L. & M.
8,000—19-11-96.

INDEXED.

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 795 M.

DATED 5-4-97.

DESPATCHED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Private scavenging system

Concurring, in the remarks of the Collector of Godavari on the report of the Cm. C Ellore, on the Condition of —— in the multy: and stating that the Chairman's explanation in this connection is unnecessarily diffuse and verbose and cannot be considered satisfactory

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

C. No. 2560 M. of 1896 &
663 M. of 1897

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 2560 M

Recd 26/9/96
C.S.

~~Urgent.~~ Manager to submit an early explanation replying reply. C.S. 1/10/96

TO BE RETURNED
WITH REPLY.

From The Collector
Godavari

Dis No. 1073/Eng of 96

Dated 9 9 1896

Received 15 SEP

Registered "

Enclosures 1

Spare copies

No. 1102
~~Order~~

Referred to the Municipal Council Ellore for remarks which should be submitted through the Collector.

(By order)
W W Phillips
Ag Assistant Secretary.

V.D
18/9/96

Fort St. George
23rd Sept. 1896

SUBJECT.

Submitting report on the condition of the Private Scavenging system at Ellore with reference to certain remark made in this office Dis No 722/Eng of 96 d 4.7.96

To
The chairman, Mun: Council, Ellore

P.T.O.

18/9. a 1/4

C. Nos. 2560. M. of 1896 &
647. M. of 1897.

Misc. No. 795 Mis. 5/4/97

Order

The Government concurs in the Collector's remarks in his endorsement.

2. The Chairman's explanation of 29 closely written pages ~~which~~ is unnecessarily diffuse & verbose & ~~long~~ cannot be considered satisfactory.

V.R.
2/4/97

S.J.R.
5/4/7

Ap of 1st. P of 2d Encl. & 6.

To The Chairman, M.C. Ellore
thro' the Collector of Godavari
Despd. 5/4/97 ✓

VR
5/4/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No.

Referred to the Municipal Council Ellore for remarks, which should be submitted through the Collector.

(By order)

Asst. Secretary

Dis No. 1073/Eng. of 96

GODAVARI DISTRICT, COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Cocanada, 9. 9. 1896.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 2560 M
Dr 12/9

FROM
W. A. Brodie Esq.,
COLLECTOR,
Godavari District.

TO
THE Chief Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department
Madras.

SIR,

In this office remarks on the Administration Report of the Ellore Municipality for 1895-96 submitted with this office Dis no 722/Eng of 96 d/ 4.7.96, it was promised (1) that the Superintendent of Police would be addressed in regard to the lukewarmness of the Police in prosecuting persons for nuisances and (2) that due notice would be taken of the Sub Magistrate's delay in the disposal of cases filed against persons for keeping insanitary latrines.

2. The Superintendent of Police and the Deputy Magistrate Ellore to whom the extracts from the Administration report relating to these subjects were forwarded, report to the following effect

The Superintendent of Police states that in 1893-94, 974 cases were ~~[illegible]~~ prosecuted, in 1894-95, 1316 and in 1895-96, 1310 cases, and ~~that~~ the remarks made in the extract are not in accordance with facts.

The Deputy Magistrate, Ellore submits the explanation of the Sub Magistrate in which the latter states that the figures shewn in the extract sent to him are incorrect and the statements made by the Chairman incorrect.

The Deputy Magistrate agrees with the Sub Magistrate and remarks as follows:-

"4. The means adopted by the Chairman for
"extending the system are quite unique
"in themselves. To direct the Municipal totis
"who were privately engaged to clean latrines,
"not to clean them, so that the owners of the
"latrines might be forced to apply for
"Municipal help, and (~~thus~~ then) to prosecute the
"owners on the presumption that the totis
"were not doing any service, and the premises
"must be consequently unclean, is certainly
"the wrong ~~way~~ way to go about and likely to
"make the Municipal Administration of the
"town very unpopular".

A

The Sub Magistrate's explanation with the Deputy Magistrate's endorsement is enclosed for perusal.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
your most obedient Servant
(Sd) [illegible]
Collector

for Collector

REVENUE (189) DEPARTMENT.

FROM

THE COLLECTOR,

Godavari District.

TO

THE

Dated
Despatched 189 .
Received

No. ——
ENG.

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

Stationary Sub Magistrate's office. Ellore: D/ 8.8.96.
Despd. 10.8.96.

No 831/10.8.96.

To

The Deputy Magistrate
Ellore Division,
Ellore.

Most Respected Sir,

(75) b. Private scavengering
× × × × × × × × ×
The latrines which were cleaned by scavengers employed by the owners of houses were frequently inspected by several Councillors and fifty one owners have been prosecuted for keeping their latrines in unsanitary condition, of which 5 were convicted and 15 acquitted on account of the stupidity of the Sub Inspector in carrying out the instructions given him and the rest 31 are still pending disposal: The delay in the disposal of these cases is another inconvenience to the improvement of the system × × × × ×

In reference to your endorsement no 651 of 31.7.96, on copy of the Collector's letter to you Ref on cur no 1065/Engl of 1896 requesting you to obtain my explanation for the delay in the disposal of the cases referred to in the marginally noted extract from the Administration report of the Ellore Municipality for 1895-96, I beg to append a statement showing the details of the cases instituted in my bench Court against the owners of latrines cleansed by private agency, from which it will be observed that the total number of owners prosecuted was only 24, the cases disposed

disposed of 21, and the cases pending 3. and not 51, 20, and 37 respectively as stated by the Chairman and that convictions were six and not five.

