Voters' Lists – Dindigul Municipal [illegible]

[L. & M.
3,000—19-11-96.]

INDEXED.

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 660 M.

DATED 23-3-97.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Voters' Lists

Cancelling with remarks G.O. No. 1886 M d/7-11-96. and ordering that the ——— as originally revised by the Chairman M. C. Dindigul should now be published and Nos. 9 and 12 of the Election rules, strictly followed

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Voters' lists — Municipal municipality

Again G.O., ~~dated~~ No. 1806. M. of ~~189 , No.~~ 7th November 1896.
Current No. 3430. M. of 1896, dated 23d. Decr/96 from the Collr. of Madura.
Current No. 834. M. of 1897, dated 23d. July/97 from the Chairman M. C. Dindigul.

~~[illegible]~~ ORDER ~~[illegible]~~ No 660 munis. 23/3/97

In the Government order read above, ~~it was held that~~ the opinion expressed the chairman of a municipal council ~~was not bound to~~ might before publishing the lists of voters delivered to him under No 7 of the election rules ~~without~~ scrutinising them and correcting them if necessary. This order was passed on a letter received direct from the chairman of the municipal council of Dindigul, in which he ~~states~~ explained that the council took objection to his correcting some "glaring inaccuracies" in the lists. By this, the Government was led to believe that the mistakes corrected by the chairman were of the nature of clerical errors or ~~some~~ mere obvious misdescription; and the order ~~was passed~~ related solely ~~with reference~~ to ~~the~~ such cases of ~~circumstances~~ a nature. But it now appears from the Collector's letter read above that the chairman's ~~did~~ statements were misleading and incorrect (in his letter to Govt) as he did not confine himself to the recti-

-fication of "glaring inaccuracies", as he termed them, but ~~had gone the length of actually~~ revised actually the lists, ~~and~~ removing from them the names of some the voters entered therein. Such action was wholly beyond the powers of ~~he~~ the Chairman ~~has no power to do this~~ and the Government now resolves to cancel its order, No. 1886. M. dated 7th November 1896, ~~in which the resolution of the municipal council declaring the revised lists published by the chairman to be illegal, was cancelled, under Section 35 (1) of the Madras District Municipalities Act.~~ The lists, as originally received by the chairman, should now be published and Nos. 9 and 12 of the election rules strictly followed.

2. The Chairman should have submitted his letters to Government in these cases through the Divisional Officer and the Collector as required in G.O. No. 1162 M. dy 4th September 1893, & he is requested to be careful to do so for the future

— / True order /

F.R.
20/3/97

To The Collector of Madura
" Chairman, M.C. Dindigul.

PWD / Sec., L & P.W. Department & P of the Rd. HO,

Desp. 26/8/97

~~FOR~~ ORDERS

Read again. G.O. No. 1886. M. d 7th November 1896 & C: No. 3430.M

Voters' lists, Dindigul municipality.

From the Collector of Madura.

For Orders

Plese see the notes and c
orders in G.O. No. 1886 M.d/7" November 1896, in which it was held that the
Chairman of a municipal council was
not bound to publish the voters' lis
delivered to him under ~~rule~~ No 7 of th
election rules, without scrutinizing
them and making corrections therein, i
necessary.

2. This order was passed on a referen
from the Chairman of the Municipal
Council of Dindigul, who stated that
the council took objection to his hav-
ing corrected some "glaring inaccuracie
in the lists and carried a resolution
declaring that the lists published by
him were illegal. It now appears from
the Collector's letter read above th
the Chairman did not confine himself
to the rectification of "glaring inacc-
racies" as he termed them, but had gon
the length of removing some persons
from the lists on the ground that he ! λ
had his own doubts as to their proper
qualification. The Collector Mr. Twi
points out that the election rules do
not contemplate a free revision of th
lists by the Chairman according to hi
own personal doubts and knowledge, a

Of course not

that such a power in his hands is likely to be much abused. There seems to be some force in Mr. Twigg's argument and as he says, the Chairman can if he wishes to have any inaccuracies in the lists rectified, do it openly and avoid all misunderstanding by causing one of his subordinates to lodge objections under rule 9 or by himself bringing them to the notice of the Collector in view to action being taken under rule 12. If the Collector's view is concurred in by Government, G.O. No. 1886 M. dated 7" November 1896 will have to be cancelled and the Chairman directed to publish the lists as originally delivered to him. The Council's resolution of the 12th December 1896, which practically cancels its previous resolution of 23" November 1896, should also be cancelled, as it is illegal, under section 30(5) of the District Municipalities Act, as pointed out by one of the Councillors.

× Flag. C.

× Flag. B.

× Flag. A.

V.A.
19/2/97

Office

Please put up the Election Rules. They are not in the file. Please see that files are made complete before being sent (up) ~~How~~

S.H.
21/2/97

× Please see G.O. flagged D.

V.A.
22/2/97

Taking up this case at home after reading all these I ~~[illegible]~~. I find the rules not in the file, which I shall have there for to reference when I go there! S.H.

[illegible]
[illegible]

When Mr. Arundel wrote the note the file of G.O. 7.11.96 no 1886 M assumed that the

errors, or some obvious misdescription; ~~which~~ not, as now appears, corrections amounting to actual revision of the names of voters, & their removal from the lists.

We must now cancel the G.O. of Nov. last, explaining that the Govt. was misled & how.

Except plain & obvious clerical ~~mis~~ errors, the Chairman ~~[illegible]~~ sh^d not be recognized as having the power to correct any other mistakes, & Rules 9 & 12 of the Election Rules (G.O. 8/12/90 no 1876 M — flag D) sh^d be strictly followed.

When the G.O. is cancelled the lists must be published as originally received by the Chairman.

The Govt. w^d not have been misled if the Chairman's letter had been submitted thro' the Collector.

S.H. 4/3/97

I agree —

No doubt Mr. Arundel did not notice the fact that the letter had not come through the Collr. — The office should, however, have detected it — This is, as the Sec. says, a point which must be insisted on —

[illegible]
5/3/97

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 3430.M.

From

The Collector of Madura

Order.

Ref. for Cur: **No.** 5546/8 of 96

Dated 23rd December 1896

Received 25-DEC.-1896

Registered

Enclosures 12 as per list

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting with remarks petition from certain members of the Dindigul Municipal Council in re the Voters' lists for the Dindigul Municipality.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1886	m.	7-12-96
	1846	m	30-10-96
	1579	m	16-9-96
	1226	m	7-9-94
	899	m	10-7-93
	25	m	12-1-89
	978	m	28-7-93
	1635	m	15-12-88

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Reference on Current No. 5546 of 1896.
General

Madura Collector's Office,
23rd December 1896.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 3430. M.

From
J. Twigg Esquire,
Collector of
Madura

To
The Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Department,
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for the orders of Government a petition from certain members of the Dindigul Municipal Council, together with enclosures according to the annexed list.

Enclosure I

2. It appears that on 14th October the Council passed a resolution that, as the voters lists prepared under Rule 7 of the Election Rules had been altered by the Chairman before publication, they were illegal.

Enclosure II

N.B. It is most necessary that the sub reps. comns. drawn thro' the Collr. be insisted on. There is a tendency in the last 2 or 3 years to avoid it. The Collr. ~~would~~ It is upon the Collr. we rely to tell us whether the facts are correctly represented & further it is essential that he should know what is going on. S.T.M. 14/1/97

The Chairman addressed Government in a letter (which did not pass through the Collector) dated 14th October, and by Order dated 7th November the Government cancelled the above resolution.

Enclosure III

3. On 23rd November the Council passed another resolution to the effect that the meeting under Rule 10 to consider objections to the lists should be adjourned till orders were received from Government on a letter which it was proposed to send explaining matters.

Enclosure IV

4. On 12th December a Special meeting was held to consider the draft of the said letter, but a Resolution was carried which is practically to the effect that no letter should be sent at all. Hence a deadlock.

Enclosure V

5. The deadlock can be removed readily enough by the cancellation of the resolution of the 23rd November if the Government adheres to the view that the alterations by the Chairman are legal. The petitioners, however, ask that the question may be once more brought before Government, and, as the Chairman's letter of the 14th October did not set out the whole facts, I have complied with their request.

6. The letter of the Chairman No. 255

gives

gives the impression that the alterations made by him are merely corrections of 'glaring inaccuracies' as he terms them but the terms of his questions which were answered in the negative by Government are general and I doubt whether Government intended that its order should carry this general meaning. A long list of alterations discovered and objected to accompanied the petition and for the purposes of this reference I took a few of them and asked the Chairman to inform me if the facts were as represented. It will be seen from his reply dated 15th instant that he removed certain persons from the lists because he had his own doubts as to their house-rent qualification. This will be a sufficient illustration of the petitioners' contention without going further. If this is allowed it means that the Chairman has the power practically to revise the lists before publication – a course which does not seem

Enclosure VI

Enclosure VII

Enclosure VIII

to be contemplated in the Rules, and which gives the Chairman a power which might be abused. It is true that it is easy for any one whose name is struck off, to put in a claim under Rule 9; but if a Chairman can strike off names of his own motion he can also enter names in a similar manner, and it is here that the mischief might arise. It is very seldom that lists are subjected to so severe a scrutiny as in the present case, and unless party-feeling runs high no one is likely to make it his business to check the lists and object to doubtful voters.

7. If it is conceded that the Chairman is not free to revise the lists according to his personal doubts or knowledge, I venture to submit that the order of Government should be made more explicit, so as to show in what cases alterations may and may not be made: and in view of the difficulty of drawing the line I would further respectfully suggest whether it would not be advisable to rule that the Chairman should not alter the lists at all, but should publish them as received by him. To correct errors I would suggest that the Chairman should scrutinize the lists and direct a subordinate to lodge an objection under Rule 9 in the ca of persons believed to have been wrongly included. Persons wrongly excluded by an obvious error might, if necessary, be ordered by the Collector to be entered on the lists under Rule 12 if they did not take steps themselves under Rule 9. In this way the lists would be corrected openly in the view of the Council and misunderstandings like the present would be avoided. 9

8. To conclude, the suggestions I make for the consideration of Government are

(a) To cancel the resolution of 23rd November

(b) To direct that the lists shall now be published as originally received by the Chairman.

Enclosures 9 to 12 are not relevant to my presen reference, but are submitted as they form part of the file.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed^t. Ser^t.,
V. Will.
Collector

Current No. 5546 of 1896
Dat. 14 Genl/12 96

Dindigul 12th December 18

W 13.12

Da

To J. Twigg Esq C.S.
Collector of Madura
Madura

Sir

We have the honor to place before you papers regarding a resolution passed by the Municipal Council on the 23rd November last & to state the following facts.

In accordance with the above resolution Mr. Mensel drafted a letter addressed to Govt. based upon careful research among Municipal Records. This letter and the remarks referred to therein is before you among the above papers.

At the meeting of to day the only business to be transacted was to approve of the said letter to Govt. or to make such alterations in the same as may be found expedient by the Council. The letter was duly read & a proposition made by Mr. Mensel seconded by Mr. P. R. Narayana Sastryal "that the letter of this date "addressed to Govt. together with its "enclosures be approved of by the Council "and forwarded on to Govt. through the "usual channels"

Before Mr. Mengel's proposition was put to the vote Mr. Muthu Naick under the plea of discussing the proposition, made another proposition that "It is unnecessary to send any "letter to Govt."

This proposition was rushed through & carried by the casting vote of the Chairman, Mr. Mengel's proposition having been entirely ignored.

The fact that one of the original proposers of the resolution of the 23rd November last, changing his mind at the last moment, speaks for itself.

We protest against the whole procedure of to days meeting, the proposition passed was directly opposed to that of the 23rd November last & under Section 30 clause 5 "No resolution of the Municipal "Council shall be modified or "cancelled within 3 months after the "passing thereof, except by a resolution "of the Municipal Council supported "by no less than one half of the whole "number of such Municipal Councillors"

As the Council at present consists of eleven Councillors this resolution could not be cancelled except by six of such Councillors. At todays meeting five voted against five, the Chairman giving the casting vote. The resolution was therefore undoubtedly illegal. The fact that the Chairman voted personally and by casting vote in favour of a measure cancelling a resolution containing distinct charges against himself also speaks for itself.

The copy of todays proceedings, which we herewith submit, is misleading & not in accordance with facts. Mr. Mengel's proposition was never put to the vote & therefore was not lost. Mr. Neuthen Naikks' proposition does not appear in the Minute book.

We protest against this treatment most strongly and appeal to you to exercise your power under Section 35 clause 1 to suspend or cancel the resolution of to day and to call for the necessary papers with a view to sending the whole matter up to Govt. with our letter for disposal & final orders together with your remarks.

