets again to have to form an unfavourable opinion of the conduct of Councillor M. L. Rg. D. Sundaraiva Rao.

As suggested in para. 10 of his endorsement, the Collector will be requested to obtain an explanation from M. Krishnamurti Pantulu, Sub asstt Inspector of Schools, & submit it to Govt

(from orders)
Ld 8/8/96

Ld
8-96

Chairman, mp Ellore
Collector of Godavari.
Dis. 15/8/96

Those materials are enough, I venture to think, to show the development of a plan and a policy on the part of Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao to prejudice Government against the Chairman by misrepresentations and to lend dignity to the petitions, how he has encouraged to secure signatures of some other Councillors under very objectionable circumstances. By a reference to Mr Moore's letter Dis. No 321 Rev (vide XI) of 95 para 2, it would appear how some of these Councillors conducted themselves during the Budget meeting. Mr Moore said: "At the meetings on 4th & 5th when I attended, I noticed that many of the Councillors discussed several subjects at the same time. This may be highly interesting and instructive as well as amusing but does not conduce to a business like discussion of important proposals such as those which are discussed at a Budget meeting." This I believe would better apply to Mr. D. Sundara Siva Rao who I regret to remark, objected to every resolution in the last Budget meeting and insisted on noting down his objection for every resolution. In ordinary meetings, even in cases in which the whole Council vote for a resolution, he would as a matter of right insist upon noting his dissent and thus waste much time.

The other two Councillors Messrs. D. Krishnamu

Rutnam & C. Chandrayya Subedars both stated
in 1895 about Mr D. Sundaravira Rao as one whose
existence in the Council was dangerous and the
only remedy was to eliminate him from the
Council to secure Co-operation and harmony in
the Councils (Vide enclosures Extracts XX & XXI).
This is the Councillor who got into the Council
through some technicality in the Election rules and
not by securing highest number of votes as required by
the rules. This is the Councillor who got a Criminal
Charge filed against him before the Head Assistant
Magistrate for the alleged use of two Municipal Lanterns.
This is the Councillor who moved Government to
sanction any prosecution under Sec: 407 of the
Indian Penal Code as the Head Assistant Magistrate
returned the said Complaint for want of sanction of Government.
This is the Councillor who since he entered the Council
has been an obstructionist and whose Conduct was
highly Condemned by the Council including some of
the signatories to the petition and the only remedy
they recommended was his elimination from the
Council. On the recommendation of the Commr C
and the Collector, Government remarked that this
Councillor's remarks on some papers referred to him

as Divisional Councillor by the Chairman, were
highly objectionable and the Government was further
pleased to observe that it views this petitioner's Conduct
in this respect with grave displeasure and trusts that
Comments of this Nature will not again be necessary (Vide
G. O. No 1738 - M. Mis. dated 24-10-95). The outcome
and effect of this Government order on Mr D. Sundara-
Siva Rao, I regret to state, is the production of the
present petition which has created a great disturbance
in the Council and a great disaffection in the Conservancy
Establishment. I am sorry that this report has become
rather lengthy but all facts I felt ought to be brought
to the notice of Government when the Conduct of
the Council and the Chairman was questioned
by unfair & unfounded allegations. With one more
fact I shall be done with Mr D. Sundaravira Rao
and leave him to the disposal of Government. This
Councillor Mr D. Sundaravira Rao filed a suit against
the Council for damages in the Collr Munsiff's
Court for Malicious prosecution. This Councillor
was prosecuted in 1893 for having wilfully disobeyed
Council's order before he became a Councillor but
the prosecution was dismissed for default of

the non appearance of the present Municipal Manager and the Municipal Sub-Inspector when the case was called up by the Head Assistant Magistrate in 1893. The damages case is still pending and at the request of the pleader for the Council the subject of sanctioning costs for obtaining Copies in the damages case was taken at the meeting on the 22nd February 1896 when the following resolution was passed:-