These 24 cases were instituted in two batches, 15 in one batch and 9 in the other. The 1st batch of 15 cases was received on 12/3/96 and first deposition of the complainant or prosecutor was taken on 17.3.96, and on 18.3.96 they were taken on file as Bench cases Nos 253 to 267 of 1896; and the accused in all these cases were, on 17-4-96, during my absence on privilege leave, acquitted, under sec 245 CPC, by the Sub Magistrate of Chintalapudi, not because" of the stupidity of the "Sub Inspector in carrying out the" "instructions from him" but because the cases were found to be false, the latrines concerned not having been visited by the prosecution witnesses "in their life time", and not having been found to be in an unclean condition at all (vide enclosed (extract of the Register of Bench cases in this connection). This extract would further show how careless and indifferent was the Chairman in prosecuting these owners for the so-called insanitary condition of their latrines, by not calling one single witness who had seen the latrines at any time on or before the date of offence and in not respecting or minding the advice given by the Bench Magistrates that the cases had better be withdrawn; it would also show that the insanitary state of the latrines was a mere guesswork, and arrived at through a mere deduction worked out from the sole fact that the toties engaged by the owners were ordered by the Chairman not to cleanse private latrines; so that it cannot but be presumed that these 15 latrines "which were cleansed by scavengers employed by the owners of houses" were never "inspected by several councillors" and that these 15 owners "have been prosecuted" not "for keeping their latrines in insanitary condition" but because the toties "engaged by owners" were ordered not to cleanse their latrines.

3 Again the Administration report of the Municipality for 1895-96 was, I am told, despatched from

from the Municipal office on the
10th June last. On or before that
date there was not a single
Conviction in any one of the
24 cases instituted, and I am
at a loss to understand how
under such circumstances five
Convictions could be thought
of, and how the Chairman
arrived at these strange figures
- cases prosecuted "51" in lieu of
15 ~~, and pending trial~~ already
disposed of "20" (15 acquitted + 5
convictions) in lieu of 15 and
pending trial "31" in lieu of none
It is true that there were Convictions,
but they were Subsequent to 10th
June 96, and 6 in number but
not five

4. As to the 2nd batch of nine
cases, they were received on
19.3.96 seven days after the
1st was received, although the
date of offence was much
earlier in these cases, and the
first deposition of the Sub
Inspector could not be recorded
until 26-6-96, (that is 16 days
after the despatch of the Admi-
-nistration report) owing to the
neglect by ~~of~~ this Inspector of
orders directing him to attend
to attend Court as immediately
after this set of nine cases was
received as possible: and on
that day (26-6-96) these nine cases
were taken on file. Of these nine
5 cases were disposed of on 10.7.96,
and one on 21.7.96, the accused
in all of them being convicted
by me. The other three are still
pending disposal owing to the
absence of the accused from
Ellore Town.

5. In regard to delay in the
disposal of these cases: so far
as the first batch of 15 cases
was concerned, it will be seen
that on the sixth day of the receipt
thereof, the first deposition
was recorded (that is on 17.3.96)
and that day one month, the
cases were disposed of. In the
case of the 2nd batch, the cases
could not be taken on file
earlier than 26.6.96 (that is more
than three months since their
receipt) owing to the Sub Inspector
not turning up in Court till
then to give his first deposition;
and within 15 days afterwards,
that is on 10.7.96, five out of

of these nine cases, and eleven
days thereafter, that is on 21.7.96,
another case, were disposed of.
In other words those cases of the
second batch that could be
disposed of were so disposed
of within a period of less
than a month since the date
of file, viz, 26-6-96; and the
rest are pending disposal
owing to the absence of accused.
So that the Chairman's statement
that "the delay in the disposal
of these cases (that is the 31 case,
represented by the Chairman as
pending at the time of the
submission of his Administration
report) "is another inconvenience
to the improvement of the system",
and which statement has called
forth the serious attention of
the Collector, and urged him
to call for an explanation
from me, is another mis-
representation, and has no
foundation whatever like all
its predecessors in the extract
of the Administration report
under reference. On the contrary
inconvenience was caused to me

99

in respect to the taking up on
file of the 2nd batch of these
cases owing to the indifference
of the Chairman in not securing
the attendance of the prosecutor
to give his first deposition before
me as directed, until after
a period of more than three
months from the date of the
receipt thereof and, as in the
case of complaints by private
parties, I did not strike the
cases off for default, looking
to the interests involved therein.

6. It will thus be seen that
all the assertions without
a single exception made by the
Chairman in the Administration
report do not contain a particle
of truth in them but that they
are all a tissue of falsehoods;
and a reference to G.O. dated
12th September/95 no 1428 M, re-
viewing this Municipality's Ad-
ministration report for 1894-95
para 3(3) and para (5) will show
that these mis-statements were
not unintentional but were
wilful and quite premeditated.
In para 25 of his report for
1894-95, the Chairman reported

92.

that the fall (from 215 to 186) in the number of private latrines under the control of the Municipality was due "partly to the unwillingness of the people to keep their latrines under Municipal Control and chiefly to the constant strikes among the scavengers." But the Government could not believe him, and observed in para 3(3) that, in view of the fact that there was not a single prosecution, within the whole year, of those house-owners "who declined "to join the system and yet "kept their premises in an insanitary condition" and also of the fact that the system was working satisfactorily in other towns, it was "idle for the Chairman to attribute want of success of this system in alone to the unwillingness of the people to join it and to the strikes among the Toties," considered the failure to be due "to a reprehensible want of "interest in the matter on the "part of the Council and its "executive" and, with a view

to take

to take steps to enforce compliance with their orders already issued, resolved to fix a period of 4 months "within "which the private scavenging "system must be extended to a "satisfactory degree and "rendered sufficiently self supporting" and to direct the submission of a report exactly four months after the date of receipt of this, their order, and the Government in para 5, further warned the Chairman and his Council that unless marked improvement was shown in all the directions pointed out, both in the direction of the private scavenging system and in the direction of the general Administration for 1895-96 they would consider the desirability to deprive the Council of the privilege of electing its own Chairman and to reduce the proportion in the number of elective seats. It is this warning of Government, the fear that the Council would be deprived of its privileges unless some marked improvement is shown in the Administration Report somehow or another, that set at nought all other considerations and actuated the Chairman to represent things which never existed, and to hide his own faults by mis-stating that "the delay in the disposal of these cases is another inconvenience to the improvement of the system." The Chairman seems apparently afraid of a severer censure this time, and unable to find other means to avoid it has had recourse to misrepresent to Government as he has done, that private latrines not under the control of the Municipality have been frequently visited by several Councillors, that 57 owners were prosecuted, 15 of them were acquitted owing to the stupidity of the Sat Inspector, and five were convicted, the remaining 31 being pending disposal and that the delay (by the Bench Magistrates) in the disposal of the 31 pending cases is another inconvenience to the improvement of the system (probably in addition to the other two in-conveniences already reported on - to wit, the unwillingness of the people and the constant strikes among the totis): But I beg to submit, that even granting that there was delay in the disposal of these cases, you will observe ~~that~~ that delay could not be an inconvenience at all to the improvement of the system in 1895-96, because the cases were instituted in the last month (March/96) of the year, and that too in the middle part thereof, and none of them could therefore be expected to be conveniently disposed of within the end of that month; and even if they could, it would be too late for the Chairman to his conveniently improving the private scavenging system within the close of the year 1895-96.