All we ask for is a fair & impartial hearing & we feel sure that once the papers are placed before yourself & Govt. the necessary enquiries will be instituted.

We have the honor to be

Sir

Your obedient servants

Enclosure No. A

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura.

Reference on Current No. 5546 Genl of 1896.

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

Petition dated 12th December 1896.
from Mr. G. Mengel etc. councillors of
the Dindigul Municipality.

EXTRACT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL HELD ON THE 14TH OCTOBER 1896

* * * *

Claims and objections to the Voters' lists relating to the I, III, IV, and the VIth Wards.

Proposed by M. R. Ry. P. S. Mohamed Magthoom Rowter Avergal that the lists prepared by the Sanitary Inspectors according to Resolution No. I of 27th July 1896, and submitted on the 25th August, were amended by the Chairman on the 5th September 1896 and not pasted in their original state; and being amended by the Chairman against the Election Rules, they are illegal and therefore new lists ought to be prepared for Wards No. I, II, III, IV, V & VI.

Seconded by M. R. Ry. P. R. Narayanasastriar Avergal.

Carried by 5 against 4. M. R. Ry. Moideen Maracaya Rowther Avergal not voting

---

II. Proposed by the Chairman, that the Government be addressed for an authoritative ruling as to whether the Chairman has power to make any corrections in the lists submitted to him by the persons appointed under Rule 7 of the Election Rules before they are published under Rule 8, if he finds any inaccuracy or omission in the lists delivered to him.

Seconded by M. R. Ry. K. Ananthanarayana Aiyer Avergal.

Lost by 4 against 5. Moideen Maracaya Rowter Avergal not voting.

(Signed) T. RAJAGOPAUL,
Chairman.

(True Extract)
Chairman.

GNANARUTHNAGARA PRESS, DINDIGUL—

Enclosure No. I

ENCLOSURE NO.1

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura.

Reference on Current No. 5546 of 1896
Genl

Dated 23rd December 1896.

Subject.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Dindigul dated 14th October 1896

41

1
30 Oct. 96

No 255

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
DINDIGUL.

14th October 1896.

From

M. R. Ry.
T. RAJAGOPAUL NAYUDU GARU
CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
DINDIGUL.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT
FORT SAINT GEORGE

Sir

In submitting herewith, for orders of Government copies of two Resolutions passed by the Council, at a meeting held today for the purpose of deciding claims and objections of voters in connection with the Voters lists, under Rule 10 of the Election Rules, I have the honor to state that the two Sanitary Inspectors of the Municipality were appointed under Rule 7 to submit the lists through the respective Ward Councillors before the 1st of September 1896, being the date fixed by Government, under the said Rule, as per Government Order No. 978 M; Mis: dated 28th July 1893, and that in the lists as submitted, I found glaring inaccuracies, which I corrected, and published the corrected lists in due course, under Rule 8, on the 10th of September 1896. I presume that, with reference to Rule 8 the Chairman has a right to see that the lists are correct, as far as possible by checking them with reference to the tax-registers in the Office and other information available and this was what was done at the Office. If the lists were not scrutinized at the Office, the consequence would be, that persons could become voters and candidates who are not eligible to be such and those could not become voters or candidates, who are eligible to be such. In the absence of any scrutiny at the Office, this could be avoided only if persons choose to apply to the Chairman, under Rule 9 to include their names or exclude those of others.

Further, I think that the intention of Government in laying down, in Rule 7 that the lists prepared should be delivered to the Chairman for publication is evidently to allow of such lists being scrutinized by him as far as possible, and not that he may sign such lists, however incorrect they may be for publication.

At today's meeting, it was not pointed out, that any person was either wrongly included in, or excluded from the lists, but it was maintained by a majority of the Council that the Chairman is bound to publish the lists as prepared by the persons appointed for the purpose, without seeing the accuracy or otherwise of the lists submitted. Even if there be any such inclusion or exclusion, the electorate has had ample opportunity of putting forward claims or objections for the same, as the corrected lists were duly published, under rule 8.

In this connection, I have to mention, though individually, that the proposer of the first proposition was put down in the IV Ward list countersigned by him, as eligible for a candidate on the only ground of his paying an income-tax of Rs. 82; and his name was allowed to stand in the list on the strength of his countersignature. But an objection petition was received that he is not eligible either for a candidate or for a Voter even, on the ground that he does not pay income-tax. This objection petition also was to come along with other objection petitions for disposal, at today's meeting under Rule 10. It appears that he has not paid income-tax for 1895—96 and the assessment for 1896—97 has not yet been finally settled.

Under these circumstances, I respectfully solicit the early orders of Government as to (1) whether the Chairman is bound to publish the lists as prepared and submitted by the persons appointed for the purpose without looking into the correctness or otherwise of them, (2) Whether the lists as published, are illegal and (3) Whether it is necessary to prepare new lists as resolved upon by the Council.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

(Signed) T. RAJAGOPAUL,

Chairman.

GNANAKUTHNAGARA PRESS, DINDIGUL—

Enclosure No. II

ENCLOSURE NO. 2

In a letter

From

The Collector of

Madura.

Reference on Current No 5546 Genl of 1896

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

Copy of letter No. 255 dated 14th October 1896 from the Chairman Municipal Council, Dindigul to Government

2 / 36120 [illegible]

Local and Municipal Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following papers:—

From the Chairman Municipal Council Dindigul dated 14th October 1896 No. 255 submitting Council's Resolutions in connection with the lists of Voters prepared under Rule 7 of the Elections Rules.

ORDER NO. 1886 M. MIS; DATED 7TH NOVEMCER 1896,

The question raised by the Chairman in the last paragraph of his letter read above will be answered in the negative.

2. The Municipal Council's Resolution No. I dated 14th October 1896 which is in excess of the powers conferred on it by law, will be cancelled under section 35 (1) of the District Municipalities Act.

(True extract)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To

THE CHAIRMAN
Municipal Council,
DINDIGUL.
Through the Collector of Madura.

Local and Municipal Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT

Read the following papers:—

From the Chairman, Municipal Council, Dindigul, dated 17th October 1896 No. 258 submitting a copy of the Council's resolution No. I dated 17th October 1896.

From the same officer dated 17th October 96, No. 259 requesting the orders of Government on certain points in regard to election.

ORDER NO. 1846 M; MIS. DATED 30TH OCTOBER 1896

The Municipal Council's proposal to postpone the election for the Vacancy in the 3rd Ward, until fresh lists of electors have been completed is approved.

2. The first question in the Chairman's second letter read above will be answered in the affirmative and the Second in the negative.

(True extract)

(Signed) A. L. HANNY,
30—10—96,
Acting Assistant Secretary
For Chief Secreetary.

To

THE CHAIRMAN
Municipal Council,
DINDIGUL.

GNANABUTHNAGARA PRESS, DINDIGUL—

Enclosure No. III

ENCLOSURE NO·3

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura.

Reference on Current No. 5546 of 1896
Genl

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

Copy of Government Order No. 1886 M.
Mis, dated 7 November 1896.

3
30-12-96

COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL DINDIGUL, HELD ON THE 23RD NOVEMBER 1896 AT 7—30. A. M.

Present:—

M. R. Ry.	T. Rajagopaul Nayudu Garu,	Chairman
	G. Mengel Esquire, ...	Councillor.
	J. W. Short Esquire,	„
„	P. S. Mohamed Magthoom Rowter Avergal,	„
„	S. P. Muthu Naiker Avergal,	„
„	M. Arockiam Pillai Avergal,	„
„	V. S. Pichaimoideen Rowter Avergal,	„
„	V. S. Mohaideen Marakaya Rowter Avergal,	„
„	P. R. Narayana Sastriar Avergal,	„
„	K. Ananthanarayana Iyer Avergal,	„

Proposed by Mr. Mengel that the Meeting held under Rule 10 of the Election Rules, be adjourned till after the Council receive final orders from Government to a letter which the Council think proper to address Government in connection with the Voters' lists now put before the Council, stating clearly what happened and under what circumstances the Council had to pass the Resolution No. I, dated 14th October 1896, and as the same were inaccurately represented to Government by the Chairman, in letter No. 255, the said letter having been a confidential one, sent by the Chairman without the knowledge or the approval of the Council,

Seconded by M. R. Ry. P. R. Narayanasastriar Avergal.

Carried by a majority of 6 against 4 (M. R. Ry. T. Rajagopaul Nayudu Garu, S. P. Muthu Naiker, M. Arockiam Pillai and K. Ananthanarayana Aiyer), dissenting.

Proposed by the Chairman that, in order to avoid delay, the claims and objections be disposed of at this Meeting pending the decision of Government on the letter which the Council want to address to Government.

Seconded by M. R. Ry. K. Ananthanarayana Aiyer Avergal.

Lost by a majority of 6 (Messrs: G. Mengel, J. W. Short, P. S. Mohamed Magthoom Rowter, V. S. Pitchaimoideen Rowther, V. S. Mohaidin Maracaya Rowter and P. R. Narayanasastriar, dissenting) against 4

Proposed by Mr. Short, that Mr. Mengel be requested to prepare the said letter to be addressed to Government by the Council and the same be placed for approval before a Special Meeting of the Council which should be held on or about the 2nd of December at 8 A. M., under article 2; Section 29 of the District Municipal Act and the Chairman be also requested to furnish Mr. Mengel with necessary records connected thereon, on or before the 25th Instant, so that there may be sufficient time to draft and circulate the same letter, a day or two prior to the day of the Special Meeting.

Seconded by M. R. Ry. V. S. Pitchaimoideen Rowter Avergal.

Carried by a majority of 6 Councillors against 3 dissenting. (The Chairman, M. R. Ry. S. P. Muthu Naiker and K. Ananthanarayana Aiyer) and M. R. Ry. M. Arokiam Pillai Avergal not voting.

(Signed) T. RAJAGOPAUL,
Chairman.

(True copy)

Chairman.

[illegible] 96

Enclosure No. IV

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura

IV

Reference on Current No. 5546 Genl of 1896

GNANARUTHNAGARA PRESS, DINDIGUL—

Dated 23rd December 1896.

Subject

Copy of Proceedings of the Municipal Council Dindigul, dated 23rd November 1896.

Copy of the Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Dindigul passed at a meeting held on the 12th December 1896.

—

Present:-

× M. R. Ry. T. Rajagopaul Nayudu Garu chairman
— G. Mengel Esquire
— J. W. Short Esquire
— M. R. Ry. P. S. Mahomed Magthoom Rowter avl
× " S. P. Muthu Naickar avl
× " M. Arokiam Pillai avl
— " V. S. Pichai Mohideen Rowter avl
× " V. S. Mohideen Marakkaya Rowter avl
— " P. R. Narayana Sastriar avl
× " K. Anantanarayana Iyer avl

5 against 5. Chairman using his casting vote

—

Read letter as drafted by Mr G. Mengel.

Proposed by Mr. R. Ry. P. R. Narayana Sastrier avergal :- [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] neutral [illegible]

[illegible] withdraw [illegible]

Chairman:- It is unnecessary to answer this question before a resolution is passed by the Council on the Subject.

Therefore the abovesaid proposal of Mr. R. Ry. P.R. Narayana Sastriar avergal is withdrawn by him.

Proposed by Mr Mengel that the letter of this date, addressed to Government, together with its enclosures, be approved

of

Translation of the tamil portion of the Resolution

Proposed by Mr R Ry P. R. Narayana Sastrial Averg that, if the Chairman should think that there are reasons, to be assigned, immediately ~~or~~ after Sometime, to show that all or any of the facts mentioned in the draft letter proposed to be Submitted to Government are incorrect, and that the question of Submitting the letter under reference should then be Considered, this may be ascertained before the question of Submitting the letter is Considered; that, if the Chairman accedes thereto, this his proposition might be put to vote; and that, should he on the other hand decline or Seem neutral, the Same might be held as withdrawn

(True translation)

For Collector

Madura
23rd December 1896

of by the Council, and forwarded on to Government through the usual channel. Seconded by M. R. Ry. P. R. Narayana Sastriar, avergal Councillor.

Rejected by casting vote, Messrs S. P. Muthu Naickar, M. Arokiam Pillai, V. S. Mohideen Marakkaya Rowter, K. Anantanarayana Iyer and the Chairman voting against the proposition and Mr Mangel, Mr Short, M. R. Ry. P. S. Mahomed Magthoom Rowter avl, M. R. Ry. V. S. Pichai Mohideen Rowter avl and P. R. Narayanasastrier avl, voting in favour of the proposal.

II. Printers' Bill for Rs 12-4-4 for printing the said letter and some of its enclosures:-

Passed by a majority, Messrs S. P. Muthu Naickar, M. Arokiam Pillai ~~and~~ & K. Anantanarayan Iyer and the Chairman, dissenting.