Resolution:- As Mr D. Sundarasiva Rao proposed to withdraw the suit if the Council should desire it and as Mr. S. Sitaramayya proposed the withdrawal of the suit, it is resolved that he requested to withdraw the suit and he has agreed to withdraw the same (vide XXII. Resolution & copy of Correspondence enclosed). This resolution was passed after much discussion and a public copy of the same was communicated to him which he first declined to receive for the reasons stated by the serving peon. I then sent the resolution copy with a covering letter in reply to which he denied his having agreed to the resolution. The unanimous (vide XXI, XIII & X.) statement of the whole Council that day, the statements (vide XXII) made by the Manager & the Head (vide XXIII) Clerk who were present when the Council passed this resolution, will clearly show how deliberately

a false statement Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao made impeaching the validity of the prosecution and the conduct of the Council. I may mention here that the Head Clerk is D. Sundara Siva Rao's father-in-law's brother. This is a serious matter which materially affects public confidence in the solemn proceedings of the Council and ought, therefore, I venture to submit to be seriously noticed by Government. If Councillors themselves impeach deliberate and solemn proceedings of the Council, what guarantee can there be for the public to have confidence in the proceedings of the Council

From these it would appear that Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao does not seem to realize the importance and the dignity of the honorary position of a Municipal Councillor. It is hardly necessary for me to mention here that truthfulness, honesty of purpose, and public interest ought to be the predominent factors in a Council Constituted for the welfare of the public. I am afraid that by his persistent Conduct in obstructing the Municipal administration

and in resorting to objection proceedures for the fulfilment of his object, Mr D. Sundara Siva Rao is making himself liable to the grave displeasure of Government under Section 19 of the Municipal Act. I regret to submit that partly from delay in Collecting materials and mostly from my sickness which has confined me to bed for over 20 days, I was not able to send my remarks earlier.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

C. Sitaramayya
Chairman.

C. No 718 Inf of 1896

From

The Chairman

Municipal Council

Ellore.

To The Chief Secretary to the Govt. Fort St George Madras.

Dated 17th May 1896.

Despatched 18th May 1896.

Received CONSTT. 18 MAY. 96 GODAVARI.

Encls.

No 179

Subject.

Reference. No 347 of 17th March 1896 from MR Rg. D. Sundarasadas and five others and the remarks of the Chairman thereon.

Dis No. 664 Inf of 1896.

Submitted with the enclosures to the Chief Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department.

2 The petitioners allege:-

(a) that although at successive meetings of the Council held on the 4th, 5th, 6th & 7th December last for the consideration of the budget for 1896-97, certain propositions were discussed and resolutions passed, the Chairman did not enter the resolutions in the minute book, as the resolutions were opposed to his wishes;

(b) that although the meeting of the 14th December (re the budget) was well attended, the Chairman adjourned it on the plea that the Divisional Officer was not present;

(c) that after the transaction of some business, the meeting of the 20 December was adjourned to the 21, but as that day it was adjourned to the 22nd a sunday - as the Chairman did not attend;

(d) finally on the 22nd 'a pack' (ie 'packed' I presume) meeting consisting of certain councillors specially invited was

held to pass the Chairmans proposals in the absence of councillors who took an active part in the discussions. Out of the 6 councillors present, one declined to vote, another dissented throughout while the third proposed amendments so that the Chairman had recourse to the casting vote to upset the resolutions passed at the meetings attended by twelve or more members."

3. The bona fides of this petition is open however, to grave suspicion for 3 reasons. First no action was taken at all by any of the petitioners until the 20th January or for almost a month. The petition was then delivered at the Municipal office addressed to Government 'through the Chairman' but after consulting his Council, he declined to forward it, on the ground that it was full of mis- statements & mis- representations. A copy was, however, forwarded direct to Government by petitioner Duggirala Sundara Sivarao about the 29 January as it was received on the 1 February (though it bears date the 25 January) and this is the petition now under report. No explanation for the delay is given in the petition.

Secondly, of the 6 councillors who have signed it, 3 (of whom one knows English & so not) have now withdrawn from it stating that only the last paragraph was explained to them by Sundara Sivarao who induced them to sign, and that when they signed, they were ignorant that the petition contained the allegations set out in para 2 which are not correct. I see no reason to doubt the truth of these statements though I am surprised at a first grade pleader like E. Katchapeswara Sastry of long standing signing anything without first making himself acquainted with the contents.

Thirdly the promoter & real author of the petition Duggirala Sundara Sivarao who procured the signatures of the above 3 councillors and possibly those of the other two by solicitation is the avowed and open personal enemy of the Chairman opposing and trying to thwart him in every possible way in the Council and to annoy him out of it, and for such conduct he has been reprimanded already by Government in G.O. No 1738 Mis L & M. Dated 24.10.95.