7' In this connection, it may not be out of place to state that as a householder in Ellore

I am one of the several house-holders who are very willing to join the system of private scavenging and I even gave in my application (in the printed form furnished) into the hands of one of the Sub Inspectors with the earnest request that the Municipality should undertake the control of my latrine but to no effect and I am obliged to engage a toty myself; the toties being engaged by house holders being mostly Municipal servants themselves, it would be much easier for the Municipality to enforce subordination and to keep private latrines clean than for the householders who cannot exercise sufficient check over them. Consequently the householders, at least all those who are well-to-do and who are so much civilised as to know the benefits arising from cleanliness would consider it a boon to keep their premises under the control of the Municipality and without any precautions at all would be most

most willing and very glad to join the system, if they were but asked to do so, and if the supervising staff would and could exercise proper control over the toties employed in cleansing private latrines. During the one and half year of my stay in Ellore, I have never been asked to join the system but on the contrary, my application for admission into it was not taken notice of; nor has my latrine ever been inspected by any one of the Councillors these 18 months. As observed by Government the failure of the system is in my humble opinion due to nothing but "a reprehensible want of interest on the part of the Council and its executive"; and yesterday M.R.Ry E Kachapeswara sastry Garu, one of the Municipal Councillors, a second grade pleader, and also one of the Special Magistrates for the town of Ellore, who is also very willing to join the system, was telling me that one of

8'

of the householders who had
joined the system, by name Kotta
Ramanna, was about to
approach the Council with a
petition requesting permission
to withdraw from the system,
since the toty employed by
the Municipality to cleanse
his premises was negligent in his
duty and that his constant
complaints to the supervising
agency, the Sanitary Sub
Inspectors and others, proved
ineffectual; and that this want
of supervision in the executive
agency is a stumbling block
in the way of the improvement
of the system, and that under
the present state of circumstances,
he preferred engaging a sweeper
himself for his own latrine
to joining the system; which is
becoming day by day a failure
here instead of a success as in
other towns. The Chairman's
attempts in extending the system
appear, from the deposition
of the Sub Inspector made on
oath during the trial of the

first batch of 15 cases referred
to above, wherein consisted
in nothing but simply ordering
those totis who accepted
private employments, to give
up those employments, and not
to cleanse the premises of those
who have not joined the system,
and then to prosecute some
of them afterwards under sec
221 of the Municipal Act, on
the mere supposition that their
premises were unclean; and
I do not think the Governmen
meant this mode of the system
at all.

In conclusion, I beg to submit
8' that from the above explanat
you will observe that the Chairm
remark that the delay in the
disposal of cases is "another"
inconvenience to the improvement
of the system is an unmerited
reflection against me, and
to request that you will kindly
recommend to the Collector that
he may be pleased to ask the
Chairman to withdraw the said
remark.

I beg to remain,
most respected sir,
your most obedient servant
(sd) T V Ramayya
2nd class Magistrate

(True copy)

Submitted to the Collector and District Magistrate Godavari, with reference to his Circ. $\frac{1065}{Eng}$/96 d, 24.7.96.

2. The figures given by the Chairman in his report are apparently incorrect, and his remarks also far from correct.

3. I consider the Sub Magistrate's explanation satisfactory. The reason for the backward condition of the scavenging system in this municipality is chiefly want of sufficient interest in extending the system and supervision of the work of the toties on the part of the Municipal Executive. To the instances quoted by the Sub Magistrate, I have to add that my office latrine which, it was found, necessary to lock up as it was never attended to by the Municipal toties though the Municipality regularly demanded its fees for the so called "private scavenging system"

4. The means adopted by the Chairman for extending the system are quite unique in themselves. To direct the Municipal toties who were privately engaged to clean latrines, not to clean them so that the owners of the latrines might be forced to apply for Municipal help, and then to prosecute the owners on the presumption that the toties were not doing any service, and the premises must be consequently unclean is certainly the wrong way to go about and likely to make the Municipal Administration of the town very unpopular.

5. As the Sub Magistrate points out, and as the experience in Cocanada also shows, the success of the system lies in the way in which it is worked and there is no doubt that, if the toties work in this direction is properly supervised, owners of private latrines find it to be a great relief to them to have them cleaned by the Municipal toties.

Ellore
Dated 12.8.96

15/8
Agt Collector and Magistrate

Compd
[illegible]
15.8

[illegible]
15.8

Ref 1065
Ecy
786

ml 17/8

From

The Head Assistant Magistrate

No 709

Dated 12 } 8-8
Despd 15 }
Received }

Subject

Submitting the explanation of the Sub Magistrate of Ellore on the remarks of the Chairman Ellore Municipality regarding the Scavengering system.

ml 17/8

Statement showing the number of prosecutions under Sec: 221 of Municipal act in the Bench Court at Ellore

number as per Register	Date of offence	Date of receipt of the charge sheet	when 1st deposition was taken	Date of file	when disposed of	How disposed of	Remarks.
253	7. 3. 96	12.3.96	17.3.96	18.3.96	17.4.96	acquitted under Sec: 245 C. C. P.	1st Batch
254	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
255	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
256	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
257	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
258	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
259	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
260	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
261	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
262	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
263	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
264	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
265	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
266	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
267	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
664	24.2.96	19.3.96	26.6.96	26.6.96			accused not present in the Town.
645	Do	Do	Do	Do			Do
646	Do	Do	Do	Do	10.7.96	Convicted	2nd batch
647	[illegible]	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
648	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
649	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
650	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	Do	
651	Do	Do	Do	Do			accused is absent from the Town
652	Do	Do	Do	Do	21.7.96	Convicted	