(Sd) T. Rajagopaul
Chairman
12.12.96

(True Copy)

T. Rajagopaul
Chairman

K
21.12.96

Enclosure No. V

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura

Reference on Current No. 5546 Genl of 1896.

Dated 23rd December 1896.

Subject

Copy of Proceedings of the Municipal council Dindigul, dated 12th December 1896.

5
3480 Cw 9.96

REMARKS UPON THE CHAIRMAN'S CORRECTIONS IN THE VOTERS' LISTS OF

WARD NO 1.

THE MARGINAL NUMBERS CORRESPOND WITH THE NUMBERS IN THE ORIGINAL VOTERS' LISTS ATTACHED HERETO.

KATHIRSA ROWTHER PAYS,

Rs. 2—10—0	in	Ward I
„ 4—5—0	in	„ III
„ 7—8—0	in	„ IV
„ 21—8—0	in	„ V

No. 26 and is eligible for the 1st Ward by reason of paying Rs. 2—10—0 in Ward No. I and 4—5—0 in Ward III; He was published as a voter in the 1st, 4th and the 5th Wards in the three previous years; his name has been excluded from Ward No. 1 and allowed to remain in the other 2 wards.

CHINNASAWMY CHETTY, PAYS.

No. 33 Rs. 3 Profession tax and is eligible. He also pays Rs. 3—8—0 house rent in the 1st Ward: he only pays 2—1—0 house tax in the 3rd Ward; he has been erased from the list of the 1st Ward and put into the 3rd without any petition to that effect; his name appears in the 1st Ward in previous years.

M. V. KATHIR MOHIDEEN ROWTHER.

No. 40 Was put on the 1st Ward list by virtue of being assessed Profession Tax Rs. 6; he opposed this and was thereupon struck off the list of voters, his objection was dismissed prior to the date of publication of the voters' lists but was not reinstated; he was a voter in the last year's list.

KANDASAWMY ASARY.

No. 41 Was put in the list as paying Profession Tax; he appealed against this; his tax was reduced to Re. 1 after publication of voters' lists.

SUBBA NAIKEN (Added to list),

Was in the previous year's list; was not added in this year's list but subsequently
put in this year's list by reason of paying Rs. 5 rent for which there are no records to
show that this is the case; the bill collector who is responsible for this addition stated
No. 57 that he did not remember where he obtained his information as regards this man's house
rent; the man in question has made a written statement (enclosure No. 12); he is not eligi-
ble as a voter under this heading though he has a right to vote under other qualifications
which were not entered in the voters' list.

WARD III

THIRUMALAYAN CHETTY.

Was put in the previous three years lists as paying Rs. 8—13—0 house tax; he has
No. 4 been reduced from a candidate to a voter by a reduction in the list of Rs. 4—4—0 in the house
tax being now put down as paying Rs. 4—9—0. The house tax register shows that he
pays Rs. 8—13—0; the Office and the Head Clerk admit *this is correct*.

MUSTAPHA SAHIB.

Was put down in this year's list as paying Rs. 7—11—0 house tax; he was also
put down and published as a voter as paying Rs. 7—11—0 in the previous years. He
No. 41 pays by the house tax register Rs. 7—11—0 and also pays Rs. 3/4 Profession Tax; he is
clearly eligible having been on the list for the last 3 years. But his name is excluded
by the Chairman from the list: he is clearly eligible to vote in the 3rd as well as in the
4th having been on the lists for the last *three years*.

GURUSAWMY NADAR.

Is entered for paying Profession Tax; he has been struck out for appealing
No. 55 against the tax; the tax had been confirmed prior to the date of publication of the lists;
but he has not been put back.

PITCHEY PILLAY.

Put in as paying Profession Tax; he objected and was struck out, but not rein-
No. 79 stated when his tax was confirmed prior to the *publication* of the lists.

KUPPUSAWMY NAIDU.

No. 95 Struck out and not reinstated for the same reasons.

ABDUL KARIM SAHIB.

No. 96 Struck out for same reasons; tax confirmed after date of *publication of the lists.*

GURUSAWMY CHETTY.

No. 98 Struck out for same reasons and not reinstated; tax confirmed 14—9—96.

KANAGA LUCHUMY AMMAL.

Has been corrected to the name of Ramasawmy Chetty the latter having been
No. 99 put in as a voter, the former having been removed as such; Ramasawmy Chetty
is a minor and therefore has no vote; but Kanaga Lutchumy has been on the
previous year's lists as for paying *Income-tax* as well as House Tax.

WARD IV

GOPAULSAWMY CHETTY.

Has been on the previous year's list as a voter; he was put on this year's list,
No. 3 but his name was erased to that of Subramaniyan Chetty who died on 14th
August 1893; the only reason given for this is the Head Clerk's statement that
the name Subramaniyan Chetty was still on the House-Tax register; he did not
take thetrouble to consult the Sanitary Inspector who prepared this year's lists:
the House-Tax register should have been corrected in accordance with petition
No. 392 of 93—94 which was passed at a *meeting of* 9th October 1893.

A. NAYANAR ASARY.

Was put down as a voter in this year's list; he has been a voter for the pre-
No. 21 vious years, his name has been erased in favour of Sankaralingam Asary who
died on 16th December 1889; this correction was made by the Head Clerk for
reasons similar to above No. 3; though the House-tax register should have been
corrected in accordance with petition No. 170 of 93—94 passed at a meeting
held on 9th October 1893.

S. M. SOMASUNDRAM PILLAY.

Was put in the three previous years' lists and also in this year's; he has been
No. 28 erased in favour of S. M. Veerabadra Pillay who died 28—10—91. This correc-
tion was made from the House-Tax register which should have been corrected
in accordance with petition No. 182 dated 93—94 passed at a meeting held on
9th October 1893.

M. RUTHNAGIRI PILLAY.

No. 29 Was put in the three previous years' lists and also in the present list; his name was erased in favour of Ponnusawmy Pillay who died on the 18th November 89; his name should have been corrected in accordance with petition No. 214 of 93—94 passed at the meeting held on the 9th October 93; the shroff in his Office note remarks that there seemed to be no petition presented by the petitioner as far back as 1893—1894, requesting his name to be included as a voter; this is incorrect and the shroff with little trouble could have found out the petition which was duly recorded in the *mis petition book* of 93—94 where all of the above petitions are registered.

S. SUBRAMANY PILLAY.

No 31 Was in the previous list and also in the present one; his name was correctly removed as not qualified; but he is agent to the Zemindar of Pillaymulingy, who should have been put in.

MUTHURAJAN CHETTY.

No. 36 Was in the three previous lists and also in this years; his name has been erased as only paying Rs 2—6—0 tax instead of Rs 4—10—0 as put in the list The House-Tax register clearly shows that he pays Rs 4-8-0 and is therefore eligible.

AVANAMUTHU NADAR.

No. 39 has been on previous lists as well as in the present one; his name has been erased; he is qualified by reason of paying house-tax Rs. 6—4—0 and is therefore clearly eligible.

A. APPAVU PILLAY.

No. 63 was on the previous lists; his name has been erased by reason of paying Rupees 2—10—0 instead of 4—12—0 house-tax; the house-tax register shows that he pays 5—5—0 and is therefore clearly eligible.

D. G. MUTHURAMA PILLAY

No. 82 was in the 3 previous lists and also in the present one; his name has been removed from the 4th ward though he has qualification to vote in the 3rd & the 4th wards

N. OLAGANATHA PILLAI

No. 83 This name has been erased from this year's lists for objecting to pay Profession tax; his petition was disposed of against him after the publication of the lists; he is therefore qualified.

K. PEER MOHIDEEN ROWTHER

No. 104 Appears on the present list as eligible to vote by virtue of being assessed profession tax; he was erased from this list because he objected to pay the tax which has been since cancelled; yet contrary to the Chairman's custom as per other voters reincluded him although his petition No. 153 of 96—97 stood undisposed of until 21st November 1896; ie. two months after the date of publication of the lists.

M. MOHAMED HUSSAN ROWTHER

No. 107 His name is erased for objecting to pay profession-tax Rs. 12—4—0; his petition has since been disposed of against him after the date of publication of the lists; he is eligible, the tax having been confirmed.

S. KANDASAMY ASARY.

No, 109 His name is erased for above reasons; tax has since been confirmed but not reinstated.

A. ROYER PILLAY.

No. 114 The name has been erased for same reasons; tax though confirmed, he has not been reinstated.

SHEIK ROWTHER.

No. 119 Has been excluded from the list though the Sanitary Inspector and the Councillor for this Ward state that he is qualified to vote by reason of paying Rupees 3—8—0 rent.

S. KATHER MOHIDEEN ROWTHER.

No. 120 Was on the lists of 93&95 and also in this year's; the name has been erased from this year's, though qualified to vote; the Sanitary Inspector and the Councillor for this Ward stating that he is duly qualified inasmuch as he does pay the requisite rent.

A. O. S. SHEIK MOHAMED ROWTHER.

No. 121 In this years list; but struck out though the Sanitary Inspector who prepared the list and the Ward Councillor state that he does pay Rs. 3 rent and is therefore eligible to vote.

AVANA NADAR.

No. 123 Was on the 93 & 94 lists and also in the present being qualified by reason of paying house-rent; his name has been struck off though the Sanitary Inspector and the Ward Councillor state that he does pay the rent 3—8—0 stated in this list.

ANNA PILLAI.

No. 126 Was in the listof 93; and now in the present list; has been excluded from the present list as not paying Rs. 3 rent though the land lord admits that he does.

THASUN PILLAY.

No. 127 Succeeds his late father who was in the list of 93; was excluded from the present list; Councillors Messrs: Short and Mugthoom state that he does pay 6 rent and is therefore eligible.

WARD NO 5

RAMASAMY CHETTY.

No. 45 Appears on the present list as eligible by virtue of being assessed profession-tax; he was scored out of the list for objecting to pay the said tax which has since been confirmed; Contrary to the Chairman's custom as per other voters he has re-included him although his petition No. 80 of 96—97 stood undisposed of until 21st November 96 ie. two months after the date of publication.

ESMAIL MOHIDEEN PULAVAR.

No. 74 In this years list assessed Rs. 12 profession tax; his objection petition No. 86 remains still undisposed of; the name is erased for objecting against the tax

VARUSAI MOHIDEEN ROWTHER.

No. 76. In this years list as paying Rs. 6 profession-tax; he objected and his appeal petition No 51 was disposed of against him prior to publication of the lists; he is clearly eligible

NEELAMEGAM CHETTY.

No. 82 Was in the three previous lists as a voter paying Rs. 3—8—0 rent; his name has been erased in this year's list though he occupies the same place he did the past three years; there is nothing to show that he does not pay the rent stated. The Sanitary Inspector who prepared this list still maintains that this man does pay the stated rent.

SINGLI CHETTY.

No. 83 Was in the two previous lists as a voter paying Rs. 3—8—0 rent; his name has been erased in this year's list though he occupies the same place he did the past two years; there is nothing to show that he does not pay the rent stated the Sanitary Inspector who prepared the list still maintains that this man does; pay the stated rent.

WARD NO .6

MUTHYA PILLAI.

No. 12 Has been on the three previous years lists and on the present; his name has been erased and that of his father Muthumayandi pillai who died on 26th November 92 5 years ago put in; the father's name is on the house-tax register; but the son Muthya Pillay has been a voter since 1893 and there is no reason why he should be excluded in favour of his deceased father now.

GOPALUSAWMY CHETTY.

No. 14 Was put in this year's list by the Sanitary Inspector who prepared it; the name has been erased and that of W. Selvyan Chetty substituted, a dead man.

SUBBYA KONAN.

No. 32 Was in last year's list and in this year's as paying house-tax Rs. 7—3—0; he has been erased as the name is not in the tax Register; he is in any case eligible as he pays Rs. 9 profession tax; this man is the Municipal dust cart contractor.

No. 396 and 429 D on the profession-tax Register N. Vellyauasary and Mayandya Pillay who are assessed profession-tax one of whom has already paid the said tax on demand, has not been included at all in the lists of voters; they are eligible for inclusion in this Ward as residing in the Ward in question.

Municipal Office }
Dindigul }
12—12—96 }

Councillors.

Gnanaruthnagara Press Dindigul—12—96.

Enclosure No VI

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura

Reference on Current No 5546/Genl. of 1896.

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

Remarks upon the Chairman's corrections in the Voters' Lists of certain wards.

Remarks
as per enclosures
No 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 & 11.
the last enclosures
being the original
voter lists in
possession of the
Chairman

VI

6/8630/4-9/96

Copy of Communication R.C. No 5546/Genl of '96 dated 14th December 1896, from the Collect of Madura to the Chairman Dindigul Municipal Council.

