[L. & M. / 3,000—28-10-97.]

Local & Munl. (1897) Depart

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 2699 M

DATED 4-12-97

INDEXED. CR

DESPATCHED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mul: Council

Stating that Govt: considers that no sufficient case has been made out for removing M.R.Ry. L. Muthuswami Chettiar from the Cuddalore — as proposed.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. 3710. m. of 1897, dated 26th October 1897 from the Collector of South Arcot
Current No. of 189 , dated from the

SUBJECT.

Removal of a municipal Councillor – Cuddalore

Confidential

FOR ORDERS.

It is difficult to pursue each case mentioned through the ifferent papers, & it would rdly be fair to call on the Cr for an explanation on the vague neral statements now made. Let ome of the worst cases be picked out and what is to be said agst of the Cr tabulated & we shall then be better able to say whether there is a good case n which to call for explanation; & the case, if there is one, will e in a shape which it will be easonable to require him to answer.

30/10/97

The facts of the case
are fully and clearly stated in
the Collector's letter. It is evident from
the Collector's letter and from the i-
connected papers that councillor
M.R.Ry. Muthuswami Chetti was in-
fluenced by personal motives in
conducting the revision of the house-
tax registers and that his conduct
in connection with the revision
of the voters' lists, though not above
suspicion, was at least chara
by gross carelessness. If the ir-
regularities brought to light in t
revision of the house-tax assessments are co
sidered sufficient to warrant
the removal of the councillor
the municipal council under
clause (IV) of subsection (1) of s
amend

ct III of 1897, it is submitted that Government may call on the councillor or an explanation as required by e Proviso to that section. The fact that the conduct complained of was before the amending act came into force, cannot prevent the Governor in Council from now proceeding under the amended section 19 - vide the notes in G.O. No 1194. M, dated 14th May 1897.

V. R.
29/10/97

H. M.

If the Councillor's conduct is deemed to be such as to bring the mun. admn. into contempt, then his ex-planation must be called for under S. 19 – a period of ay three weeks being given him in wh. to furnish it.

The charge about the hand cart is trivial & may be put aside: but it seems ertain that if the Co's, amend onduct was not actually shonest it was so perfunctory to bring the admn. into contempt.

G. K.

[G./25]
250-7-4-97.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 3710 M.

SUBJECT.

Removal of a municipal Councill — Cuddalore

FOR ORDERS.

H. M.

In his letter read above, the Collector of South Arcot reports for the orders of Government the conduct of M.R.Ry. K. Muthuswami Chettiyar, a councillor of the Cuddalore municipality, who was entrusted with the work of revising the house-ta registers and the lists of voters and of persons qualified for election for ward No I. The Collector states that a complaint was received by him, pointing out that in revising the house-tax registers the councillor underassessed either his own or his relatives' ho and exempted from taxation, othe lawfully liable to the tax. He sta that on enquiry by the Assistant Collector, it was found that there 19 houses which were either incorrectly taxed or exempted from taxa and that five of these which belong to the councillor himself or his brothers were either underassessed or exempted from taxation. The councillor who was called upon to explain these irregularities × stated that the revision of the registers was conducted on the lines followed in previous years, that an office attender and a bill-collector were deputed to assist him in the revision and that he checked only twenty per cent of the work done by them. He also states that to the best of his knowledge and ability houses were assessed with reference to their situation, that he sent the registers, as revised by him, to councillor Subbaraya Chettiyar, who might have supplied the omissions and rectified the defects noticed therein, and that the petition against him was got up at the instance of the said councillor with whom he was not in good terms. The flagrant cases of incorrect ssessments and the explanation ffered by the councillor in respect each of them are summarized low:—

× Vide his letter flagged G

1) Charge. Building No 12 in

There is no Security that Asst. Coll. Mr. Varda Rau is right. It requires rather a fine perception to say that rent sd be 12 Rs a year instead of 8. H.T.

Kamakshi Amman Kovil street at Nos 22, 23 and 25 in Clive Street, al belonging to the councillor, were underassessed. The rental value the first of these buildings was fixed by the councillor at Rs 10-1, a month or Rs 7-9 per annum, of the second and third at Rs 18, and of the fourth at Rs 12-8-–; but the Assistant Collector, considers that it might be safely raised to Rs 1 Rs 36 and Rs 18 respectively.

Explanation. The Councillor st that the proposed rental of Rs 1 per annum in the case of the fi building is rather high, the buil being a small one, and that the case of the second and th the original assessment was a ed to stand, notwithstanding fact that a portion of one of th buildings was subsequently a molished. As regards the last item, he states that the assessm on it was raised in 1888-89, a that as no alterations or imp -ments were made in the buil since then, the assessment sho not be rais but not wr

powers

Explanation. The councillor says that the exemption, in the case of the first three buildings above referred to, was granted years ago and not by him, while as regards the last he explains that the building was an old one and that the original assessment on it was allowed to stand, as the owner was reduced in circumstances and paid the present tax on the building with difficulty.

(6) *Charge*. A stable in Jain street (No 11) was declared by the Councillor to be not liable to assessment, being a cattle stall, but the Assistant Collector says he saw it used as a habitation.

Explanation. The Councillor states that this was not one of the numbers checked by him.

(7) *Charge*. House No 13 in Kamakshi Amman Kovil street which belongs to the Councillor's brother was not assessed to the tax.

Explanation. The Councillor says that it forms a latrine to house 28 in Clive street.

) *Charge*. Bu [illegible] ove, it will

[illegible]

All very wrong perhaps, but why come up to Govt. on such matters?
H.T.

(vide clause (6) above)

building No 11. in Jain street fro taxation, the councillor has pra tically no explanation to offe while as regards ~~some~~ others, he says that he did not enhance the tax, as there were no additio to the buildings concerned, sin the tax was last imposed. The Collector, however, points out that (the Councillor) "has omitted to "note that the rental value of "buildings in this rising town "is on the increase, since the "ground-nut and other trade "of the Old Town has increased "of late years and the Councill "who is a clever merchant cann "possibly have been ignorant "of this. In fact he even enhanc "the tax improperly in some cases. The Councillor also remitted a portion of the tax on one of the houses (No 28 in Irusappa Chetti street) and exempted some othe from taxation on the ground of poverty of the owners. This was apparently due to a le misapprehension on the part of the councillor of his powers as under [illegible] and thus [illegible] but not wi

H.T.

1884, as amended by Act III
1897, such exemptions can be
ranted only by the council.
he case therefore stands thus.
he councillor fixed the annual
value of certain buildings at the
recent revision of the house tax
registers, which the Assistant
Collector considers to be ~~either~~
lenient. ~~[illegible]~~ Apart from
the opinion of the Assistant
Collector, there is no evidence on
record to show that the councillors'
assessments are incorrect or
low. Even, if it is so, it is nothing
xtraordinary, for the general
endency of municipal councils
s always against enhancement
f taxation. The petitioners in
this case seem to have made
capital out of the circumstance
hat in revising the assessments
the councillor did not enhance
the tax in the case of his own
and his brothers' houses. Although
owever, the councillor's conduct
es not appear to be above
spicion, yet there is not
[illegible] ground f[illegible] consider-
charg[illegible]

W.I.

"the municipal administration
"into contempt" within the mean
of clause (iv) of subsection (1) o
section 19 of Act IV of 1884, a
amended by Act III of 1897.

3. The Collector also brin
to notice that in revising "th
list of voters and of person
qualified for election in Ward
the councillor "took occasion
"minimise his chances of fail
"in the next election by keep
"out of the list many person
"were likely to vote again
"him." On a petition presen
to him, the Collector caused
complete enquiry to be ma
by the Assistant Collector, w
reported that nineteen pers
were improperly excluded
the list. The Councillor stat×
and it is a serious admi
that he asked the ward In
to prepare the lists, ~~and~~ the
(the ward Inspector) made a copy of the previ
year's lists and gave it to
and that to save delay, "he
"ed the lists without compari
"with the trades profession and
"and land tax receipts but not wi

×Vide his letter flagged. H

nal ~~[illegible]~~ intention". This ex-
planation, if true, shows only
gross neglect of duty on the
part of the Councillor.

R
/97

The first case of removal
W.I. under the Act shd. I think
be for flagrant & clearly proved offences.