Ellore 10.8.96 } (Sd) I. V. Ramaya
2nd Class Magte
(True copy)

Dt Magistrate
Compd 15.8

1st ,4 ...act from the Register of Summary trials tried

Pro: 5 e to wit one	Date of offence	Date of Complaint	Name of Complainant	Names of Accused	Offence Complai of
Ca 253	7.3.96	18.3.96	Regina	Kone Janikaratham	Section 221 of act IV of 1884.
254	Do	Do	Do	Veeranki Venkatareddy	
255	Do	Do	Do	Pasumarti Ramiah	
256	Do	Do	Do	Do Bhagavanulu	
257	Do	Do	Do	Mandapaka Appanna	
258	Do	Do	Do	Kanumuri Lakshmayya	
259	Do	Do	Do	Mandapaka Surayya	
260	Do	Do	Do	Tadikonda Subbarayudu	
261	Do	Do	Do	Pasumarti Rangasayi	
262	Do	Do	Do	Nagalla Peda Ammaji	
263	Do	Do	Do	Madda Yeamma	
264	Do	Do	Do	Pasumarti Subbayya	
265	Do	Do	Do	Do Ratnam	
266	Do	Do	Do	Kone Ponnamamma	
267.	Do	Do	Do	Madula Narahari	

I do not want to examine them (recanting) no, I wan

Cross examination, by the Def. Vakil. I do not know the toty was ordered not to cleanse the accused's latrine. The ordered the toty not to clean the accused's latrine.

Re. Examination by Court. The evidence I can give in cases recorded. It would be nothing more and nothing less.

2nd witness Pro: Arji-Gavirigadu - Korapaty Yelli Municipa her not to do So.

Cross Examination by Def. Vakil. The Chairman told the S not allow the toty to clean her latrine if she should not a Supervision. The Municipal toties are about 20 in numb Only Some of them are Municipal Servants. I do not know accused's latrine whether before or after the Municipal C

3rd witness Pro: I have never in my life time seen the accused'

14.4.96

[illegible]

affirmation.

to go and take the advice of the Municipal C

the evidence of myself and the other prosecution wi

ordingly consulted the Chairman and he told me that

erits. The Court has after my stating the same to it to day,

ordingly consulted him again today and he has told me

raw the cases or to engage a vakil for the prosecution

itted to be correct by the witness

T. Lakshminarasimha Row

2nd Class Magistrate
17.4.96

Sec: 245 C.C.P of the offence complained of and

[illegible]

strate)

umachari

agistrate)

1st Witness. Hussain Khan Conservancy Inspector states on
Pro:

The Bench Court suggested to me on the last hearing
to withdraw this and the connected cases on the ground that
there appeared to be no cause for complaint at all. I
cases might be dealt with by the Court according to their
again advised me to consult the Chairman. I have
to ask for adjournment either to enable him to w

Interpreted to and

(Sd

The complaint is false and the accused is acquitted
directed to be set at liberty)

(Sd) T. Lakshminarasimha
17.4.96.
2nd Class Magistrate

(True extract)

T. V.
(Sd) / M. Ramayy
Stationary Sub Ma

Rec. 26/9/96.
C.S. Urgent.
Hussain Khan to
explain why he has
made these statements
and why he has conducted
the cases so badly.
C.S.
8/9/96.

(True copy.)

Comp'd
1578

Copied

…te Bench Court at Ellore for the year 1896.

…lea of …ccused …d of his …amination	The finding and in Case of Conviction a brief Statement of reasons therefor.	The Sentence and the date on which Proceedings terminated.

1st witness Prosecution. Hussain Khan Sub Inspector Ellore Municipality, states on Solemn affirmation

I never inspected the latrine of the accused in this case after the Municipal toty was ordered to cease cleaning his latrine. I never saw that his latrine was unclean. I cannot say for certain that the toty did not secretly take up the task of cleaning the latrine after he was warned by us. I do not know whether the accused had ever used the latrine since we withdrew the toty. I do not know whether he has taken measures to have his latrine cleansed by other means if he has been using it. The other two witnesses cited for the Prosecution speak only to the fact that the toty was ordered by the Municipal Chairman not to have private engagements.

…examine them.
…who was cleaning the accused's latrine. I do not know which
…witnesses know his name. I do not know why the Municipal Chairman

…254 to 267 is just the same that I have given in this case as above

…toty was cleaning the accused's latrine. The Chairman ordered

…ary Sub Inspector (1st witness Pro.) to tell the accused that he would
…y to him and have her latrine swept under the Municipal
…at Ellore. There are 40 females among Castemen living in Ellore
…any body is now cleaning the accused's latrine. I never saw the
…rman's order directing the toty to cease private engagement
…atrine.

(Sd) T. Lakshminarasimha row
1st Class Magistrate
[illegible]

Extract from the diary of the Sub Inspector C Division.

(1) D/ 16th August 1895.
Order * * * "No addition has yet been "reported. He should try his best for additional " latrines or else the names of the persons who " neglect to keep their latrines clean".

(2) D/ 17th January 1896.
Order * * * * * He should also report the "progress which he is doing towards the improvement "of private scavenging business."

(3) D/ 26th February 1896.
Order. " Send a Charge sheet of all those persons "who keep their privies in filthy condition before "tomorrow without fail."

(4) D/ 3rd March 1896.
Order "Third Reminder. Where is the list of " filthy latrines in your Division"

(5) D/ 7th March 1896.
Detected two Cases for private scavenging improvement and Collected the money of the above Cases. I also prepared a Charge sheet form for prosecution of 15 persons who had dirty privies. (Sd) Hussain Khan.

True Extract

Chairman

64 [illegible]

16-8-95

Copies of Chairman's orders.

Order d/16-8-95.

' *

1 *

2. *

3. Keep a register of all prosecutions ordered showing the result of each prosecution ordered. When lodged, and if not lodged, why not. This from the beginning of this year 1895.

Send this also within a week.

(True Copy)

Chairman

7/6457 [illegible] 1897

16-9

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municip
Council Ellore dated the 21st October
1895.