I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to inform me

(i) whether it is a fact that after delivery of the lists of voters to the Chairman under Rule 7 of the "Rules for the Conduct of Elections by Wards", a large number of persons entered as qualified by payment of profession tax were struck off the lists because they had appealed against the tax and that of these, some, e.g. No 104 of Ward No 4 and No 45 of Ward No 5, after confirmation of the tax were re-entered on the lists, while others in whose cases the tax was also confirmed, e.g. No 40 of Ward No 1 and Nos 83, 107, 109, 114 of Ward No 4 were not so re-entered.

(ii) whether it is a fact that Nos 119 and 120 were struck out from the list of Ward No 4 and if so on what grounds.

I am not now asking for any explanation. It is sufficient for my present purpose to know the facts, and I hope that you will be able to send a reply by return of post.

Madura
23rd December 1896

Srinivasachari
For Collector

Ow
mao

Enclosure No. VII

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura

Reference on Current No 5546/Genl of 1896

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

Copy of this office letter R.O.C. No. 5546/Genl of 96 dated 14th December 1896 to the Chairman Dindigul Municipal Council.

[illegible] 986

1896.
DINDIGUL
MUNICIPAL OFFICE.

From,
M. R. Ry.
T. RAJAGOPAUL NAYUDU GARU
CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
DINDIGUL.

To,
The Collector of
Madura

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
17 DEC. 1896
MADURA

Dated 15th
Despatched 16th } December 1896
Received

Enclosure. 1

Reference: This/Your Office No

VIII

Sir,

With reference to your R. on. C. No 5346/gl of 96, dated 14th December 1896, I have the honour to state that it is true that persons who have been assessed to Arts tax and who have put in petitions objecting to their liability to the payment of the same have been excluded from the voters' lists. I understand clauses (b) & (c) of Section 3 of the Election Rules refer only to persons who are paying the taxes mentioned therein and not to persons who are simply assessed to the same. Similarly all persons that had put in objection petitions were excluded from the lists of the last year also and no objection whatever, was then raised.

No. 104 of Ward No IV was not re-entered after the confirmation of the tax, but was allowed to stand on the list itself as no objection petition was received before the publication of the lists, his objection-petition having been received on 15.9.96 and the date of the publication of the lists having been 10.9.96.

No. 45 of Ward No V is not retained in the list but has been removed, not on the ground of his having objected to Arts t but on the ground of his not having the necessary property qualification. But the reference is evidently to No 72 Ramasawmy chetty in the V ward list. His name was not re-entered after the confirmation of the tax; but it was allowed to stand on the list, though he had put in an objection petition against Arts tax, as he was paying income tax, which fact however, was, by an oversight,

oversight, omitted in the list.

In the case of No 40 of Ward No I the tax was confirmed on 8.9.96 only subsequent to the corrections made by me in the lists on 5.9.96 and after the lists had been given over to be fair copied for publication. And hence, it rightly remained struck off.

Nos 83, 107, 109 and 114 were not re-entered in the lists as their taxes were reduced or confirmed, as the case may be, subsequent to the publication of the lists. Two of these have already come forward with their claims and if they are eligible, they can be included by the Council. In no case whatever, have I re-entered names after the publication of the lists. Nor have I, under the rules, any power to do so.

With reference to the house-rent qualification involved in Nos 119 & 120 of ward No IV, I have the honour to mention that in 1893 when L. C. Miller Esquire was

Chairman of this Council, there were considerable difficulties thrown in the way of the completion of the lists, especially of the IV ward, by claims and objections under clause (f), of Section 3 of the Election Rules, or in other words, by the abuse of the said house-rent qualification; and there were, therefore, appeals to the Collector, the lists had to be prepared twice over and thus considerable delay caused in the completion of the lists. Now, as regards Nos 119 & 120, as well as some others, I had my own doubts as to the truth of their house-rent qualification and in order to avoid the difficulties referred to above, I removed these from the lists so that they may, if their claims be true, come forward and establish them before the Council, under Section 9 of the Election Rules. Further it is far more convenient to leave them to establish their claims before the Council than to expect others

to

to negative their claims under the said rules. Besides, No 119 was not in the previous year's list and No 120 was excluded from the last year's list. It is also very significant that neither of these came forward to establish his claims by putting in claim-petitions under rule 9.

As some elections have to take place shortly in the II, III and the IV wards, I took particular care in checking these lists with a view to avoid all difficulties. That such difficulties arose in 1893, will appear from copy of a letter, herein enclosed, from the then Chairman, Mr. L. C. Miller, to the then Collector, Mr. E. Turner.

In this connection I would mention that no objection whatever was raised to my corrections in the lists last year. But, to my surprise, this year, some of the Councillors denied my right to amend the lists (Vide Resolution No I, dated 11th October 1896) and as the matter was urgent, I made a reference to Government direct, instead of through the usual channel, with the result that the Resolution of the Council was cancelled as ultravires. Most of these Councillors now shift ground and go into the details of the amendments made by me. The correctness or otherwise of my amendments could have been very well discussed and disposed of by the Council, persons dissatisfied at the decision of the Council having the right of appeal to you under Section 12 of the Election Rules. Instead of proceeding in this constitutional manner, some of the Councillors want to make a reference to Government on the score of inaccurate representations on my part.

A few words might be expected of me as to the origin of the opposition in the Council referred to above; but as you do not want an explanation from

me

me, I have, for the present, confined myself to answering the questions raised in the letter under reply, and shall send, later on, a memo, if necessary, showing distinctly the grounds of justification of all that I have done in connection with the voters' lists.

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most obedt. Servant

J Mujizopal.
Chairman

15.12.96

Enclosure No. VIII

In a letter

From
The Collector of
Madura.

Reference on Current No. 5546/genl of 1896

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

Letter from the Chairman, Municipal council, Dindigul to the Collector of Madura, dated 15th December, 1896.

Memo to accompany the list of papers submitted to the Collector as per his endorsement No. 634/10-4-93.

By the Council's Resolution No. 2/24.1.93 the 2 Sanitary Inspectors, the 2 Bill Collectors, the Mortuary clerk and the Shroff were appointed to prepare the lists of electors and the ward Councillors were requested to carefully correct them.

2. Unlike the lists of other wards the list relating to the 4th ward was subjected to unusual corrections, additions, and omissions as will be evidenced from perusing the original and the revised register of voters herewith forwarded.

On the 13th February last P. S. Mohamed Mokthum Rowtan, Son of M. R. Ry. Pichai Moitheen Rowtan avl who is an elected councillor for the 4th ward, wrote to the Chairman inquiring certain facts in connection with a vacancy of a seat in the elected members for the 4th ward and expressing his intention to contest it.

3. On a reply being sent to him that there was then no vacancy and no date was fixed for election he caused a nomination in his favour as a candidate to be submitted on the 19th idem.

4. Within 3 weeks from the 9th February last when the lists of voters were affixed as required by Rule 8, 38 applications were received from the 4th ward praying for the their claims to be registered as voters of that ward. These applications were intended to be circulated to all the Councillors and disposed of by the Council. But Mr Pichai Moothan Rowthar, who was the Councillor of the ward under notice, wrote and asked to send the applications to him for enquiry and report. At his request they were sent to him with letter No: $\frac{234}{8.3.93}$. A reminder No: $\frac{237}{10.3.93}$ was sent asking him to expedite

the

the return of the applications. He replied that he wanted to retain them sometime longer. After all they were delivered by him at the meeting held on the 13th March 1893 when, as they were not circulated to the other members, it was resolved to refer them to a select committee consisting of 3 Councillors for making a thorough enquiry and report. This was no doubt because Mr Pichai Moothan Rowtar was an interested party as his son had already expressed his intention to contest the vacancy at the ensuing election. The special meeting for disposing of them on the committee's report was posted to the 16th March under a misapprehension of Rule No 10. So a meeting was called for the evening of the previous day with a view simply to conform to the rules. The notice circulated for this meeting was duly put before the Council and recorded and 9 of the Councillors attended.

5. It is not understood why Mr Pichai Mooithem Rowtar had retained with him certain written statements said to have been taken by him on the 10th March 1893 from some of the petitioners till the 10th current when he brought them with him to the meeting and delivered to the presiding councillor with a covering letter. The present appeal petitioner is his eldest son. It will not be, I think, out of place here to mention that in most of the cases Mr Pichai Mooithem Rowtar's report on the applications differed from the committee's report and statements taken by them on the applications from respectable residents, e.g. Mis: No: 237 & 257. In

these

these cases the ward Councillor reports in writing that he ascertained from R. P. Vadakannu Pillai, 1st class Hospital assistant of the local Dispensary and others that the applicants were not paying 3 Rs rent whereas from the written statements obtained on the petition itself from the said R. P. Vadakannu Pillai by the committee, it is clear that they have been paying more than 3 Rs rent and the committee's report is against the ward councillor's recommendations.

6. In this way the 38 claims were thoroughly enquired into and reported and 29 of them were upheld by the Council and 9 rejected.

7. The time allowed to the Collector by Rule No: 12 is one

month from the 15th March 1893.

8. The election of a Councillor for the 4th ward has been fixed by the Council for the 24th current and all the preliminary proceedings have been duly conducted. Hence it is requested that the revised Register of electors may be returned so as to reach me on or before the 22nd current so as to enable me to prepare the necessary ballot-papers, &c—.

(Signed) Leslie C. Miller

Chairman

Municipal office }
14th April 1893 }
Dindigul }

(True Copy)

Chairman

15·12·96

D. M.
Memo of 14.4.93

Enclosure to
Chairman's letter
No 2
14.4.93

---

facts. The election of a Councillor for the 4th ward having been fixed for the 24 inst I request that the matter may be treated as urgent.

(Initialled) L. C. M.
14.4.93

(True Copy)

Chairman

L
15.12.96

Enclosure No. IX

In a letter

From

The Collector of Madura

Reference on Current No 5546/genl of 1896

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

Copy of letter No 2 dated 16th April 1893 from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Dindigul, to the Collector of Madura with copy of the memo.

1893

Dindigul

Municipal office

From

Leslie C. Miller Esquire
Chairman
Municipal Council
Dindigul

To

The Collector of Madura
(Through the Sub-Collector)

Dated 14th
Despatched 14th } April 1893
Received

No 2

Enclosure: one bundle containing (62) Sixtytwo papers

Reference: Your Endt No: 634/10.4.93

Subject

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith the records called for in the above with a brief and a memo explaining facts

---

No 259

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
DINDIGUL.
17th October 1896.

From

M. R. Ry.
T. RAJAGOPAUL NAYUDU GARU
CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
DINDIGUL.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT
FORT SAINT GEORGE

Sir

In continuation of this Office No. 255 dated 14th October 1896, I have the honor to solicit orders of Government on the following points.

(1) Whether in case the limit of 35 days elapsing, in consequence of the Council taking objection to the lists published under Rule 8 of the election Rules in the manner pointed out in the letter quoted above, a meeting may be held to hear the objections and claims on the said lists, if these lists are upheld by Government.

(2) Whether a pending election should be postponed until after new lists are prepared and completed as now resolved upon by the Council while there is time enough to admit of an election being held with the lists of the year previous that still continue to be in operation. First, with reference to query (1) I have the honor to state, that the lists of electors for this year were published in accordance with Rule 8 of the Election Rules on the 10th Ultimo and the period of 35 days fixed as a limit for the Council to hear claims and objections under Rule 10 elapses by the 15th Instant; & I regret the necessity for this second reference to Government. If the Council had decided the claims and objections that were before them when they met on the 14th Instant, pending reference to Government for orders, as to the legality or otherwise of my corrections in the lists, the matter would have become less

complex, and the points on which the orders of Government might have to be solicited would have been fewer. But the majority of 5 Councillors that voted against my proposed reference of the doubt to Government for an authoritative ruling included two Councillors father and son both of whom were and especially the latter, the proposer himself of the proposition was directly interested in declaring the lists to be illegal as an objection petition against the latter in respect of his qualification both as a voter and a candidate was to considered at that meeting along with other petitions duly circulated among all the Councillors. If the petition had been allowed to be disposed of by the Council, the possibility would have been lost, of his standing as a candidate at an election to be held by the month of February next, when the period of his present time of Office expires.

Next, as regards query (2) I have the honour to state, that one of the Councillors having resigned and his resignation having been accepted on the 8th Instant, a meeting of the Council was held to day under Rule 16 to fix a day for an election towards filling up the vacant seat. The Majority of the Council, have resolved upon soliciting sanction of Government to defer the election until fresh lists shall have been completed (vide copy of Councils Resolution submitted for orders of Government in this Office No. 258 dated 17th October 1896).