4 (a) In reference to the first

allegation against him in the petition, the Chairman explains that various proposals were discussed and voted on at the meetings of the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th December but they were purposely not entered in the minute book, having regard to the provisions of S 30 (5) of the act. What took place was a mere preliminary discussion, various proposals being brought forward and voted on, subject to the understanding that these votes were not final resolutions but subject to reconsideration, if in the end, they were found impracticable. What the council was engaged in on these days was not voting the budget, but in preparing a draft budget and consequently no resolutions were recorded in the minute book, but all merely noted down for reconsideration before being made final or cancelled as the case might be. So far as the records go, this Explanation appears to be true from Mr. Morris description of the proceedings in his letter of the 13th December (Enc XI) they would appear to have been of a very informal character & the Chairman's account is fully borne out by the resolution recorded on the 7th December (Enc VIII) in which

the result of the deliberations of the previous days is described as a draft budget and an unsatisfactory draft. The cause is to be inferred from Enclosures X and IX. It is obvious from these papers that the various resolutions had, as the Chairman says, been duly noted down, though not in the minute book. Had they been, it is clear that the resolution of the 7th December passed by 11 councillors must have been differently worded and the Chairman's notice of the 7th December (Enc: IX) must have been one to revise and reconsider certain resolutions in accordance with S. 30 (5) and not the budget proposals generally, for otherwise the budget was complete and must have gone up as it stood. The clearest proof of the truth of the Chairman's contention and of the fact that the petitioners were aware that the resolutions of the 4th, 5th, and 6th had not been formally recorded and acquiesced in ~~This~~ is however resolution I of the meeting of the 20th December (Enc: XIV). According to the petition to government, this resolution was proposed by its promoter, Sundara

Sivaram himself but though it is clear that it was intended to modify and did modify all the previous proceedings by allotting lump sums under each grant it makes no allusion to any previous resolutions. Obviously he was well aware that those resolutions had not been recorded as not being final and acquiesced in this procedure or we should have had him necessarily moving at the same time that those previous inconsistent resolutions should be rescinded There is not a word to this Effect. There can be no question therefore that this allegation is not made bona fide, that the Chairman's explanation is correct, that the petitioners then knew the resolutions they refer to in their petitions had not been formally recorded and acquiesced in this course and that the statement that the Chairman did not formally record them "as the resolutions were opposed to his wishes" is a gross misrepresentation as they were not to be recorded because not final with the knowledge, and so far as the records go, with the approval of the Council generally for there is nowhere any mention of any protest or objection.

5 (b) The second allegation would appear to be a deliberate falsehood for there was no such meeting or adjournment - vide Exc: XV, which is signed by 10 councillors & the statement of the manager that no councillors came to the office that day (Exc XVI) and Certainly the Chairman who is said to have adjourned the meeting (by insinuation) on a very flimsy and insufficient excuse can't have attended as he had put it off till the 20th by notice the previous day nor can the principal petitioner Sundara Siva Rao have done so for the date under his initials in Exc XII shows that he saw it on the 13th. Again the other adjourned meeting like that of the 21st appears in the minute book, but it contains no mention of any such meeting on the 14th December.

6 (c) This allegation appears to be also untrue. So far from it being true that the meeting of the 21st was adjourned in consequence of the absence of the Chairman, the minute book shows that he was present and adjourned the meeting for want of a quorum only 5 out of 18 councillors being present

7(d) The allegation that the meeting of the 22nd December was a packed one attended by only specially invited councillors seems to be equally false. When a meeting is adjourned, it is not of course necessary for the Chairman to issue any notice of the date to which it is adjourned under sec 29, but a notice was issued (see XIII) and though only partially circulated, the endorsements on it prove that 2 of the 4 to whom it was shown were the petitioners C. Chendriah and E. Ratchapeswara Sastry and that of the 4, only one attended the adjourned meeting, viz, Mensahi Muhammad Abdul Khayyam. The allegation is further disproved by the constitution of the meeting as it was attended by only 2 supporters of the Chairman as against 3 including the chief petitioner Sundara Iyadhar who disapproved of his proposals although one did not carry his opposition so far as to vote. The fact that of the 6 councillors who attended besides the Chairman only one had seen the notice of the previous day and that 3 of them were opposed to the Chairman's policy wholly or in part