Read remarks of Government on the Administration report of the Ellore Municipality for 1894-95 vide G. O. No. 1478 M dated 12th September 1895.

Resolved that immediate steps be taken to remedy defects pointed out by Government.

(True Extract)

Chairman

3/Feby [illegible] 1897

21-10

Circular

In reference to para 3 of the orders of the Government dated 12th September 1886 No 1478 M the Government remarked thus.

" It is noted with dissatisfaction that the number of houses served by the private Scavenging agency again fell (from 215 to 186) and that the system was again worked at a loss (Rs 339) to the Council. This is the third successive annual review, in which it had been pointed out to the council that this branch of its work has been seriously neglected x x x The Government cannot but consider that its failure must be due to a reprehensible want of interest in the matter on the part of the Council and its executive, and that steps to enforce compliance with the orders already issued are called for. His Excellency the Governor in Council resolves therefore to fix a period of four months from the date of receipt of this order by the Council, within which the private Scavenging system must be extended to a satisfactory degree and rendered self supporting."

2/ Again para 5 of the same order the Government further remarked that " the Chairman and the Municipal

4
847 May 1887

Council will now be warned that, unless a marked improvement is shown in each and every one of these directions (Sanitation, private scavenging, vaccination, and the registration of vital statistics) xxx the Government will consider the desirability of taking steps under section 13 of the Act to deprive the Council of the privilege which it now enjoys of electing its own Chairman, and to reduce the proportion which the elective seats bear to those to which nominations are made.

3/ The said report of the Government has been received in this office on 19th October 1895 and nearly three months have already passed without any improvement in any direction.

4/ The Chairman, therefore requests each and every Councillor to pay some special attention in encouraging the system in their divisions. The printed forms of application are herewith sent to each Councillor to try their best to induce the ratepayers to apply within ten days from the receipt of this circular. In case of disappointment they are specially requested to report as early as possible to latrine owners names in their Division which they consider most unsatisfactory and injurious to neighbours.

Sd/ S. Sitaramayya

Chairman delegate

[True Copy]

Chairman

A Reminder

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] 1894-95 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 10 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 12 [illegible]
[illegible] 5 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

5 [illegible] 1891

[illegible]

(Sd) S. Subbarayya

Chairman delegate

True Copy

Chairman

Copy of Chairmans orders.

D/ 8-11-95

(1) "The manager should in future See that the Resolution "passed at any meeting are given effect to "within a week from the date they are communicated "to the Divisional officer. He should send a list "of all resolutions receiving Execution with an "office note as to the manner of execution. He ~~shall~~ should "also see that a book is kept for the purpose "in which it should be stated the result of "what was done according to the resolution."

(2) D/ 15-11-95

"A letter to be addressed to the Stationary Magistra "requesting him to communicate to us the result of "Prosecutions on his file, to enable the Municipality "to take necessary action in the matter. "It may be stated that Divisional Magistrate "has been doing the same by sending copies "of the judgment and finding."

6

647 of 1897

D/ 19-11-95

(3) "As it has been brought to my notice that Ward "Mandigadu in A Dn, Ward Sydu in B Dn and "Antarvedy Somalu in C Dn have got greatest "number of private latrines and have not don

"any thing to give them up, they are hereby
"suspended until further orders. The Sanitary
"Inspector to submit new names in consultation
"with the Sub Inspectors concerned for
"their places."

(4) D/24-4-96.

" Enter all my orders in a book to be kept
" for the purpose and state the result of
"each and communicate the same to me
"once a week"

(True Extract & Copy)

Chairman

Ellore Municipal Office
21st November 1895.

No 105 Mis

From,

M.R.Ry. C. Sitaramayya Pantulu garu
Chairman Municipal Council
Ellore.

To,

The Stationary Second Class
Magistrate Ellore.

Sir,

I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to order that the results of Municipal prosecutions be intimated to this office as soon as they are disposed of as is done by the Head Assistant Magistrate Godavari to enable the Municipality to take necessary steps in that connection.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
(Sd) C. Sitaramayya.
Chairman.

(True Copy)

Chairman.

7/6447 Mar 899

Memo.

Chairman's Orders dt/. 19-11-95. As it has been brought to my notice that Urgy Marigadu in A Division Urgy Syed in B Division & Authavayya Somalu in C. Division have got greatest number of Private latrines and have not done anything to give them up they are hereby suspended until further orders.

The Sanitary Inspector to submit new names in consultation with the Sub Inspectors concerned for their places.

No. $\frac{1275}{26\text{-}11\text{-}95}$

Forwarded to the Sanitary Inspector V. Venkataswamy, for execution and early report.

(Sd) C. Sitaramayya
Chairman

e.g.c.

(True Copy)

Chairman

8/667 [illegible] 1897

True Extract

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council Ellore dated the 15th January 1896 at 8 A.m.

IX. Read lists of persons who have kept th privies under their own management.

Resolved that M.R.Ry S. Sitaramayya Pantulu garu, D. Sundararama Row Pantulu garu. Chandrosi Subbarayudu garu. Munshi Mahommad Gazul Saheb garu and S. Venkatakristnayya garu for A. B. C. D & E. Divisions respectively be authorized under Sec 274 to enter into or upon any building or land with the Consen of the owner, with six hours notice in case the owner does not consent, for inspect the latrines, privies, Cess-pools and dirty compounds.

True Extract

15-1-96

Extract from the diary of the Sub Inspector Ho...

(1) D/21st 24th February 1896.

Order

"The Sub Inspector is directed to prepare a charge "sheet of all those persons who keep their privies in "filthy condition and submit the same before tomorrow "evening without fail."

(2) D/3rd & 4th March 1896

Order "Third reminder" "Where is the list "of filthy latrines in your Division.

(True Extract)

Chairman

15-1-96

24-2-96

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council Ellore dated 4th March 1896.

XVI Read the following Miscellaneous petitions

(20) Charge sheets by Do Do sub Inspector regarding filthy compounds—

Prosecution ordered.

(21) V. Venkataswamy. Sanitary Inspector submitting lists of filthy latrines.

Prosecution ordered.

(True Extract)

Chairman.