In this connection I have the honour to mention that the lists of the year previous continue to be in operation till the 15th November 1896 and that if the election be ordered to be deferred as resolved upon by the majority of the Council, the seat will have to be vacant for an undefinitely long time which would naturally be required for going through the process of the preparation and the completion of the lists de novo.

I therefore respectfully solicit the orders of Government on the subject and submit that if the Government is pleased to order that the vacancy may be filled up according to the old lists without waiting for the completion of the new lists, the old ones now in force be declared to be in operation until fresh lists are completed.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

(Signed) T. RAJAGOPAUL,

Chairman.

(True copy)

Chairman.

GNANARUTHNAGARA PRESS, DINDIGUL—

Enclosure No. X

ENCLOSURES NO ~~12812~~

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura

Reference on Current No. 5546 genl of 1896

Dated 23rd December 1896.

Subject

Copy of letter No 259 dated 17th October 1896 from the chairman, municipal Council, Dindigul. to Government

10
363064 786

Copy of memorandum made on voters' lists for 1893 by Mr. T. Rajagopaul Naidu then Councillor as against the Rev. Dr. Chester, Chairman delegate on the 14—9—93

The lists as prepared show to say the least of it great laxity on the part of those who prepared them and clause F of Section 3 of Election Rules bas been abused:—some persons that are not eligible are included and others who are eligible omitted; although it has been hitherto the practice to send all papers prepared by subordinates to Ward Councillors for scrutiny before they are taken to the Chairman and although I requested the Chairman delegate to circulate before publication, lists of electors to Ward Councillors for scrutiny yet he was not kind enough to do so. Especially after what had taken place with regard to the preparation of these lists last time it would have been better if they had been subjected to proper scrutiny

(Signed) T. RAJAGOPAUL,
Councillor.

திண்டுக்கல் டவுன் 1-வது வார்டில் குடியிருக்கும் சுப்பநாயக்கன் எழுதிக்கொடுத்த ஸ்டேட்மெண்டு.

எனக்கு முதலாவது வார்டில் வீடு இருக்கிறது. அதில் நானே குடியிருக்கிறேன். அது எனக்குச்சொந்தம். வாடகைக்கு விட்டால் மூன்று ரூபாயிக்குமேலே கிடைக்கும். நான் வீட்டுவரி ரூபாய் 2—5—0 கொடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிறேன்.

(Signed) SUBBYANAYUDU.

Written statement taken before us on the 29th November 96 at 10 20 A. M.

(Signed) G. MENGEL.
(Signed) J. W. SHORT.
(Signed) P. S. MOHAMMAD MUGTHOOM
Councillors.

(Signed) SHUNMUGAM PILLAI
Bill Collector.

29th November 1896

(True Copies)

Councillors.

Enclosure No. XI

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura

Reference on Current No. 5546 genl of 1896

Dated 23rd December 1896.

Subject

Copy of memorandum made on voters lists for 1893 by Mr. Ry. T. Rajagopaul Nayudu Garu, Councillor.

11
56, 30 (a) 956

No.

MUNICIPAL OFFICE
DINDIGUL, 12-12—1896

From

THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL
DINDIGUL.

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO THE GOVERNMENT
FORT ST. GEORGE

SIR,

With reference to the Council's resolution of the 14th October (Enclosure No. 1) and the confidential letters from the Chairman to you, of the 14th and the 17th October (Enclosures 2 & 3) with your replies to the same (Enclosures No. 4 & 5) while admitting, that the Chairman has every right to correct undoubted inaccuracies in voters' lists, the Council cannot admit, and feel sure that you will agree in this respect, that the Chairman has the right under the cover of making corrections, to score out the names of voters that are distinctly eligible and to add the names of persons that are known to have been dead for some years:—

For the purpose of putting the state of affairs to you clearly, the Council send you with this letter, the lists of voters for Wards 1—6 (enclosures No. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 & 11) together with the Council's remarks upon the various so called "glaring inaccuracies"—these corrections being signed by the Chairman in blue;—The remarks are the result of a very careful research among the Municipal records of the past three years and everything stated in these remarks can be verified by Municipal records.

The Council desire to point out certain inconsistencies with regard to the Chairman's corrections as related to the recently imposed profession tax. The Chairman has thought fit to score out names of persons who are qualified to vote by reason of being assessed for Profession Tax, his reason for doing this, being that the parties in question have sent in objection petitions against the assessment. In the majority of cases thus scored out or erased by the Chairman, the tax had been confirmed prior to the publication of voters' lists; the Chairman, although he disallowed the names of objectors, did not think fit to add these names after the tax had been confirmed.

The Council has the honor to submit that until a petition has been disposed of, the petitioner has a perfect right to vote and the fact that a person petitions against the imposition of Profession tax does not disbar him from voting so long as such petition remains undisposed of:—

In two instances (vide remarks, ward 5; No 72 and Ward 4; No. 104) the Chairman scores out the name of a voter for petitioning against Profession Tax, disposes of the petition after the date of publication of the voters' lists and reinstates the petitioner upon the list as a voter prior to the disposal of his petition quite contrary to his manner of dealing with other voters. In case No. 104, the tax has been cancelled by the Council and yet the Chairman who previously had scored out the name, reinstated this man as a voter, although he had no other qualification.

Again the Chairman has in instances where persons have a right to vote in more than one Ward by reason of possessing property qualification as allowed by Rule 7, thought fit to remove such persons as voters from the lists of one or more wards in which lists their names have stood for years, with nothing to show that this has been done at the request of such persons—vide remark No. 26; Ward No. I.

In other instances the Chairman has excluded the names of persons qualified to vote under Sec. 3; Clause *b* of *Election Rules* although such voters have sent in no petition whatever against assessment of the Tax.

Further—Vide remark Ward I—No. 5—the name of a person was included in the list as being qualified to vote by reason of paying Rs. 5—0—0 House rent; this person Vide enclosure No. 12—admits that the house in question is his own property and that he is letting it for Rs. 2—8—0; he is therefore disbarred under this heading; this name was inserted by the Bill-Collector who stated that he did not remember where he obtained this information after the lists had been prepared by the Sanitary Inspectors and countersigned by the Ward Councillor.

What the Council now complain of is very much the same as what the present Chairman complained of in 1893 while a Councillor—vide copy of his complaint written on the back of voters' lists of 1893—1894; Enclosure No. 13:—Had the Chairman thought fit to circulate a memorandum to the Ward Councillors pointing out these corrections and his reasons, the lists would in all probability have been disposed of without reference to Government. The Council have also the honor to point out that claims and objection petitions presented under rule No. 9 of Election Rules in connection with the present voters' lists have not, as is usual, been referred to the respective Ward Councillors for scrutiny and remarks prior to their disposal by the Council; but the Chairman contrary to custom referred such petitions to two Ward Councillors M. R. Ry. K. Ananthanarayana Iyer Avergal M. R. Ry. S. P. Muthu Naiker Avl. for disposal the said Ward Councillors being the Chairman's supporters.

The Council therefore submit that the voters' lists as they now stand, have been illegally, prepared and with this explanation, feel sure that Government will see the force of ordering fresh lists under proper scrutiny to be made. If Government are pleased to maintain that the Chairman has a right to include names of dead persons as voters and exclude qualified voters, the Council respectfully ask Government to explain the intention of Clause 3 of Sec. 32; District Municipalities Act of 1884 and rules 10 and 20 of "Election Rules".

The Council has the honor to represent that under the above rulings the Chairman has taken upon himself the duties of the Council.

It may interest Government to know that it is common knowledge that the Chairman intends to contest Ward III with a view of acquiring a continued seat as Chairman; the Chairman's term as Councillor expires on the 30th April next: Mr. Subbyan Chettyar's term as Councillor for Ward III expires on the same date.

Mr. Subbayan Chettyar has been induced to send in his resignation as a Councillor although he had only a few months more to run, his resignation having been accepted by the Collector of Madura.

The Chairman intends to contest the vacancy thus created by Mr. Subbyan Chetty and if successful will be allowed under existing rules to remain Chairman for a further term of three years; that this is not the intention of Goverment is demonstrated in d,1-Section 9 of the Bill to amend Madras District Municipal Act recently passed by the Local Govt. and now awaiting sanction of the Supreme Council; this Section reads as follows:—

"In order to be qualified to be appointed a Municipal Councillor, a person must" "not be a Municipal Councillor or an Officer or servant holding Office under this Act"; it is therefore, the Council submit, clearly the intention of Government to prevent an occurrence of this nature.

The Chairman has not the confidence of the Council and the only way of retaining his seat is by taking advantage of the defects of the present Act. It is as well to point out that, in this instance, at the moment the Collector accepted the resignation of Mr. Subbyan Chettyar, Councillor for Ward No. 3, the Chairman convened a Special Meeting for the purpose of fixing an early date for the election of the said Ward and in his confidential and special letter No. 259—Vide Enclosure No. 3—made a special request to Government that the election should be fixed to take place without loss of time upon the then existing voters' lists and the whole intention presumably being (1) to have the election completed prior to the expiration of the Chairman's term of Office; (2) to have the election completed prior to the introduction of the New Act; (3) to have the election completed in such a way so as to escape the necessity of putting himself up for election by the Council, well knowing that the Council are unwilling to re-elect him as Chairman.

The Council therefore appeal to Government that the election for Ward No. 3 be postponed until the expiry of the present Chairman's term of Office or to pass a special order prohibiting any Councillor to stand as a candidate for the said Ward; the fact of one or two vacancies occurring does not in any way interfere with the business of the Municipality.

12—12—96
MUNICIPAL OFFICE
DINDIGUL

Councillors.

GNANARUTHNAGARA PRESS, DINDIGUL—

Enclosure No. XII

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura

Reference on Current No $\frac{5546}{genl}$ of 1896

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

Draft letter from the Municipal Council, Dindigul to Government

12 / S 30 dec 96

List of enclosures to letter Ref: on Current No. $\frac{5546}{Genl}$ of 96 dated 23 December 1896 from the Collector of Madura to the Secretary to Government Local and Municipal Department, Madras

No	Subject of paper	No. of pap
A.	Petition dated 12th December 1896 from Mr. G. Mengal etc Councillors of the Dindigul Municipality.	1
I	Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council Dindigul, dated 14th October 1896	1
II.	Copy of letter No. 255 dated 14th October 1896 from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Dindigul, to Government	1.
III.	Copy of Government Order No. 1886 M. Mis. dated 7th November 1896	1
IV.	Copy of Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Dindigul dated 23rd November 1896.	1
V.	Copy of Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Dindigul. dated 12th December 1896.	1
VI.	Remarks upon the Chairman's corrections in the Voters lists of certain wards	1
VII	Copy of this office letter R. & C. No $\frac{5546}{Genl}$ of 1896 dated 14th December 1896 to the Chairman, Municipal Council, Dindigul.	1
VIII.	Letter from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Dindigul, to the Collector of Madura, dated 15th December 1896	1.
IX.	Copy of letter No. 2 dated 14th April 1893 from the Chairman Municipal Council, Dindigul to the Collector of Madura with copy of the memo.	2.
X.	Copy of letter No. 259 dated 17th October 1896 from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Dindigul to Government	1

3197

Copy of Memorandum made on Voters lists for 1893 by 1

M.R.Ry T. Rajagopaul Nayudu Garu Avargal Councillor

1- Draft letter from the Municipal council. Dindigul to Government.

Madura
23rd December 1896

Fwd

For collector

Enclosure No 13

In a letter

From

The Collector of
Madura

Reference on Current No. 5546 Genl of 1896

Dated 23rd December 1896

Subject

List of enclosures.

13
3430 th. 9/96

Local & Munl. (1897) Department

CURRENT No. 834 M

Order

From M. R. Ry
T. Rajagopaul Nayudu
Garu
Chairman
Municipal Council
Dindigul

No. 401

Dated 23-2-97
Received 24-2-1897
Registered 24-2-1897
Enclosures 6 10
Spare copies

24 FEB 1897

SUBJECT.

Copies of correspondence between this office and the Collector of Madura, in connection with the Voters' lists – enclosing for consideration of Government along with the reference made by that officer.

Ref

Where is the previous paper on the subject? last in circulation?

8/3

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Municipal office
Dindigul, 23rd February.

No: 401

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 834 M

From

M. R. Ry.
T. Rajagopaul Nayudu Gar
Chairman
Municipal Council
Dindigul

To

The Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal
Department
Fort Saint George
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose herewith, for the consideration of Government along with the reference made by the Collector of Madura, copies of correspondence between

etween the said officer and myself in connection with the voters' lists, as I venture to believe that these will throw much light on the Subject.