Suggested that nothing
has been proved against
the Councillor except care-
-lessness & undue leniency,
against which the power
to remove for bringing the
municipal administration into
contempt was not framed.
Perhaps the following order
might issue;

Muni: **Order** no. 2699 mis d/ 4. 12. 97.

The Govt. considers that
no sufficient case has
been made out for
removing the Municipal
Councillor, though it
cannot consider
his explanation as
entirely satisfactory

W.I.
3 12 97

HS
4/12/97

Collector of South Arcot
~~[illegible]~~

Confidential

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 3710 M

very easy

From
The Collector of
South Arcot

Order.

No.

Dated 26th October 1897.
Received
Registered
Enclosures five
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Reporting for orders the conduct of M.R.Ry K. Muthusami Chettiar Avl. a councillor of the Cuddalore Municipality in the South Arcot District –

BACK PAPERS

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

SOUTH ARCOT.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Cuddalore

No.

DATED 26° October 1897

FROM

A. E. Castlestuart Stuart, Esq., I.C.S.,
F.G.S., F.L.S., F.R.G.S.
COLLECTOR OF SOUTH ARCOT.

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY,
TO GOVERNMENT
Local & Muml. DEPARTMENT.
MADRAS.

SIR,

I have the honour to report for the orders of Government under Section 19(1)(iv) of the Madras District Municipalities Act, the conduct of M.R.Ry K. Muthusami Chettiar Avergal, a councillor of the Cuddalore Municipality.

2. In August 1896, I received a petition signed by some of the residents of Ward No I of the Municipality that M.R.R. K. Muthusami Chettiar who had been entrusted with the work of revising the Housetax, did very much as he pleased, under-assessing either his own or his relatives' houses. The petition was forwarded by me to the Assistant Collector for careful enquiry and report. The Assistant Collector Mr. T. Varada Rao inspected the houses referred to and submitted his report No. 1143 dated 8° September 1896, copy of which I enclose for information. The door nos. of the houses and their rental value are noted by the Assistant Collector and a perusal of his letter will show that this councillor conducted

the revision of the tax on no principle whatever - He has been extremely lenient in the treatment of his own and his relations' buildings and over assessed some houses belonging to poor people - About 19 cases of wrong assessments are mentioned by the Assistant Collector. On 29th January 1897, the Chairman was called upon to submit the explanation of the Councillor as the Assistant Collector's investigation left no room for doubt that a very careful revision of assessments was necessary and that the Councillor had not scrupled to take advantage of the occasion and his position to benefit himself and his relatives - In spite of many reminders and threats to report the matter to Government, the Chairman did not reply till 16th July 1897 when he stated as follows:— "Regarding the revision of house tax in the 1st ward Old "Town Cuddalore, I beg to inform you that the tax on houses which has not in certain cases been equitably assessed, has been revised and notices issued to the owners as required by the Act" - While admitting the wholly incorrect revision of house tax, the Chairman bstained from making any mention about the Councillor concerned or his explanation which was called for - Four days later, however, the explanation of the Councillor was eceived from the Chairman. I submit it herewith - The Chairman, however, did not express his opinion n any of the cases, but only stated that the tax had een properly revised by him - Out of the 19 cases in- orrectly taxed or exempted, 5 belong to the Councillor - his brothers and they have all been under assessed cept one which has been exempted. The Councillor

offers

offers no explanation at all whatever for his imprope procedure in the case of 2 houses exempted by him f tax one of which belongs to his brother and of 2 othe which have been over assessed viz:- No. 3 & 13 in Kamate Amman street, and 25 and 112 in Erusappa Chetty st For exempting No. 11 Jains street improperly, the Councill has practically no explanation to offer. He says he did n check the number as he checked only 20 per cent of the work done by the bill Collector and attender who prepare the tax register - In several cases, the explanation of the Councillor is that he did not enhance the tax as there w no additions to the buildings concerned since the tax was l imposed - But he has omitted to note that the rental valu of buildings in this rising town is on the increase since the groundnut and other trade of the old Town has increased of late years and the councillor who is a clever merchant cannot possibly have been ignorant of this - In fact he even enhanced the tax improperly in some cases - The councillor actually also took upon himself the power to remi a portion of the tax on account of poverty - vide door No. 28 Erusappa Chetty street. The councillor says that he did not raise the tax to the proper amount because the owner is reduced in circumstances and pays the present tax with difficulty. His explanation on the whole is lame and does not remove the impression that the revision of tax was conducted by him with a view to benefit himself - The statement of the Councillor that he did the work to the best of his knowledge and ability and that when the revised Register was sent to another

Councillor Subroya Chetty, he failed to supply omissions for reasons best known to himself, are no explanation for the most unsatisfactory way in which the work was done. On the whole in the matter of the revision of the tax registers the Municipal Councillor was guilty of having abused his powers as such.

3. The term of this Councillor expires by the 19th November next, and he evidently intends standing for reelection. He has many enemies in the Old Town ~~in~~ which he now represents in the Council. When the Register of eligible voters was last revised in April last, he took occasion to minimise his chances of failure in the next election by keeping out of the list many persons who were likely to vote against him. A petition was received in August last pointing out that 39 names were omitted from the list of voters improperly and with a fradulent motive. The Assistant Collector made a careful enquiry and reported in his letter No 1119/Dis dated 20th October 1897. Mr. Varda Rao points out that 19 names have been improperly omitted. A report on this matter was submitted by me dated the 25th instant recommending the preparation of a correct list of persons entitled to vote. The statements taken by the Assistant Collector and the explanation of the Councillor in writing are submitted for the perusal of Government. The Councillor practically admits his improper procedure in the case of 9 persons excluded from the list. Arumuga Chetti one of the men excluded is said to live in house No. 256, the rental value of which was

Cno. 370 2nd (97) received today

estimated

---

estimated by this Councillor himself at Rs 50, and should have been registered as a voter. In the case of voters who were dead at the time the list was prepared, the Councillor failed to register their legal successors. He tries to make capital out of the fact that when the council considered the list of voters, Councillor Subroya Chettiar who lives in the same ward did not suggest the necessary amendments. It is not known why Subroya Chettiar did not interest himself at the time in the voters' list, but this fact cannot exonerate K. Muthusami Chetti from blame. He has been a resident of the place for many years and says that he was instrumental in raising the tax of the several persons. He must therefore have been well aware of the qualifications of all and the omission of the names from the list could not have been due to mistake or ignorance. The Councillor states that several of the petitioners' names were not in the old list of voters and tries to make out that he was innocent of any motive in the revision of the list. This is disproved by the fact that the Councillor did not hesitate to add his brothers' son Kolandappa Chetti as a voter and for thus increasing his own votes, he went out of the way and transferred house No 28 in Clives' street from his brothers name to that of Kolandappa Chetti without any reference to the Chairman in whom alone the power to make such alteration vests.

4. Another complaint against this Councillor was that he used a Municipal hand cart for conveying bricks for his private house-building

purposes - There is not sufficient evidence to prove this allegation, but an enquiry made into the complaint showed that the Cart was used to convey bricks from the Councillor's house to that of one Apparsami Chetti who bought them and that the Cart was used with somebody's permission probably the Councillor's brother as the Councillor himself was not at home at the time. This shows how Municipal property in Cuddalore is taken care of by its servants -

5. This Councillor does not scruple to abuse his powers as Municipal Councillor to the detriment of his rivals or for his own benefit - His tactics cannot but bring the Municipal Administration into gross contempt - The Assistant Collector is not certain that Muthusami Chetti is worse than some of his fellow Councillors and is of opinion that if any of his accusers supplanted him they would do no better - This may be so, but it is no justification for the misconduct of this Councillor. This Municipal Council requires weeding and an example made of one or two of its worst Councillors will have, I think, a good effect on the others. This councillor should, I submit, be removed and declared ineligible for re-election for at least 3 years.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant

Collector -
27-10-97

RM

SOUTH ARCOT.

Asst. COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Cuddalore,
20th October - 1897.

No.

FROM
T. Varada Rao Esquire B.A. B.L.
asst. COLLECTOR OF SOUTH ARCOT,

TO
The Collector
South Arcot.