proves clearly, I think, that no special invitations were issued and that the adjournment of the previous day's meeting to that date was generally known to the councillors. Certainly petitioners C. Chendriah & E. Ratchapeswara Sastry cannot honestly complain for if any were specially invited they were and it was their own fault that they did not attend. The allegation that the meeting was a 'packed' one must therefore, I think, be held not only to be not proved but proved to be a misrepresentation. No doubt enclosure XIII goes to prove that the statement in para 7 of the memo put in by 10 councillors (see XV) is not true as regards this one meeting & the notice (XIII) shewed have been shown to all in place of only 4, but the Chairman seems to have signed it on the 21 and it probably was circulated to so few only because the time was so short and through indifference on the part of the man entrusted with the duty of serving it. Had it been shown to supporters of the Chairman only, I could have attached some weight to it, but it cannot be given

any seeing that although the Chairman's opponents are in a minority, it was served one of them as against 2 supporters. Possibly too the 10 councillors who sign Exs XV may have had oral notice of item XIII without initialling it. A minor mis-statement in this portion of the petition is the statement that the Chairman made use of his casting vote. From the petition itself it is clear he did not exercise this privilege. Having a majority of 3 to 2, no second or casting vote was necessary on his part.

8. The last part of the statement also is not true, unless resolution III of the meeting of the 21 December was contrary to resolution I of the meeting of the 20 allotting Rs 18500 under Grant III but making no distribution of this sum in detail. From the budget as passed by Government in Fo. no 472 of 19.3.36 M. it does not seem to have been done so. As the resolution of the 20 December was silent on the point, it was, I think, perfectly within the competence of the meeting of the 22nd December to distribute the lump allotment as it thought fit. What the previous resolutions were that the Chairman is said in this portion of the petition to have made use of his casting vote to upset, is not clearly stated but the allusion would appear to be to the preliminary resolutions of the meetings of the 4, 5th, 6th and 7th. If so the man who did this would appear to have been not the Chairman on the 22nd but petitioner Lundara Sivarao on the 20; as resolution I at the meeting of that date appears from the petition to have been moved by him and to have superseded & been intended to supersede the previous proceedings with which it appears to have been clearly inconsistent.

9. Having regard to the many mis-statements and misrepresentations in the petition it is impossible not to believe that it is a false and malicious composition as the Chairman alleges, got up principally if not entirely by his enemy petitioner Duggirala Lundara Sivarao in order to

bring discredit upon him & his supporters
any se in the Council and possibly with the further
opponen intention of getting proposals which the
one of Chairman was anxious to have adopted
too th Cancelled by Government, as he had failed
may to oppose them successfully in the Council
with itself. In his explanation the Chairman
ma accuses Sundara Sivaram of improper
har conduct in connection with another matter
of pr and submits papers in support of his
itse statements but this may all, I think, be
this omitted from consideration as irrelevant
, Still there remains the fact that the
n petition to Government under review teems
with mis-statements & mis representations
is u of which some are so glaringly untrue
ne that they must have been made deliberately
f out of malice and I cannot think it to
al the interest of Municipal administration
ne in Whose that one who has so prevaricated
d the truth in order to malign & discredit
fo the Chairman and those of his colleagues
who side with him should be allowed
i to remain in the Council. No doubt the
th Chairman has a remedy in a criminal
prosecution for defamation if he chooses

and I am surprised he has not had recourse
to it, but it is not desirable, I think, to
compel the Council to wash its dirty linen
in public. As in G.O. no 1738 mis Lx the
24th October 1895 Sundara Sivaram
was given fair warning that unless he
conducted himself thereafter decently
Government would not tolerate him any
longer as a councillor, They to support
the Chairman's demand which, I think,
in the circumstances, a just one that he
should be removed from the Council Where
he has proved himself a discordant
element from the first. It is neither
to the interest of the Municipality nor
compatible with the dignity of Govern-
-ment that a person in the position of
a councillor should be at liberty with
impunity to move the latter to take action
against the Council as a body by mis-
-representations so gross & defamatory
as some of those the petitioners have been
clearly proved guilty of, & Sundara Sivaram
appears from the record to have got the

As the law at present stands, the Govt cannot remove him from Council.

Vide pencil notes the previous page

petition up.