Since I addressed the Collector last one seat in the 2nd ward has already fallen vacant and another in the 4th ward is to fall vacant four days hence. Thus the number of seats vacant in the Council in the course of a few days will be three.

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

Mayingopaul
Chairman
23-2-97

K
23.2.97

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

1897.

ENCLOSURE NO 1

In a letter

FROM

The Chairman,
Municipal Council
Dindigul.
MADURA DISTRICT.

No. 401

Dated 23-2-97

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
24 FEB 97
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT.

Letter from the Collector of Madura, dated 14th December 1896 - calling for information in connection with some numbers in the Voters' lists

1
834 M of 1897

Madura Collector's off
District Magistrate's

Dated 14th December 1896.

R.C. No 5546/G1 of 96.

From

The Collector
District Magistrate of
Madura

To

The Chairman
Dindigul Municipal Council

Sir,

I have the honour to request that you will be good enough to inform me

i Whether it is a fact that, after delivery of the lists of voters to the Chairman under rule 7 of the "Rules for the conduct of elections by wards, a large number of persons entered as qualified by payment of professional

rofessional tax, were struck off e lists because they have appealed gainst the tax and that, of these, some, E.g, no 104 of Ward No 4 and No 45 of Ward No 5, after confirmation of the tax were re-entered on the lists, while others in whose cases the tax was also confirmed, E.g, No 40 of Ward No 1 and Nos 83, 107, 109, 114 of Ward No 4 were not so re-entered.

ii Whether it is a fact that Nos 119 and 120 were struck out from the list of Ward No 4 and, if so, on what grounds.

I am not now asking for any explanation. It is sufficient for my present purpose to know the facts and I hope that you will

be

be able to send a reply by return of post.

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) C. Subrahmania Aiyar
For Collector

(True Copy)

T Muyingopaul
Chairman
23-2-97

22-2-97

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

1897.

ENCLOSURE **NO** II.

In a letter

FROM

The Chairman,
Municipal Council
Dindigul.
MADURA DISTRICT.

No. 401

Dated 23-2-97

SUBJECT.

Reply to No I - with one enclosure — referred to in para 7 of this letter - in reply

2/824 M of 1897

No 2 [illegible]
with 1 enclosure [illegible]
[illegible]

1896.
DINDIGUL
MUNICIPAL OFFICE.

From,
M. R. Ry.
T. RAJAGOPAUL NAYUDU GARU
CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
DINDIGUL.

To,
The Collector of
Madura.

No. 330

Dated 15th
Despatched 16th } December 1896
Received

Enclosure 1

Reference: This/Your *Office No.*

Sir,

With reference to your R.on.C. No $\frac{5346}{96}$ of 96, dated 14th December 1896, I have the honor to State that it is true that persons who have been assessed to Arts tax and who have put in petitions objecting to their liability to the payment of the same have been excluded from the voters' lists. I understand clauses (b) & (c) of Section 3 of the Election Rules refer only to persons who are paying the taxes mentioned therein and not to persons who are simply assessed to the same. Similarly all persons that had put in objection petitions were excluded from the lists of the last year also and no objection whatever, was then raised.

2. No 104 of ward No IV was not re-entered after the confirmation of the tax but was allowed to stand on the list itself, as no objection petition was received before the publication of the list, his objection petition having been received on 15-9-96 and the date of the publication of the list having been 10.9.96.

No 45 of ward No V is not retained

in

in the list but has been removed not on the ground of his having objected to Arts tax, but on the ground of his not having the necessary property qualification. But the reference is evidently to No 72 Ramasawmy Chetty in the V ward list. His name was not re-entered after the confirmation of the tax; but it was allowed to stand on the list though he had put in an objection petition against Arts tax, as he was paying income tax which fact, however, was by an oversight, omitted in the list.

3. In the case of No 40 of Ward No I the tax was confirmed on 8.9.96 only subsequent to the corrections made by me in

the

e lists on 5-9-96 and after
e list had been given over
be fair copied for publication,
nd hence it rightly remained struck
off.

Nos 83, 107, 109 and 114 were not
reentered in the list as their
taxes were reduced or confirmed,
as the case may be, subsequent
to the publication of the lists.
Two of these have already come
forward with their claims and,
if they are eligible, they can be
included by the Council. In
no case whatever have I reentered
names after the publication
of the lists. Nor have I, under
the Rules, any power to do so.

With reference to the
houserent qualification involved
in Nos 119 & 120 of ward No IV, I
have the honor to mention
that

that in 1893, when L. C. Miller
Esquire was Chairman of the
Council, there were considerable
difficulties thrown in the
way of the completion of the
lists especially of the IV ward
by claims and objections under
clause (f) of Section 3 of the
Election Rules, or in other words
by the absence of the said
houserent qualification; and
there were, therefore, appeals to
the Collector, the lists had to
be prepared twice over and
thus considerable delays
caused in the completion
of the lists. Now, as regards
Nos 119 & 120 as well as some
others, I had my own doubts
as to the truth of their
house-rent qualification and
in order

order to avoid the difficulties
eferred to above, I removed
se from the lists so that
they may, if their claims be
true, come forward and
establish them before the
Council under Section 9 of
the Election Rules. Further
it is far more convenient to
leave them to establish their
claims before the Council
than to expect others to negative
their claims under the said
rules. Besides, No 119 was not
in the previous year's list and
No 120 was excluded from the
last year's list. It is also
very significant that neither
of these came forward to
establish his claims by
putting in claim petitions
under rule 9.

As some elections
have

have to take place shortly in
the II, III and the IV wards, I took
particular care in checking
these lists with a view to avoid
all difficulties. That such
difficulties arose in 1893, will
appear from copy of a letter,
herein enclosed, from the
then Chairman Mr L. C. Miller
to the then Collector Mr E. Turner.

In this connection, I
would mention that no
objections whatever was raised
to my corrections in the
lists last year. But, to my
surprise, this year, some of
the Councillors denied my
right to amend the lists (Vide
Resolution No I dated 14th October
1896) and as the matter was
urgent, I made a reference
to

Government which instead
through the usual channel,
with the result that the Resolution
of the Council was cancelled
as ultra vires. Most of these
Councillors now shift ground
and go into the details of
the amendments made by
me. The correctness or otherwise
of my amendments could
have been very well discussed
and disposed of by the Council,
persons dissatisfied at the
decision of the Council having
the right of appeal to you
under Section 12 of the
Election Rules. Instead of
proceeding in this constitutional
manner, some of the Councillors
want to make a reference
to Government on the score
of

of inaccurate representation
on my part.

A few words might be
expected of me as to the origin
of the opposition in the
Council referred to above,
but as you do not want
an explanation from me,
I have, for the present,
confined myself to answering
the questions raised in the
letter under reply and
shall send, later on, a memo
if necessary showing
distinctly the grounds of
justification of all that I
have done in connection
with the voters' lists.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
(Signed) I. Rajagopaul
Chairman.

(True Copy)
I Rajagopaul
Chairman

22.2.97

23.2.97

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

189 .

ENCLOSURE NO 1 to

In a letter letter No 330/15-12-96

FROM

The Chairman,
Municipal Council
Dindigul.
MADURA DISTRICT.

No. 401

Dated 23-2-97

SUBJECT.

Copy of a letter from L. C. Miller Esquire to E. Turner Esquire, with a memo — Enclosure to letter No 330/15-12-96 —

3/884 M of 1897

1893

Dindigul
Municipal office

From
Leslie C. Miller Esqu
Chairman
Municipal Council
Dindigul

To

The Collector of
Madura
(through the Sub-Collecto

Dated 14" }
despatched 14" } April 1893
Received }

No 2

Enclosure, one bundle containing (62) Sixty Two papers.

Reference:- Your Endt No 634/10.4.93

Subject

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith the records called for in the above with a list and

a

a memo explaining facts. The election of a councillor for the 4th ward having been fixed for the 24th current, I request that the matter may be treated as urgent.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Sd) L. C. Miller
Chairman

(True Copy)

K
23.2.97

Chairman
23-2-97

D. L.

Memo of 14-4-93

Enclosure to
Chairman's letter
No 2
14-4-93

4/884 M of 1897

Memo to accompany the list
of papers submitted to the
Collector as per his endorse-
ment No: 634/10-4-93.

By the Council's Resolution
No 2/24.1-93 the 2 Sanitary Inspectors
the 2 Bill collectors, the
Mortuary clerk and the
Shroff were appointed to
prepare the lists of electors
and the ward councillors
were requested to carefully
correct them.

2. Unlike the lists of
other wards the list relating
to the 4th ward was subjected
to unusual corrections, -
additions and omissions
as will be evidenced from
perusing the original -
and the revised registers
of voters herewith forwarded.

On the 13th February
last

last P. S. Mohamed Mohitheen Rowter, son of Mr. K. Ry. Pichai Mowitheen Rowter Esq., who is an elected councillor for the 4th ward, wrote to the Chairman enquiring certain facts in connection with a vacancy of a seat in the elected members for the 4th ward and expressing his intention to contest it.

3. On a reply being sent to him that there was then no vacancy and no date was fixed for election he caused a nomination in his favor as a candidate to be submitted on the 19th idem.

4. Within 3 weeks from the 9th February last when the lists of voters were affixed as required by Rule 8, 38 applications were received from the 4th ward putting forth their claims to be registered as voters of that ward. These applications were intended to be circulated to all the councillors and disposed of by the Council. But as Mr Pichai Mowitheen Rowter, who was the councillor of the ward under notice, wrote and asked to send the applications to him for enquiry and report. At his request they were sent to him with letter No $\frac{236}{8-3-93}$. A reminder No $\frac{237}{10-3-93}$ was sent asking him to expedite the return of the applications. He replied that he wanted to retain them f

then sometime longer. After all they were delivered by him at the meeting held on the 13th March 1893 when, as they were not circulated to the other members, it was resolved to refer them to a Select Committee consisting of 3 councillors for making a thorough enquiry and report. This was no doubt because Mr Pichai Moitheen Rowter was an interested party as his son had already expressed his intention to contest the vacancy at the ensuing election. The Special meeting for disposing of them on the committee's report

was posted to the 16th March under a misapprehension of Rule No: 10. So a meeting was called for the evening of the previous day with a view simply to conform to the rules. The notice circulated for this meeting was put before the Council and recorded, and 9 of the councillors attended.

5. It is not understood why Mr Pichai Moitheen Rowter had retained with him certain written statements said to have been taken by him on the 10th March 1893 from some of the petitioners till the 10th current when he brought them with him

to the meeting and delivered to the presiding Councillor with a covering letter. The present appeal petitioner is his eldest Son. It will not be, I think, out of place here to mention that in most of the cases Dr Pichai Moothoo Rowtar's report on the applications differed from the committee's report and statements taken by them on the applications from respectable residents, e.g. No: 237 & 257. In these cases the ward Councillor reports in writing that he ascertained from R. P. Véda Kannu Pillai, 1st class Hospital assistant of the local dispensary and others that the applicants were not paying 3 Rs rent whereas from the written Statements obtained on the petition itself from the said R. P. Vedakannu Pillai by the committee, it is clear that they have been paying more than 3 Rs rent and the committee's report is against the ward Councillor's recommendations.

6. In this way the 38 claims were thoroughly enquired into and reported and 29 of them were upheld by the Council and 9 rejected.

7. The time allowed to the Collector by Rule No:

one month from the
15th March 1893.

8. The election of a councillor for the 4th ward has been fixed by the council for the 24th current and all the preliminary proceedings have been duly conducted. Hence it is requested that the revised Register of electors may be returned so as to reach me on or before the 22nd current so as to enable me to prepare the necessary ballot papers, &c.

(Signed) Leslie C. Miller
Chairman

Municipal office
14th April 1893
Dindigul.

(True Copy)

T. Nagingopaul
Chairman
23-2-97

1
23.2.97

MUNICIPAL DEPAR

1897.

ENCLOSURE NO

In a letter

FROM

The Chairman,
Municipal Council
D
MADURA DISTRICT.

No. 401

Dated 23-2-97.

SUBJECT.

Demi official le
from the Collect
of Madura – c
of – requesting
furnished with a
copy of the Proceed
of the meeting of

5
834 M of 1897

th.

Madra

19. 12

Dear Sir,

Will you be good

to send me a copy o

proceedings of the Co

at the meeting of th

12th Instant. I write demi

as it is a holiday an

matter is urgent.

Yours tru

(Signed) J. Twig

(True Copy)

T Rajagopa
Chairma

23-2-97

23.2.97

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

1897.

ENCLOSURE NO IV.

In a letter

FROM

The Chairman,
Municipal Council
Dindigul.
MADURA DISTRICT.

No. 401

Dated 23-2-97

SUBJECT.

Reply to Enclosure No III — with one enclosure — c. of proceedings passed at the meeting of 12-12-96.