SIR,

ENCLOSURE:

I have the honour to report regarding the several complaints received against M. R. Ry. J. Muthusami Chetty of Cuddalore O.T. a Municipal Councillor.

I regret the delay in the submission of this report which is due to the fact that the enquiry had to be conducted by myself and involved several journeys to Cuddalore O.T.

In my letter No. 1143 dated 4.9.96 I remarked "The few cases investigated by me shew that the ~~records~~ revision was not carried out on any fixed principles. In some cases the assessment is based on the Annual Rent value. This is a matter for easy ascertainment when the houses are rented but in the case of houses occupied by owners, the revising Councillor has been extremely lenient. Every street door has been seperately numbered and this shews as seperate numbers, buildings which form part of the whole structure. Thus stables, cattle sheds and privies which form annexures to houses are seperately numbered; because they have doors opening into the street. The petitioners think that each seperate number should bear an assessment; but this need not always be the case - as obviously when the House Rent value is calculated also with reference to the annexures. In many cases the Councillor has inadvertently taken upon himself to declare houses as not liable for taxation on the ground that the owners are too poor to pay. But this a matter which can be legally disposed of only by the Council in its corporate capacity".

M. R. R. Muttusami chetty has not attempted to give any detailed explanation. Paras 1 to 6 of his letter to the Chairman dated 27th May 1897 are general allegations.

He gives some sort of ?? detailed expl:

I believe there is enmity between M. R. Ry Soobroya chetty and Muttusami chetty. To this

I

I shall make reference later on. The mere fact that the revised register was sent to Soobroya chetty and that the latter for some reason or other failed to supply omissions or rectify defects does not exonerate the revising Councillor. The work taken up by him should have been thorough and complete. Paras 7 to 23 contain M. R. Ry Muttusami Chetty's explanation regarding the descrepancies in the revision - As I have already said the Councillor should have avided meddling with the taxation of his or his brothers houses or those of his relations.

No explanation is given why the Councillor usurped to himself the privilege of exempting houses from taxation on the ground of poverty.

1 case in Errappa Chetty Street

As regards the Voters list.

(1) The old list for ward No. I is dated 9th October 95 and contains 76 names. The new list dated 19th April 1897 contains 72 names.

(2) The names omitted are given below.

i Messrs Parry and Co. The explanation given is that as the agents are constantly changing the name was omitted from the list. This is irregular and opposed to the rule to clauses (b) and (c) of the election rule no. 3 framed under the act IV of 1884. Section 250 wherein a "person or persons" is said to include a corporate body and companies.

page 2 of 50
87290

(2) Messrs Perman Byal and company:- The explanation given is that the partners of the company are not here and that no business is carried on within the premises which ~~have~~ are said to be vacant. Louis Michael and Govindasami Chetty ~~are~~ were examined in this connection. I find that although Govindasami Chetty signs cheques for the firm, he is not the duly authorized agent. Some export trade is done for the firm at Cuddalore O.T. but the principal place of business, it seems, is Pondicherry. Muttusami Chettyar might have felt some difficulty in naming any particular person as agent of the Company, but there is o reason whatever why the name of the Company tself should not have been registered as a ber.

(1) But Messrs & Co are neither

(2)

This a firm not a company

(3) Theally Krishnasami Chetty rightly omitted eing a permanent resident of Pondicherry.

(4) Vrishabanatha Nainar - was born in March

1877

1877 - is less than 21 years old and was rightly omitted.

(5) Muthia Pillay and Kadiravelu Pillay are brothers and joint owners of house properties. The elder brother and manager should have his name registered. neither of the two names now appears in the list. (3)

(4) (6) Ponnusami Pillay - acknowledged to be an omission by ~~overslip~~ oversight.

(5) (7) Mrs Thompson - - - Do -

(8) Mrs Pierce - In the voters' list her husband's name appears. As he is dead Mrs Pierce's name should have been submitted. (6)

(9) Mrs Laffray - rightly omitted being a non-resident.

(10) Muthumari Chetty - pays a house tax of Rs 3-8-0 profession tax Rs 6-0-0 and Income tax Rs 10. The Councillor's explanation is that this man's name has been omitted as he was convicted for an offence under Section 147 I.P.C. and sentenced to pay a fine of Rs 50 The Councillor did not report this fact to the Chairman but omitted the name from (7)

the list, of his own motion. Clause (b) rule 4 says that persons who have been convicted of any such offence or subjected by a Criminal Court to any such order as implies a defect of the character are disqualified from being registered as voters. Rule 6. lays down that objections in regard to the preparation of voters lists should be decided at a meeting of the Council. I think it was highly improper for a single councillor to have ~~reserved~~ usurped the functions of the whole Council in this manner, particularly as Muthu Mari chetty complains that he and the Councillor Muttusawmi Chetty have been on inimical terms for the last 5 or 6 years

??

(11) Nachiappa Chetty - said to have become a resident of No. 1 ward only on the 19th November 1896.

(12) Velayuda chetty - resides in Ward No. I but has his trade in Ward No. II. In Ward No. 1 he pays a house rent of Rs 50 per annum. In Ward No. II he pays a profession tax of Rs 12. It is only when a person pays

a

a house or land tax of Rs 3-12-0 and upwards and has the requisite property qualification in each ward that he can be registered in more lists than one (vide rule 7). Therefore Velayuda chetty was rightly registered in Ward No. II and not in Ward No. I.

(13) Kandasami Chetty. Said to be a non-resident.

(14) Ramasami odayar. Omission due to oversight.

(15) Visvanatha aiyar.- was brought to the tax register after the Voters list was prepared.

(16) Daivanayaga naidu.- only pays profession tax in Ward No. I but has property qualification in Tirupapuliyur - rightly omitted.

(17) Annamalai Pillay. Should have been entered as his emoluments amount to Rs 30 per mensum.

(18) Sackiam Pillai. has left the town on transfer.

(19) Portnovo. Ramalinga Chetty - pays a house rent of Rs 4 and lives opposite to the Councillor's house. Omitted on the ground that he is a resident of Port-novo which is denied by

the Said Darmalinga Chetty.

(20) V. Arunachella Chetty is Said to reside in Pondicherry - but Arunachella Chetty Says that he resides in Cuddalore O.T.

(21) Siva Chidambara Chetty } Omission due to 9+20
(22) Muttu Naickere - } over Sight.

(23) Venkatarama Naidu - objection withdrawn.

(24). Rajamannar Naidu } Say that they
(25) Padumanaba Sastri } pay a house rent

of Rs 3-8-0 and Rs 3-0-0 Per mensum - respectively: should have been registered. 11+12

(26) Arumuga Chetty. is Said to live in house no. 256 the rental value of which was estimated by the Councillor himself at Rs. 50/- should have been registered. 13.

(27) Ponnusami Chetty. } Omission by 15
(29) Kalyanaramier } mistake.

(28) Marimuttu Pillai - withdrawn.

(30) Poongolai Chetty - is now dead, his son's name Poongolai Subroya Chetty's name should have been registered. 16.

(31) Uthandi Chetty - Said to be a resident of

of Port. Novo.

(32) Amarapatty Chetty. His house is really in Ward no. II but by a mistake is entered in ward no. I.

17 (33) Mrs. Nas Bank. Said to have sold her house - but the name of the purchaser not entered.

18 (34) Mrs. Vellones. } Omission by mistake.
19 (35) Mrs. Rawss food }

(36) Subroya Modelly. - Non-resident;

(37) Doraisami Nainar. - withdrawn.

(38) Chinnathambi Pillai - pays a house rent of Rs 2-1-0 not entitled to vote.

20 (39) Veerapasary. - pays profession tax in Ward no. I but; has his place of business in Ward no. II. Name does not appear in the list of no. I or no. II ward.

On examining the voters' register, I find that the names of several Jonaga females had been omitted. This is not authorized by the rules.

The boundary of the I ward runs

along the centre of Clive Street. Thus the houses on the northern row are in the I ward. and the houses on the opposite row form the II ward. But for the purposes of assessment, all the houses in that Street are entered in the I ward register. There is a good deal of confusion in consequence, which can be avoided by the houses ~~number~~ being entered in the registers of the wards to which they belong.