Ellore Municipality

Official Memorandum

No. 198

Dated 9-3-96

Reference. Chairman's order of 9-3-96

Orders. Sanitary Inspector V. Venkata-swamy is to explain by tomorrow evening what has become of the latrines examined in my presence in Powerpeta, and why he did not send report asked for in this office No 175 of 1-3-96. If the above reports were not received in the said time he will be dealt with severely.

(Sd) S. Sitaramayya

Chairman delegate

True copy

S. Sitaramayya

Chairman

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council for the town of Ellore dated 18th March 1896 at 8 A.m.

VIII. Read the following reports.

(1) From the Sub Inspector A.Dn. Submitting list of private privies which are in a filthy Condition.

Prosecution ordered. Bench magistra not voting.

(13) From Sanitary Inspector, Submitting of private latrines which are in a filthy state.

Prosecution ordered. Bench magistrates not voting

/ True Extract /

Extract from the diary of the Sub Inspector D. Division.—

(1) Dated 26th February 1896

Chairmans orders.

"The Sub Inspector is directed to prepare a Charge "Sheet of all those persons who keep their privies "in filthy condition; the same is to be Submitted "before tomorrow."

(2) D/ 22-3-96

Order.

"If the owners did not like to get them "Cleaned by Municipal agency the Sub "Inspector should report the condition "after careful Examination."

(True Extract)

22-3-96

Copy of Chairman's order d/

19th May 1896.

Memo.

Please bring all annual report papers to me tomorrow after-noon at 4 P.M. in whatever condition they may be.

To the manager - Municipal office.

(True Copy)

Chairman

Recd 22-5
(Sd) C.S.

Erode Municipal office
22nd May 1896.

In sending herewith a meeting notice for Monday. I beg to inform you that as there is the writing of the report and the preparati of few Statements I beg you will be pleased to fix the meeting for wednesday the 27th Inst.

I am unable to work over time to prepare the report as I am sick.

Your most obedient Servant
(Sd) C. J. Chapman
Manager.

True Copy.

Order thereon.

Bring all papers to me this evening at 4 P.M. as already directed and after Satisfyi myself as to the state of the report I sha see to postpone the meeting.

(Sd) C.S.
23-5.

True Copy

C 98 893

Received 5 P.M.
a portion of the
Administration report
/Sd/ C.S. 23/5.

Memo

It is now 5 P.M. and I have waited for you in vain from 4 P.M. Probably you are not ready with the Administration report or you are indisposed. Whatever may be the cause, I want you to send all the Administration report materials by the Head Clerk before this evening which I must receive to day & read.

/Sd/ C. Sitaramayya
Chairman
23-5.

To
The Manager. Municipal office.

Manager says Head Clerk has been ill for a week and so the demand collection balance statements are not ready and so the Administration report statements cannot be ready before Monday. Hence meeting fixed for Monday is postponed to Tuesday.

/Sd/ C.S. 2[illegible]/5.

[illegible]

C 98 893

Ellore Municipal office

The Chairman
Municipal Council
Ellore

Most Respected Sir,

With reference to your honor's memo dated 25th May 1896 remarking that there is delay in the submission of my accounts required for the preparation of the Administration report for the official year 1895-96, I humbly beg to inform your honor that I have no accounts to be submitted nor have I any concern in them, but that they are usually submitted by the manager and the 2nd Clerk as they keep all the registers &c in which the information will be found.

2/ Although it is not my duty, at

May 1896 I rendered all my possible assistance and got the accounts ready by the 28th May 1896 I beg therefore to inform your honor that there is no least delay on my part.

I humbly beg to remain
Most Respected Sir
Your most obedient servant.
Sd/ J. Subbarayudu
H. Head Clerk.

C 98 / Eccg 897 P.a

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

647 R

CURRENT No. 601

COLLECT
29 JAN 97
GODAV

Cs. w/ report 29/1/97

From The Chairman
Municipal Council
Ellore

No. 601

Order.

Dated 27-1-97

Received 15-2-97

Registered 16-2-1897

Enclosures 337 No 1102 with Enclosures
C. M. 2560 M. of 1896 with 3 encls retd

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting report on the Condition of Private Scavenging sys
as requested in No 1102 of 23-

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
fo	1629	h	23-9-96
fo	1478	h	12-9-95
fo	749	h	13-6-94

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Ellore Municipal Office.

Dated the
Despatched } 27-1-97

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT
CURRENT No. [illegible]

No. 601

FROM,

M-R-Ry.

C. SITARAMAYYA PANTULU GARU;

CHAIRMAN,

MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, ELLORE.

To,

The Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department
Madras.

Sir, / Through the Collector, Godavari /

With reference to no 1102 dated 23rd September 1896, referred to the Municipal Council for remarks. I have the honor to enclose a copy of the Resolution passed by the Council and submit as follows: —

2. In para 75 (b) of the Administration report it was stated that as 51 latrines were found to be in an insanitary condition that the owners were prosecuted, that the latrines were inspected frequently by several Councillors, that 5 owners were convicted, 15 acquitted owing to the stupidity of the Sub Inspector, who conducted the prosecutions, and that 31 cases were still pending, and that delay in the disposal of these cases was another inconvenience to the improvement

to the Stationary Sub Magistrate for report, the Stationary Sub Magistrate states, that the total number of owners prosecuted was only 24, that convictions were 6, acquittals 15, and pending cases were 3. So far as these figures are concerned, the Sub Magistrate's Statement should of course be taken as correct, as the Statement made by the Council was made from information obtained from the Municipal office and the Municipal Servants.

3. Before referring to and replying to the various remarks and reflections passed by the Sub Magis-trate, upon the Council and its conduct, I have to inform that the No. 51 was arrived at from information given by the office people and the Sanitary Staff. During the preparation of this years Administration report, I was unwell and could not consequently personally attend to the figures and statements myself, and had, therefore, to entrust that business to a Councillor M.R.Ry Sattiraju Sitaramayya, who had in consultation with and with the assistance of the Municipal office Establishment and the Sanitary staff prepared the draft

2/

after making necessary additions, and alterations. I need hardly state here that the Council and the Chairman have to depend upon the Manager, the head of the office for figures and statements required in the preparation of an Administration report. I may also mention here that notwithstanding that fact, I had also specially directed the Manager of the office to see to the correctness of the figures and statements in the Draft Administration report, and that he in reply stated that he had attended to the correctness of the statements and the filling in of figures. With such precautions and care the preparation of the Administration report was attended to and passed.