10 I am also, I must say, astonished that a responsible Government Officer like M. Krishnamurti Pantulu Sub Assistant Inspector of Schools should have been found affixing his signature to a petition containing so many falsehoods - falsehoods according even to some of his co-petitioners I would suggest that the papers be sent to him and he directed to submit his explanation. Government has a right to demand that its own officers at least should not combine with others to mislead it. The falsehoods to which I specially wish to refer are

(a) the statement that the meeting of the 14 December was well attended whereas no such meeting was ever held

(b) The statement that the meeting of the 21 December was adjourned owing to the absence of the Chairman whereas it was adjourned by the Chairman for want of a quorum:

(c) The statement that the meeting of the 22nd December was a hacked meeting attended only by specially invited councillors whereas Enclosure XVI shows that the only specially invited persons were opponents and supporters of the Chairman Equally & the meeting was attended, as a matter of fact, by only 2 councillors in complete accord with the Chairman and 3 who were more or less at variance with him.

Varadarajulu
Collector.

X2.
WD
136.

REVENUE (189) DEPARTMENT.

FROM

THE COLLECTOR,

Godavari District.

No. 664 / Eccf.

Dated 14 }
Despatched 16 } June 189 6.
Received 22 JUN. 96

SUBJECT.

Submitting with remarks Ellore Municipal Chairman's report on petition from D Sundara Siva Rao and certain others of Ellore.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Current Nos. 1700 & 1755 m. of 1896.

From

FOR ORDERS.

I have read the records through and there is the case.

The facts of the case are fully and clearly set forth in the Collector's endorsement. As observed in para.9, the petition is evidently a false and malicious composition got up principally, if not entirely, by one of the signatories, M.R.Ry.Sundara Siva Rao, who is an enemy of the Chairman, in order to bring discredit upon him and his supporters and to upset his proposals; and it is a matter for surprise that five other Councillors should have subscribed to this petition. Three of these however have subsequently withdrawn from it stating that only the last paragraph was explained to them by Sundara Siva Rao, who induced them to sign the petition and that when they signed it they were ignorant of the fact that it contained the incorrect statements found in para.2. Moreover from the papers disposed of in G.O.No.1738 M.d/24th October

October 1895, and from the circumstance explained in page 21 of the Chairman's letter, it is clear that Sundarasiva Rao has been trying to oppose and annoy the Chairman at every turn, and it is therefore not desirable in the interests of the Municipal administration that he should retain his seat on the Municipal Council, but as the law stands at present, there is no way of removing him, At present, the Government can do nothing more than again reprimand him for his unbecoming and objectionable conduct and express its surprise that the other councillors should have subscribed to the petition. If however this can be done under section 19(iv) of the amended Act, perhaps the papers may be allowed to lie over until the amended Act comes into force, so that this councillor may then be summarily removed from the Council.

2. The Collector's suggestion in para.10 of his endorsement may be adopted i.e. to ask the Sub-Asst Inspr of schools for an explanation for signing this misleading petition.

V.R. 14/7/96

It would be straining sec. 19 (iii) too far to remove Sundara Rao from office, as his continuance therein is can hardly be said to be dangerous to public peace or order, although it may be inimical to the interests of the Council.

I think this might be done— BS

This Councillor seems to be an unmitigated Rascal. There does not appear to be the slightest doubt that the petition sent up was a false and malicious concoction. This may be which the Collr could possibly be got rid of as the law the present stands and be for the Chairman to prosecute

Wbod 17.7.96

Jud. not suggest to the Chairman to prosecute Chairman now? I say that Govt. would look weak. Jud. simply forward the Chairman's letter & the Collr's endorsement with the remark that the former

Then given for copying ____
Then copied ____
en examined ____
n signed ____
189.

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

URRENT No.

NCLOSURES TO C. No.

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

OF GOVERNMENT.

ENT WITH DITTO.

NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

Y in full.
OT to be copied.
Copy abstract only.
Copy heading only.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Block No.

R.O. 10 1000-19-5-11.

Oct

exp

Lett M Dept

எண். 1339/M. தேதி 11-2-1936

	81	3	7	9-1-36	C	
				Rs Boards 2-8-0		
				2871		

[R.O. 10] 2,000-19-5-11.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Block No.

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Referencer,

Dept. Lon Press / Mis. / Rout. No. 1339/M, dated 12.8.1936 191 Rack No. Range,

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of Referencer.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			
2-9-11	Lon	3474	M			
	MR	3667	11			
3/10/36	MRo	12180	/36			