Arunachella Chetty is the eldest brother of the Councillor. At his request house No. 28 Clive's Street which was entered in the name of Arunachella Chetty was transferred to that of Kolandappa Chetty. This ~~is~~ was done without any reference to the Chairman in whom alone the power to make any such alteration vests.

Regarding the use of a Municipal cart by certain coolies to convey bricks from the Councillor's house to that of Appasami Chetty - the Councillor denies all knowledge. He says that it must

have

have been the fault of the coolies or Appasami Chetty, himself.

There seems to be a good deal of ill feeling between this Municipal Councillor and another named Subbraya Chettyar. At the instance of the latter Veerappasami and others (petitioners) have deposed against Muthusami Chettyar. The Municipal Manager Mr. D. O'Brien made an independent enquiry and reports that the cart was used by some boys without the knowledge of the Municipal Councillor. At any rate there seems to be neglect in safeguarding Municipal properties.

The term of office of Muthusami Chettyar expires on 19-11-97 and it is ridiculous that he of all the Councillors in Old Town should be pitched upon by the Chairman for the preparation of the house-tax and Voter's registers. Very little check was exercised by the Chairman himself.

Taken as a whole I am not at all certain that Muthusami Chettyar is worse than his fellows. If any of ~~the~~ his accusers supplanted him they would do no better. Muttusami Chettyar has several enemies apparently and he does not scruple to exercise his authority as Municipal Councillor to their disadvantage.

The following papers are herewith submitted.

(1) Muthusami Chettyars explanation received with the Collectors Reference on $\frac{131}{\text{Eng pet}}$ of 97 dated 30.7.97.

(2) Collectors Endorsement dated 19.8.97. no $\frac{176}{\text{Eng lur}}$ of 97 with its enclosures.

(3) Collectors $\frac{200}{\text{Eng pet}}$ of 97 received with his Reference on $\frac{200}{\text{Eng pet}}$ dated 24.9.97.

(4) Collectors Endorsement dated 25.8.97 no $\frac{185}{\text{Eng pet}}$ of 97 with the Municipal Managers report & 1 file.

(5) Statements taken from Muthusami Chettyar and other parties.

(6) Muttusami

(6) Muttusami Chettyar's written explanation

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
T. Varadarao
20.10.97
Assistant Collector.

176
C No 185, & 200 of 97
Encl 189.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
SOUTH ARCOT.

FROM

THE Asst. COLLECTOR OF
SOUTH ARCOT.

Encl III

To

The Collector
South Arcot.

Dated 20th }
Despatched } October 1897.
Received }

ENCLOSURE.. 6 (as per margin)

No. 1119 / Dis 97

Subject.

Submitting report regarding the several complaints received against M. R. Ry K. Muthusawmi Chettiar of Cuddalore 97.

Ref no 131 of 96.
Cuddalore

To

The Collector of
South Arcot
Cuddalore

(To be returned)
Forwarded to the Asst. Collr. who is requested to make careful enquiry & report at an early date on the allegations contained in this petition.
[illegible] for Collr.
15.8.96

Lr 18/8 Reports here

Most Respected Sir,

We, the undersigned, beg to bring the following to your honor's kind consideration.

In the revision and assessment of House-tax of I Division I Ward, the Chairman of Cuddalore Municipality always deputes the work to Mr. Muthusamy Chettiar a Councillor of this Ward.

The Councillor increases, decreases or cancels the taxes as he pleases without caring to do justice and in consequence the poor are the real sufferers. Even in the case of his own buildings as well as those of his relatives, he has not acted properly; for, the Chairman never troubles himself to know about the correctness of such assessment or to take notice of any complaint or appeal petitions.

DESPATCHED
17 AUG. 96

1797 / C. 96

The list herewith attached will show your honor some of such irregularities in the present revision of the current year.

ask the Chairman to send me the H. Tax Revised register of Ward no. I.

We, therefore, humbly pray that your honor will kindly inspect the buildings personally with the revision list, and then order the chairman to make an impartial revision again.

Lr 26/8.

For which we shall be highly thankful to your honor.

15th August 1896
Cuddalore

We beg to remain
Most honored Sir
Your most obedient servants

1896

From

T. Varada Rao Esquire
B.A. B.L.
Assistant Collector
South Arcot

To

The Collector of
South Arcot

Dated } September 1896
Recd }

No. $\frac{1143}{w}$ of 96
Circ:- ouly

…SURY DEPUTY COLL…
10 SEP 9
CUDDALORE

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement R Dis $\frac{131}{c.Ex}$ of 96 d 15-8-96 I have the honor to state that I have carefully gone over the list submitted by your petitioners and also inspected all the houses referred to therein.

Jain Street

No 32 is a thatched hut as are Nos 31 & 33 but only one of these viz 31 was assessed at 0-6-9. No 34 is a tiled house as alleged by the petitioners but it is wrongly numbered as 32. It is properly assessed on an ~~average~~ annual Rental Value of Rs 40-0-0. No 11 was declared to be not liable to assessment being a cattle shed but I find it used as a habitation although the occupants allege that they do not pay any rent. It belongs to the owner of the opposite house (No 22) which is taxed.

No 19. This and No 18 are huts in the same compound and occupied by the same family. One of these alone is taxed, viz, No 18 at 0. 6. 9. This seems fair.

Brahmins Street

37 & 52 are tiled houses which may fairly fetch an annual rental of Rs 12 each. The occupants being old Brahmin women, the Councillor revising the assessment, declared them not liable to taxation. This is irregular, for, the, authority to exempt on the score of poverty is vested only in the Municipal Council as a body. (vide Sec 57. Act IV of 1884)

Muthu Moodaly Street.

No. 1 is a tiled house. The ~~Collector~~ Councillor says, it is not liable to taxation, but his opinion cannot be supported. The Chairman has however taxed the house at 0 6 9.

No. 3 is a passage & a covered shed attached to No 4. The ~~Collector~~ Councillor declared this not liable to separate taxation but No 4 is very inadequately assessed on an annual rental value of Rs 42 - - . This

may

may be raised to Rs 75. The house belongs to the attender of the Municipal office who was appointed to assist the revising Councillor.

No. 16 is very similar to No 15 which is taxed at 7 as. The Councillor has usurped herein the functions of the Council by declaring the owner - a poor widow - not liable to taxation.

Mohanarang street No 14 & 21

These are ~~not~~ no doubt thatched huts. Had they been the sole property of the owners, they would not be liable for taxation, fetching a rental value below Rs 6 but as they are owned by persons who possess other taxable property the Councillor has rightly taxed them. (Sec 63. cl (c) IV of 1884)

Kamatchi Amman Street

No. 2 not taxed because the assessment, it is said, would be below 4 as; but No 3, quite a similar house, is taxed at 14 as. This is a case of improper assessment. No 16 - The Councillor says that it is a stable & not liable for taxation. This was formerly assessed at 7 as. This may be retained. This belongs to a Councillor who was present & declared that he was

willing

Errusappa Chetty Street

No 25 ~~Average~~ annual Rental value now estimated at Rs 36 may be reduced to Rs 24.

No 28 assessed on ~~Average~~ annual Rental Value of 48Rs, but being ~~at~~ a very large ~~land~~ house may be assessed on ~~Average~~ annual Rental Value of 60Rs.

112 is a large thatched shed. The Councillor declares this as not being liable for taxation; but as it belongs to a blacksmith who has other house property, the shed should be ~~assigned~~ assessed at least 2 as per annum

Veerappasary's Lane

No 10 is non existent. There are only 9 numbers in this street.

Nos 2 & 3 are tiled houses and seem to be properly assessed.

One Annamalai Gramany complains that his house No 4 in Errusappa Chetty Street was over assessed. The ~~average~~ annual Rental value is estimated at Rs 50. It seems to ~~be~~ me to be fair, but seeing that other houses are under assessed the owner has no doubt a cause of complaint.

This has been already disposed of by the Council.

The few cases investigated by me show that the revision was not carried out on any fixed principles.

In some cases the assessment is based on the ~~Average~~ annual Rental Value. This is a matter for easy ascertainment where the houses are rented; but in the case of houses occupied by owners, the revising Councillor has been extremely lenient. Every street door has been separately numbered and thus shows as separate Nos, buildings which form part of the whole structure. Thus stable cattle sheds & privies which form annexures to houses are separately numbered because they have doors opening into the street. The petitioners think that each separate No should bear an assessment; but this need not always be the case. As ~~observing~~ obviously when the ~~Average~~ annual Rental value is calculated also ~~to~~ with reference to the annexures.