4. The next question then is how did a wrong figure find entrance under prosecutions under private Scavenging and was its insertion due to a pre-meditation and determination on the part of the Council and its Chairman, as stated by the Stationary Sub Magistrate to misrepresent facts, or due purely to a mistake or wrong calculation. In this connection a reference to the Resolutions of the Council dated 4th and 18th March 1896 and to the extracts from diaries of the Sanitary Staff, will explain how the figure 51 was arrived at.

(20) Charge Sheets by D. Division Sub Inspector regarding filthy Compounds.

Prosecution ordered.

(21) V. Venkataswamy Sanitary Inspector, Submitting lists of filthy latrines.

Prosecution ordered.

Resolution dated 18th March 1896.

VIII Read the following reports.

(1) From the Sub Inspector A Division, Submitting list of private privies which are in a filthy condition.

Prosecution ordered. Bench Magistrates not voting.

(13) From the Sanitary Inspector - Submitting list of private latrines which are in a filthy state.

Prosecution ordered. Bench Magistrates not voting.

Extracts from diaries and Chairman's orders

A Division - D/ 27-2-96.

(1) The Sub Inspector is directed to prepare a charge sheet of all those persons who keep their privies in filthy condition and . . . .

(2) D/ 5-3-96. 3rd reminder. Where is the list of filthy latrines in your Division.

(3) C. Division D/ 16-8-95.

He should try his best for additional

(4) D/ 17-1-96. . .

He should also report the progress which he is doing towards the improvement of private Scavenging business . .

(5) D/ 29-2-96.

Send a charge sheet of all those persons who keep their privies in filthy condition . . .

(6) D/ 5-3-96.

3rd reminder - Where is the list of filthy latrines in your Division.

(7) Inspector's diary D/ 7th March 1896.

. . . . Detected 2 Cases for private Scavenging improvement and collected the money of the above Cases. I also prepared a charge sheet for prosecution of 15 persons who had dirty privies.

(8) D Division. D/ 26-2-96.

The Sub Inspector is directed to prepare a Charge Sheet of all those persons who keep their privies in filthy condition . .

(9) D/ 22-3-96.

If the owners did not like to get them cleaned by Municipal agency the Sub Inspector should report the condition after careful examination . .

It will thus be seen, that Sanitary Inspector submitted 10 cases for prosecution for keeping dirty

15 Cases, and that the D Division Sub Inspector
Submitted Some cases whose exact number is
not known as his report is missing in the
office, but the Chairman delegate assures the
Council that the figure mentioned in the D Division
Sub Inspector's list was 6 according to his
memory, and the Council has no reason to
doubt his Statement. It will be clear
from this that the number of prosecutions
sanctioned by the Said two Resolutions of
the Council for keeping dirty latrines was
57 and the Chairman delegate who inserted
the Said figure and in whose hand-writing
the wording of 75(b) is in the draft Administration
report, assures the Council that he did so under
the impression and belief that the prosecutions
already ordered were actually instituted. The
Chairman delegate assures the Council, and
the Council has every reason to believe that
he had entered 5 Convictions, and 15 acquittals
on the information furnished to him by the
Sanitary Inspector who is responsible for carrying
[illegible] through Council Sanitary

3

States that on the assumption that 51 cases sanctioned
were instituted, he had presumed that 31 prose-
-cutions were still pending, when according
to his information only 20 Cases were disposed of
and that he fully expected that these figures
will be duly checked in office. This is the
information submitted by the Chairman delegate
on reference to him of this matter.

4. Looking to the importance of the Subject,
the Stringent orders passed by Government and
my Strict orders to the Manager from time
to time to open a book for entering the number
of prosecutions ordered and the result of each
and to attend to the carrying out of every Resolution
within a week from the date of its passing, it
is nothing but natural to expect that prosecutions
ordered would have been instituted in time and the
Chairman delegate is justified in presuming,
however weak the presumption may be, that the
number 51 Sanctioned was prosecuted. If as
is Stated by the Chairman delegate there was
a proper check in office with regard to these figures,
all this unpleasant correspondence would have
[illegible] unnecessary to [illegible]

Chairman and the steps taken by him in the
preparation of the Administration report.
As copies of the Several orders &c are appended
to this report only relevant portions are
referred to here.

(1) Chairman's order d/ 16-9-95.
To the Manager Municipal office. "Keep a register
"of all prosecutions ordered Showing the result of
"each prosecution ordered. when lodged, and if not
"lodged, why not. This from the beginning of this
"year 1895. Send this also within a week."

(2) Do — d/ 15-11-95.
"A letter to be addressed to the Stationary
"Sub Magistrate requesting him to Communicate
"to us the result of prosecutions on his file to enable
"the Municipality to take necessary action in the
"matter. It may be stated that Divisional
"Magistrate has been doing the same, Sending
"Copies of the Judgment and finding."

(3) d/ 19-5-96.
"Please bring all annual report papers to me
"tomorrow afternoon at 4 P.m. in whatever condition
"they may be."

(4) d/ 22-5-96. From the Manager
[illegible] herewith a meeting notice for monday

"of the report and the preparation of fair statements
"I beg you will be pleased to fix the meeting for
"wednesday the 27th Instant."

(5) Chairman's order to the Manager d/ 23-5.
"Bring all papers to me this evening at 4 P.m.
"as already directed and after satisfying myself as to the
"State of the report. I shall see to postpone the meeting."

(6) Chairman's order to the Manager d/23-5-96.
"It is now 5 P.m. and I have waited for you in vain
"from 4 P.m. Probably you are not ready with the
"Administration report or you are indisposed.
"Whatever may be the cause I want you to send all
"the Administration report materials by the Head
"Clerk before this evening which I must receive
"to day and read."

(7) d/ 23-5-96
Manager says Head Clerk has been ill for a week and
"so the demand, Collection and balance &c were not ready and
"so the Administration report statements cannot be ready
"before monday. Hence meeting fixed for monday is
"postponed to Tuesday. Send draft report to me
"of what is already completed before Sunday and the rest
"before monday."