6/834 M of 1897

1896.

DINDIGUL

MUNICIPAL OFFICE.

From,
M. R. Ry.
T. RAJAGOPAUL NAYUDU GARU
CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
DINDIGUL.

To,

The Collector of
Madura

No. 333

Dated 21st
Despatched 21st } December 1896
Received

Enclosure. 1

Reference: *This*/*Your* *Office No.*

Sir,

With reference to your demi official letter dated 19.12.96, but only received today, I have the honour to enclose herein a copy of the Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Dindigul, passed at a meeting held on the 12th Instant.

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) T. Rajagopaul
Chairman

(True Copy)

T Rajagopaul
Chairman
23-2-97

K
22-2-97

Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Dindigul, passed at a Special meeting held on the 12th December 1896.

Present:-

M. R. Ry
T. Rajagopaul Naidu Garu
Chairman
G. Mengel, Esquire councillor
J. W. Short, Esquire Do

M. R. Ry
.. P.S. Mahomed Meeran Thambi Rowther avl, councillor
.. S.P. Muthu Naicker avl, do
.. M. Arkium Pillai avl, do
.. V.S. Pichai Mohideen Rowther avl, do
.. V.S. Mohideen Marakkaya Rowther avl, do
.. P.R. Narayana Sastriar avl, do
.. K. Anantanarayana Iyer avl, do

1/834 M of 1897

Read letter as drafted by Mr G. Mengel.

Proposed

of

Proposed by M. R. Ry. P. K. Narayana Sastriar avl. – [illegible]

[illegible]

Neutral [illegible]

[illegible] withdrawn

[illegible]

Chairman: – It is unnecessary to answer this question, before a resolution is passed by the Council on the subject.

Therefore the above said proposal of M. R. Ry. P. K. Narayana Sastriar avergal is withdrawn by him.

Proposed by Mr. Mangel, that the letter of this date addressed to Government, together with its enclosures be approved of by the Council and forwarded on to Government through the usual channel.

Seconded by M. R. Ry. P. K. Narayana Sastriar avergal Councillor.

Rejected by casting vote. Messrs S. P. Sennathu Naickers, Mr. Arokiam Pillay, V. S. Mohideen Marakkaya Rowther, K. Ananta narayana Iyer and the Chairman voting against

the proposition and
Dahrengel, Mr Short, M. R. Ry
P. S. Mahomed Meeg Thoom
Rowther avl, M. R. Ry V. S. Pichai
Mohideen Rowther avl, and
M. R. Ry S. R. Narayana Sastriar
avl, voting in favour of the
proposal.

II. Printers' Bill for Rs 12-4-4
for printing the said letter
and some of its enclosures.

Passed by a majority,
Messrs S. P. Muthu Naicker,
M. Arokiam Pillai, K. Ananta-
narayana Iyer and the
Chairman dissenting.

(Signed) T. Rajagopaul
Chairman
12.12.96

(True Copy)

T Rajagopaul
Chairman
23-2-97

8
23.2.97

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

1897.

ENCLOSURE NO V

In a letter

FROM

The Chairman,
Municipal Council
Dindigul.
MADURA DISTRICT.

No. 401

Dated 23.2.97

SUBJECT.

Letter to collector of Madura forwarding ten enclosures — copy of and one of the ten enclosures e.g. memo showing the grounds of justification of the corrections made in the voters' lists.

8
834 M of 1897

1896.
DINDIGUL
MUNICIPAL OFFICE.

From,
M. R. Ry.
T. RAJAGOPAUL NAYUDU GARU
CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
DINDIGUL.

To,
The Collector
of
Madura

No. 337

Dated 24th
Despatched 26th } December 1896
Received

Enclosures (ten) Sent separately per packet post.

Reference:— This / Your Office No.

Sir,

In enclosing herewith a copy of the Proceedings of the Council (Vide Enclosure No 1) passed at its meeting held on the 22nd Instant under Section 10 of the Election Rules, I have the honour to state that this is the third — meeting held for the purpose of hearing claims and objections. In the first meeting held on the 14th October 1896 for the purpose, the lists of electors, as published on the 10th September 1896, were declared illegal on the ground that the list were amended by me and not pasted in their original state (Vide Enclosure No I). This resolution having been cancelled by Government in its order No 1886 M. Mis, dated 7th November 1896 and permission having been granted to hear claims and objections on the Selfsame lists even after the limit of 35 days prescribed in Section 10 of the Election Rules (Vide Encl II) a meeting of the Council was held on 23-11-96 — the second meeting under Section 10 — when, a resolution was passed adjourning the meeting till orders of Government shall have been received on the representation then proposed

proposed to be made by certain councillors. At the same meeting Dr Mengel Councillor was requested to draft a letter for the purpose and place it for approval before the Council at a Special meeting then proposed to be held on or about the 2nd of this month (Vide Encl No III). Owing to the delay on the part of Dr Mengel in the preparation of the letter and getting it through the press, the letter came on for approval at the meeting of the Council held on the 12th of this month instead of on the 2nd as originally resolved; but it was rejected (Vide Encl No III). No further

proposal having been put
forward so to have the Resolution
No I of the 23rd ultimo Should
be given effect to and the
Resolution consequently
having virtually become
inoperative, I was led
to convene a meeting of
the Council on 22.12-96, the
3rd meeting of the kind held
Section 10 of the Election
Rules. At this meeting
on the motion of Mr Mengel,
a further adjournment was
resolved upon till orders
Shall have been passed
by you on the representations
of his and others – after the
Christmas Holidays: and
this, on two grounds that
the Resolution of the 12th instant
was illegal under Se[illegible]
[illegible]

clause 5 of the District Municipa
Act, and that Mr Mengel's –
proposition (motion to adopt
his letter) was not put to
votes.

With reference to the
1st of the above said grounds,
I have to remark that the
Resolution No 1 of the 12th instan
is in no Sense illegal under
clause 5 Section 30 of the
District Municipalities –
Act IV of 1884, as by it, no
resolution of the Council
was Set aside. The words
in which the Resolution is
couched mean and could
mean only one thing in
the Queen's language and
that is, that Mr Mengel's letter
Shall not be approved. As to
the

the Second ground in support of the proposition under reference I am at a loss to know and hence I leave it to you to judge which is true, whether this statement or those in para 2 of Mr Mengel's letter dated 12.12.96. (Vide Enclosure V) implying that the resolution was passed by my vote and the casting vote. If as Mr Mengel says the resolution of the 12th Instant was not put to votes, how did he allow the Council to proceed to pass the printer's Bill which formed the Subject of the next resolution?

The manner in which the three said Resolutions were passed at meetings held under Section 10 of the Election Rules, clearly

clearly points to the existence of a compact among the members forming the opposition, to obstruct the business of the Council, the same Councillors having been voting, in a body, on all these occasions. Further the fact of the draft of Mr Mengel having been printed before it was adopted by the Council is another instance to show that the whole thing was preconcerted.

Nor are some of these gentlemen free from any motives or interests of their own. Mr Pichai Mohideen Rowter is the father of Mr Naythoon Rowter and the brother of Mr Mohideen Marakkayar

Marakkaya Rowter and all these are commissioners. About July ~~last~~ of this year Mr Sekhi Mohidin Rowter apprehending that his son Mr Magthoom Rowter would become ineligible at the time of the preparation of the ward lists, to be an elector even put in a petition to have a house that stood in his name transferred in the name of Mr Magthoom Rowter. This house had been sold not to Mr Magthoom Rowter but to his elder brother Mr Haje Shaik Mahomed Ibrahim Rowter; and Mr Magthoom supported the application in his public capacity. As they were unwilling to produce the title deed and secure the consent of the purchaser, the

the

the transfer could not be ordered. In the meantime, when the ward lists came to be prepared, the Sanitary Inspector put Mr Magthoom's name in the list for the IV ward, as paying an income tax of Rs 82; and he — Mr Magthoom — has countersigned the list. He had not paid income tax for 95-96; nor was the assessment for 1896-97 finally settled at the time of the preparation of the lists. There was a petition objecting to his name being included as a voter, on the ground of his not paying income tax and this was to have come on for disposal, on the

14th October 1896, the day on which a meeting under Section 10 of the Election Rules was held for the first time. If the petition were heard and the objection upheld at this meeting, Mr Draugthoom's name would have to be removed from the list. And his term of office as councillor for the IV ward expiring in February next, the chance of his standing as a candidate at the next election would have been thereby lost. Consequently these three were interested in delaying the completion of the list and in having the list declared illegal. And it was Mr Draugthoom that brought forward the proposition to that effect and

and carried it. The very next day i.e. on the 15th October, the brother of Mr Draugthoom viz. the purchaser, came forward with an application to have the abovementioned house transferred in his name and this also was supported by Mr Draugthoom and his father (Vide Enclosure No VI).

As for Mr J. W. Short, he has been from the beginning opposed to my holding the office of Chairman. He was the person who objected to my election itself, on no lawful grounds whatever.

Messrs G. Mangel and P. R. Narayana Sastriar must have been led to believe the story given currency to by interested parties, that

I intend contesting the seat for the III ward now vacant. It is really very strange that these gentlemen should strain every nerve of theirs, to guard against a much less than probable contingency, neglecting at the same time, their duty of completing the list of electors, which is a reality. Probably they are dissatisfied with me in my dealings as Chairman with them as private individuals (Vide copies of correspondence - Encl No VII).

In conclusion, I have to point out that these gentlemen have, in obstructing the completion of the lists of electors, been

Shifting

Shifting their position every now and then; and there is no knowing where they will settle for themselves what line of attack it is would be best for them to take: At first they objected to my corrections in the lists and fought for fresh list; when this failed they wrangled about what and how I should have corrected; and now, they have taken to adjournments at their pleasure. And this is because they are in a majority to carry any and every proposition through.

I am afraid that under the present state of circumstances, there is no likelihood of the lists being allowed to be completed in the near future.

The memo herein enclosed (Vide Encl No VIII) will sufficiently show that their apprehensions in regard to the omissions and the additions are unreasonable: even if they be reasonable, the constitutional procedure should have been to dispose of the claims and objections before them and leave the rest to you to be set right, under Section 11 of the Election Rules.

There is already one seat vacant and two more will fall vacant — one for the 2d and the other for the

4th

4th ward in January and February 1897 respectively: and consequently the completion of the lists can no longer be delayed.

I have, therefore, the honour to request you will be so good as to dispose of the claim and objection petitions forwarded herewith in original (Vide Encl No IX) and to favour me with orders for necessary corrections under Section 12 of the Election Rules, in the lists so that they may be completed.

The parties concerned will be directed to appear before you, whenever you require their attendance

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) T. Rajagopaul
Chairman

(True Copy)

T. Rajagopaul
Chairman
23-2-97

22.2.97

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

189.

ENCLOSURE **NO**

In a letter

FROM

The Chairman,
Municipal Council
Dindigul.

MADURA DISTRICT.

No. 401

Dated 23.2.97.

SUBJECT.

Enclosure No VIII to letter No 337/24.12.96 – memo – Showing the grounds of justification of the corrections made in the Voters' lists.

9/834 M of 1897

Memo Showing the justification

of the corrections etc

made in

the

Voters' lists

for

1896 – 97

Memo showing the justification of the corrections etc made in the Voters' lists for 1896–97.

Serial No	Number in the list	Name as in the lists submitted.	Corrections, additions or omissions in the list by the Chairman.	Objections as per memo prepared by Mr. Mengel Councillor	Reasons assigned by the Chairman for rectification of the list as per Column No. 4.
1	26	Kathersa Rowter	Struck off	Eligible for 1st Ward by reason of paying Rs 2-10 . in Ward No. I & Rs 4-5- in Ward III.	(1) In the first ward he pays house tax of Rs 2-10- and so he is not qualified to vote in that ward. In the third ward list submitted to me, his name was not entered. If he pays Rs 4-5- his name may no doubt be included in the III ward. In the IV & V wards his name remains, as he is eligible.
2	33	Chinnasami Chetty	Struck off the 1st Ward list and included in the III Ward list.	Should have been included in the 1st Ward as he pays House rent Rs 3-8- & Profession tax Rs 3- & Rs 2-1- house tax in the III Ward. His name has been erased from the 1st Ward list & put in the 3rd Ward without any petition to that effect	(2) He resides in the III ward. He can vote only in that ward under Proviso to Section 3 of the Election rules as he has no property qualifications in other wards.