In many cases the Councillor has inadvertently taken upon himself to declare as houses are not liable for taxation on the ground that the owners are two poor to pay. But this is a matter which can be legally disposed of only by the Council in its Corporate capacity;

willing to pay the tax. He seems to be a very upright Councillor because his complaint against the revising Councillor was that the latter had left the stable free of tax.

No. 12 is a godown belonging to the revising Councillor. It has been assessed at 0.10.1 but may be safely raised to 1 Rupee.

No. 13 is a pucka built well, a bath room and verandah suitable for dwelling and is said to belong to the revising Councillor's brother. This ought to be taxed at 8 as but was exempted on the ground that it is a privy attached to a private house.

No 20. stable. The Councillor says it is not liable for taxation. It is really attached to No 19, the tax on which has been raised from Rs 5-4-0 to Rs 5.14.1. The tax may be more approximately re-distributed at 5-4-0 on No 19 & 0-10-1 on No 20.

Nos 22, 23, 24 & 25 are really one building, but assessed on an ~~Average~~ annual Rental Value of 72 Rs which may be safely raised to Rs 100. They are all godowns separately assessable. No 91 is a large terraced house belonging to revising Councillor's

brother

brother and assessed at a ~~Average~~ annual Rental value of Rs 20 which may be raised to Rs 60.

Clive street.

No 22 & 23. one is a godown and the other a stable and assessed at present on an annual rental value of Rs 18. This may be doubled as per next house No 21, which is assessed on ~~Average~~ annual Rental Value of 36 Rs. These houses belong to the Revising Councillor. No 25 house & stable belonging to the Revising Councillor, assessed on a ~~Average~~ annual Rental value of Rs 12.8 may be raised to Rs 18.

No 28 is a large upstairs house assessed on ~~Average~~ annual Rental value of Rs 60 may be raised to Rs 75.

Kulllay Chetty street

No 2. Tiled house is assessed at 2.1.7 on an ~~Average~~ annual Rental value of 30 Rs; but No 50 is a large tiled house assessed as No 2 which may be raised to Rs 4.3.2.

Nos 52 & 53 are now assessed ~~at 2.1.7~~ as separate buildings. This should not be done being parts of the same house. The ~~Average~~ annual Rental value of Rs 54 seems correct the assessment should have been revised by the Chairman. If this had been done, there would be no room for complaint.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
T. Varadarao
Asst Collector

AG

To,

Varadarao Esquire B.A. B.L.
Assistant Collector
South Arcot
Cuddalore.

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
12 OCT. [illegible]
CUDDALORE DIVISION.

26/10

Sir,

With reference to the Petition presented to the Collector about the preparation of the Voter and Councillors lists of the 1st Division 1st Ward I beg to state that the Petition in question was prepared at the instance of Councillor S. M. Subbaroya Chettiar.

2. That it is a well known fact that myself and the said Subbaroya Chettiar are at variance for a long time owing to certain caste disputes.

3. That when the Councillors and Voters lists were prepared and published in the Ward and at the Municipal Office, and that after the elapse of a month the said lists were confirmed or adopted by the Council at their meeting held on the , the said Councillor S. M. Subbaroya Chettiar was also present at that meeting and could have objected to the lists.

lists on the ground of being incomplete, but was then silent on the point.

4. That the preparation of the Councillors and Voters lists were entrusted to myself and Councillor M. R. Ry. S. Devanayagam Mudelliar, that the original lists were detained at the latter Councillor's quarters as he was absent from the town for a week on his own private business. The lists reached me on the 18th April /97. as those lists were due at the Municipal Office on the 20th of the said month, I at once sent for the Ward Inspector and asked him to prepare the lists, as he had no time at that juncture he copied the old lists as it stood in the previous year and gave it to me. and I, to save delay signed the lists without comparing them with the Trades & Profession and house and land registers, but not with any mal-intention.

This is a serious admission
G.B.

5 That the parties who presented the Petition in question Viz: R. Veerappa Assary, K. Rathina Chetty, Anthoniswami Chetty and Manicka Chetty did not find a place in the lists of Councillors and Voters of the previous years, that I and Veerappa Assary
are

are at variance for the last 10 years and that I did not ask the above said 4 persons to give their votes on my behalf at the time of election.

6. That the Petition originated by my increasing their trade and house taxes by giving the required information to one of the 2nd Ward Councillor in preparing the former list of that Ward, which facts will be clearly borne out by perusing the trade tax registers and the Petition presented by them sometime ago against the revision of the house tax in the 1st Ward and that Councillor S. M. Subbaroya Chettiar was also present at the time of enquiry owing to certain animosity that exists between him and me.

7. The extent of the 1st Ward is as defined below. "The Cuddalore 1st Ward shall comprise that portion of the 1st Municipal division which is bounded on the north and west by the 2nd Municipal Division, on the South by a line running East along the centre of Kulla Chetty street upto its junction with Kamakshi Amman Kovil street upto its juncture with Clive street, thence East along the centre of Clive street and Canning Lane; and on the East by a line running north East along and in the back-water to meet the
boundary

6

boundary of the 1st and 2d Municipal divisions."

8. That the houses situated on the left side of the above said streets belong to the 1st Ward and those to the right belong to the 2d Ward, and that the voters and Councillors lists were prepared accordingly & that these lists were originally prepared by 1st Ward Councillor late Mr. George.

9. That the parties mentioned in the margin belong to the 2d Ward and so they were omitted in the 1st Ward.

Balambal
Sundaramal
K. Rathinasamy
Cophia Pillai
Veerasamy Chetty +
Ponnusamy Chetty

Ponnusamy Chetty
Clerk of Ramalingam Chetty
T. Muthusamy Chetty
M. Sundai Chetty
Govindasamy Chetty
P. Subbaroya Chetty
M. Narayana Chetty

Veerappa Asary
Sivapackiam
Natarasa Chetty (Junior)
Annamalay Chetty
K. Ramasamy Chetty
A. Subbaroya Chetty

Sengalamy Ammal
Vythilinga Pathar
Nataraja Pillai
Mahd. Madarsa Rowther
A. Sivalinga Chetty
Vythilinga Chetty

+ Samy Chetty
Venkataramia Chetty
Manjini Chetty
Ponnusamy Chetty
T. Subban Chetty

10. That as the amount of taxes in the 1st Ward was by far less to that of the 2d Ward and as the amount of both wards were to a certain extent to be divided between 2 bill Collectors for the purpose of collection, sometime ago certain parties in the 2d Ward were included in the trade tax list of the 1st Ward for the sake of collection.

11. That to the best of my knowledge and belief I have prepared the Councillors and Voters lists. and that the Chairman I doubt not if called upon will be able to certify about my conduct and the work done by me as a Councillor.

12. That as directed in person to give in writing the particulars relating to the Petition which was Enquired into on the 1st Inst.

1st Instant without crossing the Petitioners Councillors to address you with full hopes that you will be pleased to take into benign Consideration the above facts and pass such orders as you may deem fit.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most Obdt Servant

Cuddalore O.T.
6 October 1897.

Encl V

Received 7.6.97.

From,

M. R. Ry. K. Muttuswami Chetty,

Municipal Councillor,

Cuddalore.

To,

The Chairman,

Municipal Council,

Cuddalore.

Sir,

I beg, with reference to your No. —, dated 19th February 1897, to submit the following remarks on the points calling for explanation in the matter of the revision of the house tax conducted by me in the 1st Ward Old Town Cuddalore and referred to in the Assistant Collector's letter dated September 1896, No. 1143.

2. The recent revision was conducted on the lines followed in previous years in which the house tax registers were revised.

3. Office Attender Arunagiri Pillai and Bill Collector Venkatrama Aiyar were deputed to assist me in the revision, and 20 per cent of the work done by them was checked by me. I have here to point out that, to the best of my knowledge and ability, houses were assessed with reference to the locality in which they were erected.

4. In respect to stables attached to houses

which are contiguous to the building I have included them in the assessment imposed on the building itself.

5. It is a well known fact that Sand Subraya Chettiar, at whose instance the Complaint under reference was drawn up are not in terms.

6. Further my scrutiny of the revision was no secret inasmuch as I sent the Register after it was completed by me to Councillor Subraya Chettiar who could have supplied omissions and rectified the defects he may have discovered therein. I made a mention of this fact to the Assistant Collector during his enquiry into the allegations contained in the petition which he was directed to report upon.

7. No. 11 Stable in Jani's street. did not form one of the numbers I checked.

8. Nos. 37 & 52. Brahmin street were exempted when years ago and not by me. ?

What about No 8/43? [illegible]

9. No. 4 Mattu Madelly street. This house was always in the occupation of the owner and the assessment thereon was imposed by the Assessor originally appointed by the Municipality for the purpose. The building though not enlarged or improved since its first assessment has deteriorated.

? belongs to the attender of the Mun. office

10. No. 14 Muttu Madelli street. Vide remarks opposite Nos. 37 and 52 - para 8.

11. No. 2 Kamatcheamman Covil street. This house being below the minimum amount liable to tax, it was omitted as in previous revisions to which no objection was hitherto taken

This is no explanation. Why was No 3 assessed which is [illegible] similar house?

12. No. 16 in the same street. This property does not belong to any Councillor but to Mr. Manicka Chetty, and it has been correctly assessed at Re. 1. 4. 2.

13. No. 12 in the same street is a small building. It was closed at the time of the Assistant Collector's inspection. It was never rented what if? and the tax was fixed last year. Rental of Rs. 12 proposed is rather high and it is for the Chairman to determine, after inspecting the property, whether it is liable to such heavy assessment.

belonging to this Councillor

What about No 13?

14. No. 28 in Clive street. This building has no garden and property No. 13 in Kamatchiamman Covil street therefore forms a latrine to the former building; the latter being fit for no other purpose.

15. No. 20 Kamatcheamman Covil st. No. 19 is a latrine part and parcel of No. 20. The assessment on which includes that on No. 19.

16 Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 25. All these belong

to one individual and are bazaars in one block. They were assessed at Rs. 5-0-8 in the current year but on appeal, the Council, at their meeting held on the 16th March 1897 reduced the assessment to Rs. 4-8-3 as in previous years. In the same way house No. 4 in Erusappa Chetty's street was taxed on an annual rental of Rs. 50, was by the Council at the same meeting on appeal reduced to Rs. 36.

17. No. 96. Kamatcheammen Coil st. This building is a small one measuring 17 3/4 ft. in width. It is an old structure and has no upstairs. In the previous revision the tax on this building was increased from 0-14-0 to Re. 1-4-0. It has not undergone any change or improvement to warrant an increase in the assessment and it is not apparent why an increase in the assessment on this building has been recommended.

18. Nos. 22 and 23. Clive street. These are cow sheds. The assessments on these were allowed to stand notwithstanding the fact that a portion of building No. 22 has been demolished. These sheds were purchased by me in July 1895 from one Authacoriche Muthuswami Chetti.

19. No. 25 Clive street. The assessment on this was revised in 1888-89 and as no alterations

on

or improvements were made thereto, it is not understood why an increase is proposed on the present rental of Rs. 9 imposed on this building.

20. No. 28 in the same street was originally assessed on an annual rental of Rs. 50, but owing to certain additions made thereto, I raised the rental to Rs. 60 in the previous revision and the building was incomplete when I revised the tax for the current year and it was only completed in this month.

21. No. 28 in Erusappa Chetty's street is an old building and the assessment on it was allowed to stand on the ground that the owner is reduced in circumstances and it is with difficulty that he pays the present tax on the building.

22. No. 50 Kalla Chetty street stands in the name of a female. As the building is the same as it always was I thought it unnecessary to revise the assessment on it.

23. No. 25 in Erusappa Chetty's street was assessed on a rental of Rs. 3, but reduced by the Council on appeal to Rs. 2.

The above remarks, I trust, will convince you that I have done my best to discharge the revision of the tax on buildings in the 1st Ward as well as I possibly Could do.

I have &c.

(Signed) K. Muttusawmi Chetty,
Councillor
27.5.97

Cuddalore O.T.
27th May 1897

A True Copy

Chairman

1

Encl II

1-oct-97.

Veerappan –
I have signed Ex. A. It is a petn to the Collr. I read it before signing. A list was sent with the petn (A1). I signed it also. The first charge is that M R R Muttusawmi chettiar has omitted several names from the voters list prepared this year. He has omitted about 50 names because he does not expect them to give him their votes. That is my opinion. The persons omitted have not appealed or otherwise complained. I do not know whether voters lists have been printed & published. No public notice by means of tom-tom was given inviting appeals or complaints against the list. I am one of those whose name has been omitted. At the last occasion Muthusawmi chettiar recommended that I should give my vote for some nominee of his. I refused to support him or to support Muttusawmi chettiar. The names omitted are

1. Mrs Parry Head
2. Perum Bgst of 6.
3. Krishnasawmy chetty. He has got a house worth Rs 15000 for which he pays assessment. He pays an assmt of Rs 14. 5. 7 in respect of two houses Nos 36 & 37 in the 18th Street. The houses are entered in the name of Shetty Kistnasawmi chetty.
4. Vishwanatha Nayanar pays an aspt of over Rs 200. The reason why his name is omitted is that he has refused to give his vote to Muttusawmi chettyar.
5. Muttia Pillay. Two houses 48 & 49 are entered in the name of both Muttia Pillay & Kadiravelu Pillay. They pay an aspt of Rs 4. 5. 5. Neither of these two names appear in the list.
6. Ponnusawmy Pillay. He pays Rs 8. 6. 5. 6 for house No 78. His name is omitted. The occupant is one O. Watts. O. Watts is a now train Driver. His pay is Rs 120. He is now transferred to Nellore. His name is left. The Watts mentioned in the list for 1897.
7. Mr A. Thompson pays 7 Rs. for No 93 house. His name does not appear.
8. Mrs Pereira pays 7 Rs. for No 94 house. The name of Her name does not appear.

Mr Pierce appears in the list.

6 9. Mrs Lappaiy — she has been residing in Pondicherry for the last 3 years.

10. Muthu Mani Chetty: altho' he pays a house tax of Rs 3-8-0 only he has been paying an income tax of Rs 10 per annum & therefore he is entitled to vote.

11. Nachiappa Chetty pays a prof. Tax of Rs 50. He also pays a house rent of Rs 10. He is agent to one Subrahmaniya Chetty. The names of neither of these persons appears in the list.

12. Velayutha Chettiar pays a house tax of Rs 112 per annum. He is entitled to vote.

13. M. Kandasawmy Chetty pays Rs 12 as. P.T. He is also entitled to vote.

14. Ramasawmy Odayar pays in respect of houses nos 432 & 433 Rs 50-7. He is entitled to vote.

16. Devanayagam Naidu is the S. Customs Supt. He works in this Dn. He pays Rs 3 P.T. He is entitled to vote here as well as in Tiruppapuliyur where he resides & where he has got a house.

17. Annamalay Pillay — He is a boat Overseer drawing Rs 30 from the Sea Customs.

18. Pachiappa Pillay — Salt sub Inspector. He was transferred only recently (ie) 20 days ago.

19. Dharmalinga Chetty. He used to pay a house rent of Rs 5. He is now dead. He died within 2 months ago.

20. V. Arunachella Chetty. He owns 264 & 289 & pays a H.T of Rs 6-8-9.

21. K. Siva Chithambara Chetty. He owns 248, 249 & pays Rs 8-8-8.

22. Muthu Naicken owner of 648 & 649. pays Rs 4-4-4

23. Vencataramanaik owns nos 263 & 265. He pays only Rs 1-7-6. He is not entitled to a vote. The statement in my petition regarding him I withdraw.

24-25 & 26. Rajamannar Naidu, Padmanabha Sastry, & Arumugham Chetty are all clerks employed

---

of in [illegible]. They pay house rent of Rs 3 per mensem & upwards.

27. Ponnusawmy Chetty is the owner of 55 & 56. pays an aggt of R 5-14-0.

28. Manimuthu Pillai owns 332 & 345. He pays only R 3-5-8. He is not entitled to no vote. I withdraw my statement in regard to him as in the case of Vencataramanaiken.