3	40	M. V. L. Kader Kuittan & Rowther	Struck off	Objection petition dismissed prior to the date of the publication of the Voters' list, but not reinstated. He was a Voter in the last year's list	(3) The lists were submitted to me on 25-8-96 and corrected on 5-9-96. The lists were in the course of being fair copied for publication. when his ~~His~~ objection petition was disposed of on 8-9-96. The lists were published on 10-9-96. As they were amended before the disposal of the petition referred to, his name was struck out.
4	41	Kandasami Asari	Struck off	This is admitted to be correct. No objection is raised against this correction.	(4) He put in an objection petition against Profession tax and it was disposed of on 21-9-96 (tax being reduced to 1 Rupee) i.e after the publication of the lists.
5	57	Subba Nayakan	Added.	Was in previous year's list in the 1st ward. No records to show he pays house rent as stated.	(5) He pays more than the requisite amount of rent to Devastanam bazaars in the IInd ward and resides in the Ist ward. His name was in the previous year's list as paying Rs 7-.. house rent. He was rightly included under my Orders.
		Ward III.			
6	4	Thirumalayan Chetty	Corrected from a "candidate" into a "Voter"	Reduced from a "candidate" into a "Voter". Pays house tax of ~~Rs~~ 8-13-.	(6) The tax against this name is only Rs 4-9-.. as found in the house tax Register. His name has been retained as a Voter and he can come in as a Candidate at any time, if he is eligible to be such.
7	41	Mustapha Sahib	Struck off the IIIrd Ward list and allowed to stand in the IVth ward.	As he pays ~~Rs~~ 7-11-.. house tax and as his name appears in the previous year's lists in the 3rd & the 4th Wards, eligible for both the Wards.	(7) He pays ~~Rs~~ 4-1-.. in the IIIrd Ward and ~~Rs~~ 3-10-.. in the IVth ward. He is entitled to vote in only one ward. As he is a resident of the IVth ward his name was allowed to stand in that ward list.
8	55	Gurusami Nadar	Struck off the list	Tax confirmed prior to the date of the publication of the list. He has not been put back.	(8) Vide Remarks (3) above.
9	79	Pichai Pillai	Do.	Do.	(9) Do.
10	95	Kuppusami Nayudu	Do.	Do.	(10) Do.
11	96	Abdul Kadir Sahib	Do.	Tax confirmed after publication of the lists.	(11) The appeal was disposed of on 14-9-96 i.e after the publication of the lists. Hence he could not be included in the lists. If he is eligible he can only be included by the Collector under Section 12 of the Election Rules.

12	98	Gurusami chetty	Do.	Do. not a mistake.	(12) Do.
13	99	Kanaga Letchumi ammal C.	Corrected into Ramasamy Chetty.	Ramasamy Chetty is a minor and could not vote. Kanakaletchumi-ammal has been on the previous years list for paying income tax as well as House tax.	(13) Ramasami chetty is a major and the father of 2 children. House tax stands in his name and not in the name of Kanagaletchumiammal. He is also assessed to Profession tax. In the matter of income tax, he has been assessed along with Kanagaletchumiammal. His name was therefore rightly substituted
		Ward IV			
14	3	Gopalsamy chetty	Corrected into Subramania chetty.	House tax register should have been corrected & the right name entered.	(14) The House tax register is a permanent record in the office for reference, in such matters. The names of these persons do not appear in the said Register.
15	21	A. Nayanar asari	Do. into Sankaralingam asari	Do.	It is true that the persons whose names have been entered in the list as corrected by me in the place of these four are
16	28	S. M. Somasundram Pillai	Do. into Veerabadra Pillai	Do.	dead. These names were entered with a view to enable the rightful claimants to come forward and establish their claims,
17	29	M. Ratnagri Pillai	Do. into Ponnusami Pillai	Do.	and to the entry in the House tax Register being rectified accordingly. ~~Two~~ Three of these namely ~~Gopalswamy chetty~~ S. M. Somasundram Pillai & M. Ratnagri Pillai, have come forward with their claims and these, would be disposed of by the Council. But it has since been pointed out, that the names of these persons have, on petitions presented by them been ordered to be transferred in 1893, long before I assumed charge of the office. The present Head Clerk and the shroff being new and not knowing about it, could not find this out and bring it to my notice. The then Head Clerk and the Shroff who are likely to know about it are also not in the office now. If these transfers had been duly entered in the House tax Register by the then Head Clerk, in my predecessors time there would have been no necessity for these corrections

18	31	Subramania Pillai	1 Removed.	Correctly removed. Pillai Mulungi zemindar should have been included.	(15) This man had been put in as a candidate on the ground of paying requisite amount of land tax. It nowhere appears that he is the agent of the said zemindar. He was rightly removed. The name of the zemindar could not have been substituted as a candidate as he has not been a resident of the town as required by the Proviso to Rule 5 of the Election Rules.
19	36	Muthu Rajan chetty	1 Removed.	He has been erased as only paying Rs 2-6-" instead of 4-10-" as put in the list, was in the 3 previous year's lists House tax Register shows Rs 4-8-" clearly eligible	(16) In the voters' list his name had been put down against "14 &c Bazaar street"; on a reference to the House tax Register it was found that No: 14 Bazaar street was Ponnusamy Pillai and not Muthurajan chetty. It since appears that the correct No: is 14 Pichaimideen Rowter's lane. Hence the mistake.
20	39	Avanamuthu Nadar	Erased.	Qualified by reason of paying Rs 6-4-" House tax, he is therefore eligible	(17) This appears to be the same individual as No: 90 entered as Avana Nadar in the list for the ward. No: 90 was therefore retained, this being struck off.
21	63	A. Appavu Pillai	Erased.	The House tax Register shows that he pays Rs 5-5-" and he is therefore clearly eligible.	(18) In the Voters' list submitted to me, his name appears against Door No: 33 South car street. The House tax Register clearly shows that only Rs 2-10-" is paid as tax on it.
22	82	D. A. Muthu Ramo Pillai	1 Removed from the IV Ward list and retained in the III ward list	He has qualification to vote in the 3rd and the 4th wards.	(19) In the III ward list his name was put down against door No: 109 as possessing property qualification in that ward. In the IV th ward list his name had been again entered on the ground of paying Profession and income tax. He is entitled to vote either in the 3rd ward on the ground of property qualification or in the IV th ward on the ground of other qualification. Hence his name was allowed to stand in the III ward where he has property qualification. He is certainly not entitled to vote in both the wards.
23	83	N. Alaganatha Pillai	Erased	His objection petition was disposed of after the publication of the lists, he is therefore qualified	(20) Vide Remark (11) Supra

24	104	K. Peer Mohideen Rowter.	Name was allowed to stand.	Erased because he objected to Profession tax. Reincluded although his objection Petition stood undisposed of until 21-11-96.	(21) He had been assessed to Profession tax Rs 3—. His objection petition was received on 15-9-96; the list was published on 10-9-96. His name was not erased & reincluded; but it was allowed to stand because there was no objection petition on the date of the publication of the lists.
25	107	Mahomed Meeran Rowter.	Erased	He is eligible, his tax having been confirmed after the date of the publication of the lists.	(22) No: 107 is A. Mahomed Meeran and not M. Mahomed Husain Rowter - Vide Remark (11) Supra
26	109	S. Kandasamy Asary	Do	Tax confirmed; but name not reinstated.	(23) Vide Remarks (11) Supra
27	114	A. Rayer Pillai	Do	Do	(24) Do
28	119	Sheik Rowther	Struck off	These pay requisite rent and hence are qualified	(25). When Mr. L. C. Miller was Chairman of this Municipality considerable difficulties were thrown in the way of the completion of the Voters' lists of the IV ward by claims and objections on the ground of payment of house rent. The lists had therefore to be prepared twice over & considerable delay caused. In order to avoid similar difficulties, I removed the names of these persons from the Voters' lists, as I had doubts in regard to the correctness as to the payment of house rent by these persons, so that, if they have any real claims, they may come forward and establish them before the Council under Section 9 of the Election Rules. And, it is very significant that none of these has put in any claim petition. Nos: 119, 121, 123, 126 & 127 have not been on the previous year's list. No: 120 has been entered and struck off the previous year's list.
29	120	S. Kader Mohideen Rowther			
30	121	A. O. S. Sheik Mahomed Rowther			
31	123	Avana Nadar			
32	126	Anna Pillai	Excluded.	Excluded as not paying Rs 3 rent. The landlord admits that he does pay	(26) Anna Pillai is the son-in-law of Pragasam Pillai. It appears that he is living in one of the charitable mission houses in the 6th ward.

33	127	Hasan Pillai	Excluded.	Excluded from the present list. Councillors Messrs. Short and Magthorn state that he does pay ~~Rs~~ 6 rent.	(27) Hasan Pillai is Mr. Pragasam Pillay's brother's son and appears to be of below the requisite age and is a dependant of Mr. Pragasam I know ~~[illegible]~~ Pillay & Hasan Pillay Pillay, and I do not think it they pay any houserent.
		Ward V			
34	45	Ramasami chetty	Allowed to stand on the list.	Scored out and reincluded although his objection Petition stood undisposed of. until 21-11-96.	(28) His name was not scored out & reincluded but was allowed to stand as he was paying income tax.
35	74	Sinab mohideen Pulavar	Erased.	Objection petition remains still undisposed of. Name erased for objecting against the tax.	(29) Vide Remarks (11) Supra. Objection petition still pending.
36	76	Varusai Mohideen Rowter	Do.	Objected to profession tax - and appeal disposed of against him prior to publication of the lists, he is clearly eligible	(30) Vide Remarks (3) Supra
37	82	Neelamegam chetty	Erased.	Was in 3 previous lists, he occupies the same place he did the past 3 years. Nothing to show that he does not pay rent. The Sanitary Inspector maintains that he does pay the said rent of ~~Rs~~ 3-8-"	(31) (Vide General reasons II against Sheik Rowther &c) (Remark ~~para~~ 25 Supra)
38	83	Sengili chetty	Do.	Was in 2 previous lists, he occupies the same place he did the past 2 years. Nothing to show that he does not pay rent The Sanitary Inspector maintains that he does pay the said rent of ~~Rs~~ 3-8-"	(32) Do.
		Ward VI			
39	12	Muthia Pillai	Erased and his father's name Muthu Mayandi Pillai substituted.	Muthu Mayandi Pillai died on 26-11-92 His name is in the House tax Register. There is no reason why the son's name should be excluded in favour of his deceased father.	(33) Vide remark (14) Supra

40	14	Gopalsamy chitty	Erased and his father's name substituted.	Selvayan chitty is dead.	(34) Do.
41	32	Suppakonan	Erased.	Was in last year's & this year's list as paying Rs 7-3-0 house tax. As his name is not in the House tax Register he has been erased. In any case he is eligible as he pays 9 Rs Profession tax, being the Municipal dust cart contractor.	(35) His name is not in the House tax Register. He is therefore not eligible to vote as possessing property qualification. In the Voters' list submitted to me he has certainly not been put down as a voter for paying profession tax, — column B having been left blank. Further he has been assessed to Profession tax by a supplemental list subsequent to the publication of the lists. He does not pay 9 Rs Profession Tax; nor is there any such ~~rate~~ scale. He was assessed Rs 25-0-0, supplementally, as stated above. But this was reduced to Rs 6-0-0 on 13.10.96.
42		N. Vellayan asary - No 396 of the profession tax register.	Not included	Not included though ~~they are~~ he is eligible K V K	(36) N. Vellayan asari is No: 399 & not 396. Vide remark (11) Supra.
43		Mayandya Pillai	Do.	Do.	(37) No: 429 D according to the Profession tax Register is Mamundia Pillai and not Mayandya Pillai. He was assessed to profession tax by a supplemental list subsequent to the publication of the Voter's lists.

N.B. So far as my corrections in the II ward list are concerned, no objection has been taken nor are there any claim and objection petitions to be disposed of.

Chairman

K
24.12.96

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

1897.

ENCLOSURE NO VI

In a letter

FROM

The Chairman,
Municipal Council
Dindigul.

MADURA DISTRICT.

No. 401

Dated 23.2.97

SUBJECT.

Reply from the Collector of Madura to No V – informing that the matter has been placed before Government and — returning the enclos

16 / 624 M of 1897

Madura Collector's Offi

From
The Collector of
Madura

To
The Chairman
Municipal Council
Dindigul

Reference on Current No $\frac{5767}{gl}$
of 1896.

Dated 7th
Despatched
Received } January 1897

Enclosure: 1 bundle

Reference:—

Sir,

With reference
your letter No 337 date
24th Ultimo, I have th
honor to inform you
that the matter has
already been placed be
Government whose or
are awaited.

2. The enclosures t
your letter are herewith
returned.

I have the hon
Sir
Your most obedie
(Signed) M. Dismul

189

D., No. DATED

O C. No.

ERNMENT .. .. A A A A A A A

OVERNMENT

WITH DITTO

FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
ORIGINAL.

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