29. Kaliyanaramiah owns no 439 & pays R 4-3-2. He is entitled to vote.

30. Poonjalai ~~Soobraya~~ Chetty pays R 5-0-7 for nos 453-459. He is now dead. Even his sons (Soobraya Chetty) names have not been entered.

31. Odikandi Chetty owner of no 58/6. He pays an aggt of 4-3-2. He is alive. He is entitled to vote.

32. Amarapathi Chetty owns a house 607 in I ward. He pays 3-13-7.

33. Mrs Newbank pays 4-10-2. Mrs Newbank's name is entered for 149 & 153

34. Mrs Vallome pays for no 155 Rs 5-0-8.

35. Mrs Rainsford pays for 159 & 160. Rs 6-11-6.

36. Subraya Mudelly pays for no 38. Rs 5-4-0.

37. Doraswami Naicker owner of no 291. pays only Rs 3-8-0. He is not entitled to vote. I withdraw my statement in respect of this man.

38. Chinnathambi Pillay. He pays a house rent of Rs 3 per month. He is broker for paliyam sales. He lives in Clive street.

39. Varappasamy is myself. I paid P.T of Rs 25 prof. Tax last year. This year I am told I have been assessed at Rs 8. I pay income tax of Rs 20.

I now have read petn no 2 marked E or B.

I live in Clive street. The ~~his~~ house is adjacent to mine. One evening some coolies were carrying bricks in a municipal cart. They were carrying bricks from a house which Muthusami Chettiar purchased to the house of an Apparasami Chetty a cloth merchant. The coolies were the coolies of Muthusami Chettiar. I asked the coolies where they were taking the stones. The cooly said that Muthusami Chettiar ordered him to remove about 3500 stones to Apparasami Chetty's house. 1-ward Councillor Subroya Chettiar & [illegible] with me asked the coolies how many times the bandy had been used. The cooly said that the bandy had been run eight times until then. [illegible] asked the cooly with whose permission the mpl cart was used. He said Muthusami Chettiar had given orders and that he was using the carts. I do not know the cooly's name. I can identify the man.

Muthusami Chettiar,

For the last 5 or 6 years I have been on bad terms with Muthusami Chettiar. He may think I may not give my vote for him. I pay a H.T. of 3-8-0. P.T. of Rs 6. & Income tax of Rs 10 per annum. I pay all these taxes during the current year. I have heard Veerappa's deposition. I have nothing to add. I agree with him.

Gopalasami Modaliar,

I am resident of Cuddalore O.T. In no I ward I have a house no. 656. It is now registered in the name of Mani[illegible] ~~Modaliar~~ Ammal. She is my wife. Her name was for the first time entered in the H.T. Register in 1897. Before that Rajammal was entered. Rajammal was the mother of my wife. She is now dead.

3/ 3 years ago a voters list was prepared. My name was included in it. I voted for Ward no. I. I was [illegible] as Gopalasami Modaliar's guardian for Rajammal. I voted for Councillor whose name I do not remember. Suspecting that I am a friend of Councillor Soobroya Chetty my name has been expunged.

Ratna Chettiar,

I have 5 houses in Kutta Chetty street. No 503, 554 & 555. I pay Rs 4-13-2. My name is not in the voters list for the current year. I have signed Ex A & A1. I agree with the statements made therein. Councillor Soobroya Chetty's [illegible] married my elder brother's daughter. Thinking that I may not give my vote to Muthusami Chettiar [illegible] my name. [illegible] Apparasami Chetty signed it. Apparasami Chetty's coolies were opposite their house. [illegible] that house in a fortnight's time [illegible] municipal cart. Pakkiri Pillay [illegible]. He is not a tenant in my house. [illegible] him that a municipal cart was being used. They asked the coolies. Pakkiri Pillay asked the coolies [illegible] said that the stones were carted from Councillor Muthusami Chettiar's house. They said that the bandy had made 8 or 9 trips. Coolies were not mpl coolies. The cart looked like a mpl cart. It is painted with [illegible] mpl cart.

6 Manickam Chetty.

I live in Cuddalore O.T. I pay an income Tax of Rs 15 per annum. I have two houses in no I Ward. One is entered in my ~~name~~ mother's name. No 298. I live therein. The tax is Rs 6-10-5. In Mariamman St. no 317 is entered in my name. The tax is 0-3-0. Both the houses belong to me. Sundaramal's name is entered in the voters list. My name is also omitted from the elected persons list.

P. Manickam Chetty

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR'S OFFICE, CUDDALORE DIVISION

Viswanatha Nainar,

Re Ex C. I presented the petition. My complaint is that my name has been omitted from the list of persons competent for election. I pay a total tax of Rs 150 a year & income Tax of Rs 90. In this way I ~~pay~~ I am entitled to vote. I am 25 years old. My father died in April 1895. I was married 3 years ago. ~~I a [illegible]~~ was reading in the Matriculation classes when my father died. (note. looks 25 years old.)

Viswanatha Nainar

I am the only son of my father. I do not know whether my father had any other son born to him who died in ~~his~~ ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible].

Viswanatha Nainar

Muthusawmy Chettiar.

I am Commissioner of Ward no I. The voters list was revised by me. I have signed it. It was completed on 19-4-97. I have omitted the follg names.

(1) Parry & Co. as the agents are constantly changing I did not give their name in this list. I did not attend to the note to cl (b) & (c) of the election rule no (3) framed under Act IV of 1884 sec 250 wherein a person or persons is said to include a corporate body & companies.

(2) Mess Pierson Boyle & Co. I have omitted their name because their partners do not come here. They have no business in these premises. The premises are empty.

(3) Sheatty Krishnasawmi Chetty does not live here. He lives in Pondicherry. He has no trade here.

4. Viswanatha the Nainar was born on [illegible] March 1877. He is less than 21 years old.

5. Muthia Pillay & c. I do not know whether this man & Kadirivelu Pillay are brothers. I am not aware whether in a joint Hindu family the manager's name shd be entered in the voters list.

6. Ponnusawmy Pillay. This is an omission by oversight.

7. Mr Thompson. do

8. Mrs Pierce. Mr Pierce is dead. In the voters list Mrs Pierce ought to be entered. This is an error.

9. Mrs Lappracy. has been living in Pondicherry for the last 3 years.

10. Muthumari Chetty. has been omitted by me because he was convicted by a criminal Court in CC 4 of 95 for an offence under sec 147 IPC & sentenced to pay a fine of Rs 50. I did not report this fact to the Chm. Of my own motion I omitted his name from the list.

11. Nachiappa Chetty became resident & rate payer in no I ward on 19. Nov. 96.

12. Velayutham Chettiar trades in no II Ward. He lives in Ward no I. I do not know what rent he pays. I did not enquire. I revised the House tax register

for 96-97. no 12. Assessed in Kalai chetty street Door no 307. It is in I ward. The house is in the name of Alagappa chetty. Velayudha chetty lives in the house of Alagappa chetty. The tax is put down as Rs 5-0 per annum. I do not know whether Velayudha chetty pays this tax or not. He is the man who pays Rs 12 Trade Tax & referred to by the petn in no 12.

13. Kandaswami chetty. He lives in Pondicherry. I do not know whether he carries on business here.

14. Ramasawmi Iyer. Omission due to oversight.

15. Visvanathan Iyer. He was included in the Tax register after the voters list was prepared.

16. Devanayagam Naidu. He lives in Tirupapuliyur.

17. Annamalay Pillay. I was told his pay was only Rs 25.

18. Pakkiri Pillay. He left before having lived 6 months. He was living in II Ward. He was living in Rathna chetty's house. That house was in Ward II. His work too was in II ward.

19. I know Portnovo Shanmugam chetty. He lives opposite my house. It is no I ward. He lives in a rented house. I don't know what rent he pays. I did not enquire. He lives in no 581 Kamakshi amman koil St. The rental value is 6 rs a month. He frequently lives in Port novo. He lives for 10 days here & for 20 days in Portnovo.

20. P. Annamalai chetty. He has only one house viz 289. (pointed out that rental is over 3-12-0). The man lives in Pondicherry. The occupants entered as the owner in the revision register prepared by me.

21. Sivachidambara Chetty. Omission due to error.

22. Muthu Naicker. do

23. withdrawn.

24. 25. 26. No 24 draws Rs 12 per mensem. Don't know no 25 & no 26. No 24 can not afford to pay Rs 3 rent. I did not enquire. No 24 lives in no 294. The rental value is entered as Rs 42. No 26 lives in no 256. The rental value of the house is Rs 50.

no 27. Ponnusamy chetty. Omission by mistake

2/- (18)

29. Kaliana ramier. omission by mistake

30. Poonjalai chetty. This man is dead. In the H.T register his son's name Poonjolai Sooriya Chetty is entered. Thinking that this refers to the dead person I removed this name.

31. Oothandi chetty. He lives in Port Novo or Aparam.

32. Amarapathi chetty. His house is really in Ward no II. By mistake the house no 607 is entered in Ward no I.

33. Mr Newbank. She sold the house. I have not entered the name of the purchaser.

34. Mrs Williams. omission by mistake.

35. Mrs Rainsford. do.

36. Sooraya Moodelly. non resident.

38. Chinnathambi Pillay. pays a rent of only Rs 1-12-0.

39. Varappasami. He was assessed P.T in 95-96 in Ward no I. In 1896-97 also he is assessed in no I Ward. His place of business in no 24 Olive St. is in 2nd Ward. This man's name does not appear in the voters list of last year & this year. I do not know if his name is entered in no II ward voters list. (note. It is not).

1. Bhatiba Bibi. (9-10-11 houses). Being Jonaghan they can not come out. Custom not to enter their names.

2. Amida Bibi (58, 59) do.

3. Malayappa Butler (88) non resident. emigrated.

4. Sherifa Bibi (97) Jonaghan Gosha.

5. Vellayappa chetty. Tax was raised to 4-3-2. It is under appeal. House no 210. It is really in no II ward.

6. Manikya chetty & ankha — do.
7. Siva Lyabhyam Ammal — do.
8. Narayana Chetty & Ramasamy chetty — do.
9. Parasarama chetty — do.
10. Balambal — do.
11. Ratna Chetty — already explained.
12. Nataraja chetty — II ward.

Regarding Adivalingi chetty to Manikyam Pillay, my answer is they are all in the 2nd ward. They are entered in the 2nd Wards voters register. This explanation applies from Subba chetty to Muthusami Chetty of Kullu chetty street. In Canning lane Govindasami chetty and dubash of Major Perrin Bept & Co. In Clive Street the opposite being to II Ward.

In regard to the use of the supplement I know nothing. The coolies were not employed by me. They were perhaps employed by Appan chettya Chetty. He purchased the bricks. If the bandy was used it was the fault of Appasawmi chetty.

Door no 28. Clive street was entered in the name of Arunachella chettiar. He first told me that the house shd be entered in the name of Kotandapani chetty. I told him to send a petition. The petition was given. He gave petn ~~on 3~~ 2 or 3 days before the date of submission of register viz 10.7.97. The petn is with me now. I did not bring it with me. I ~~have for~~ have not sent it to office. I included it in my records. Not anticipating any trouble because Arunachella Chetty is my elder brother, I put it by. Under sec 70. the chairman of the council has the power to amend the tax register books. In regard to Gopalasami Moor his name was entered in the voters list at the request of his mothers-in-law. Ratna chettys houses are Ward no II. I did not enquire into the payment of the income tax by Manikya Chettyar.

1-10-97

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
12 OCT 1897
CUDDALORE DIVISION.

30-9-97

[illegible] 1st [illegible] 1st ward Bill

Collector [illegible]

1895-96 [illegible] House tax Register [illegible]

96-97 & 97-8 [illegible] House tax Register

[illegible] 1896 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Revised House

tax ~~Register~~ list [illegible]

[illegible] 96-7 & 97-8 [illegible]

[illegible] 28 [illegible]

[illegible] 1 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 96 [illegible]

[illegible] Revised House tax

list [illegible]

[illegible] list [illegible]

[illegible] House tax Register

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Revised list [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

When gi
When co
& M.
00-28-10-97

7. Subrayalchetti [illegible] Poonjo[illegible]
My father's name is Poonjolai
Chettiar. He died 2 years ago. He
was paying 5 Rs. H-Tax. I now
pay tax. House is in ~~my~~ [illegible]

Louis Michel
I am the agent of Mess. Perma Boyle & Co for shipping cargo. I am stationed at Cuddalore O.T. & have been for 3 years. ~~[illegible]~~ I represent the company here. A Chettiar pays the house taxes. Govindaswami Chettiar signs cheques for the firm. I am paid Rs 45 including house rent.

~~Shesha chella~~ Govindaswami Chetty – son in law of ~~[illegible]~~ Shesha chella chetty – my father in law is the agent of Mess. Pernon Boyle & Co at Pondicherry. He is the dubash. I buy cargo here for my father-in-law & I have no power of attorney for the firm but accounts are in our name. I pay & receive monies of the firm. I pay taxes for the Compy.

Raja Manner Naidu –
I am employed in Parry & Co. Cuddalore O.T. I get Rs 17 per month. I live in Sanjiva Iyer [illegible] St. in Veerappa Chettiar's house & pay Rs 3/- per month rent.

Abbay Naidu –
I am gumasta of Sheaty Krishnamy ~~[illegible]~~ Chettiar. He lives in Pondicherry. I live in Cuddalore. I hold no power of attorney. I have paid ~~taxes~~ 8 Rs house rent. K. Chettiar has a building of his own. I pay House tax – Rs [illegible].

Siva Chidambara Chettiar
I live in Strand. I pay house rent & [illegible] Cuddalore O.T. I do
R.S. S.O. I live in [illegible] for
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR'S OFFICE, CUDDALORE DIVISION.
12 OCT. 18[illegible]

Before me

Asst Collr

Botandai Chetty.
Muthalu Chetty is my father. He is now dead.
I am his heir. I pay taxes. I produce
receipts. He died 2 years ago. Since then
I have been paying taxes. My name is not
in voters list. I think I was omitted be-
cause I did not vote for M.C.

Ponnusamy Pillai. House tax in No 1 ward.
I pay Rs 2-4-0 House tax. My name was
I live in Cuddalore O.T.
omitted because I am not on good
terms with M.C. We had a dispute
regarding a garden. I complained agt M.C.
6 years ago. My name was removed
from the last list. I was never in the
list.

Muddu Naiker
I pay H.T. 4 Rs. I have paid for
3 years. House belonged to my father
in law. He is dead. It is now in my
name. I am paying taxes. I live
in Cuddalore O.T. I am not in the
voters list. I don't know why.

Arunachella Chetty.
I pay H.T. 6-2-0 for House Tax in 1st ward. I
live in Cuddalore O.T. I have been
paying taxes for 7 or 8 years. House
came to me 7 or 8 years ago after
my father's death. My name is not
in the voters list. I don't know why.

Dharmalinga Chetty. 4 Rs rent for Sodhaya Chetty
H.T. [illegible] M.C. The house is in
It is in 1st ward.

When gi
When co,
& M.
28-10-97
Lo

J. Subrayo Chettiar [illegible]
My father's name is Poonjolai
Chettiar. He died 2 years ago. He
was paying 5 Rs. H. Tax. I now
pay the tax. House is in my
name. My name is not in voters
list.

Padmanabha Sastriar
I am employed as M. Asst. of
Collector Cuppar. I live in Cuddalore
O.T. in a rented house. I pay house rent
of Rs 3. I have been living for 5 or 6 years.
I live in 1st ward.

Kaliaperumal Iyer
I live in Cuddalore O.T. I have a
house of my own. I pay Rs 3-12-0
house tax. My house is in
ward. My name is not in voters
list. I don't know why.

Vencataramana Naidu
I live in Cuddalore O.T. I am a
merchant. I pay a tax of
Rs 3-12-0 house tax. It is my
own house. It is in 1st ward.
My name is not in voters list.
I don't know.

T. Varadmas
14-10-97

Encl IV

Statement by the
ssistant Collector

When given for copying
When copied 6 11 97 JH 189 .
When examined 7
When signed 6/12

, & M.
-28-10-97

Lo

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

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

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

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

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