"received from Cocanada and request you will return
" it with the necessary order."

Chairman's order: "Yes. You can attend to the summons
" and go to Cocanada. Give me all the Administration
" papers before you leave the place in whatever condition
" they may be. You know I have been sick and cannot
" conveniently attend to the report. It has already been
" delayed. Send them all to me with a report of the
" papers sent and also all my orders in this connection."

(9) Chairman's order to the Manager d/ 26-5.
" The account statement forms must be sent to me before
" you leave the place, duly filled in the forms to enable
" me to go through them."

(10) Dated 4-6-96
" Put figures. Correct minor heads & fill in blanks."

(11) Dated 5-6-96.
" See if the figures and statements are correct in the draft."

(12) Chairman's order d/ 8-6-96, to the Head Clerk &c.
" The Head clerk, the second clerk and the third clerk
" are directed to attend at the house of the Chairman
" at precisely 11 A.M after breakfast to fair copy
" the Administration report. The Manager should
" keep ready all fair copies of statements for
" submission to Government with the Administration
" report before this evening and submit them to me.

" supplied the information before last evening, nor have
" they sent the fair copy of the portion given them. They
" must both come at once with those papers and also bring
" the Resolution Book. The report must be sent to-day."

(13) Dated 10-6-96. Chairman's order. Urgent.
" Copies of office letters No. $\frac{87}{7-5-96}$ and No. $\frac{115}{16-5-96}$ to the
" Inspector of Police and his reply No. $\frac{27}{8-5-96}$. These are not
" found among enclosures. This is very careless. The Manager
" is requested to explain. Why these were not enclosed.
" They must now be sent to me. The whole report will have
" to await. You must also enclose copies of the Sub-
" Inspectors or Sanitary Inspector's reports to me
" that Police declined to keep in connection with the
" above letters."

(14) Dated 2-10-96. Manager's reply after reference
from Government.
" Referring + + + I cannot say how the figures
" 51, 5, 15 + 31 with reference to private scavenging prosecution
" were arrived at by Councillor S. Sitaramayya Garu
" who drafted that portion."

(15) Manager's replies d/ 6-10-96 after reference from Government
" The draft (Administration report) will show that I have
" made about or more than 200 corrections in accordance
" with the figures and information I had at command
[illegible] the private

"What he (Chairman delegate S. Sitaramayya) wrote
"about (private scavenging system) was taken to be
"reliable, and it never for a moment struck me that
"he worked out these figures without data or information."

(b) Managers reply dated 8-10-96 after suspension.

"I beg to inform you that the figures were filled in
"all blanks and to the correctness of statements
"was also attended to."

Head clerk's reply of 12-10-96 says—

"That he saw the Chairman's order to the Manager
"dated 5-6-96 passed on the Administration draft
"report, directing that all blanks in the Administration
"draft report should be filled and that the correctness
"of figures already entered in it should also be verified,
"and that he had accordingly taken the report to
"the Manager and got it compared, but that he does
"not know whether the Manager had attended
"or not to the figure under private scavenging."

In this connection it is also necessary to refer to
Chairman's letter dated $\frac{105\ \text{Dis}}{21\text{-}11\text{-}95}$ to this very Sub + Copy Enclosed.
Magistrate requesting him, though in vain, to kindly
communicate to the Council the result of each
Municipal prosecution, as soon as it is disposed
of as has been being done by his Divisional
Magistrates, Messrs Robertson & Moore who

and thus afford an opportunity to prevent any such
mistake. A reference to the Chairman's letter to this
Stationary Magistrate dated 21-11-95 requesting him to
furnish Municipal prosecution results, and a reading
of the Chairman's order to the Municipal Manager
on 10-6-96, the date on which the Administration
report was despatched from this office to Government
will show how solicitous and careful to the last
moment the Chairman has been to secure correct
Statistics in the Administration report and how
culpably careless, and wilfully negligent and even
obstructive the Manager has been in spite of strict orders
to the contrary. The explanation given by the Manager
that he could not take the trouble to find out the
correctness of this figure, as it was worked by
the Chairman delegate on the presumption that it
would be correct, is lame and most unsatisfactory,
when he knew as a matter of fact that he had
deliberately disobeyed to open a book for noting
the number of prosecutions sanctioned and their result,
and when to his knowledge there was no information
from the Stationary Magistrate's office. It was the
duty of the Manager to furnish correct figures in
the Administration report and it was equally his
duty to correct and verify any figure entered in the
Administration report. It is more strange that

in connection with these prosecutions, either the Sanitary
Inspector's report or the Councillors' remarks; and
the Council would not have got even the numbers
but for the diaries and counterfoils of the Sanitary
Staff. It is stranger still that these should dis-
-appear in spite of Manager's attempts to find them
long before this reference was made by Government.

As however, the Manager is under suspension
for six months for his insolent and insubordinate
conduct towards the Chairman in a conversation
about the preparation of the Administration
report, the Council could not now call upon him
for an explanation. The Government will, the
Council hopes, be pleased to note the manner
in which, and the circumstances under which the
figure has crept into the Administration report,
and absolve the Council from all manner of blame
or guilty motives as ingeniously suggested, and
improperly inferred by the Sub Magistrate.
The Council further trusts that under the cir-
-cumstances stated the Government will also
be pleased to observe that the insertion of the
figure under private Scavenging was purely due

This is not
suspicious

5

or the Chairman, to palm off the defects pointed out
by Government as regards private Scavenging and
thus impose upon Government.

5. Under these circumstances the Council requests
that the Government will be pleased to correct, if necessary
the figure under private Scavenging in the Administration
report as per resolution enclosed.

!!

6. Having thus disposed of the main reference, the Council,
however, feels it its duty to bring to the serious notice
of Government the uncalled for and the undignified
remarks of the Sub Magistrate against the Council
and the Chairman, and to request that it may
be pleased to take due notice of his conduct as disclosed
in his report. The Government will further be pleased
from a perusal of his reports to observe that he has not
only failed to show that official etiquette and courtesy
due from one public officer to another, but has also
entirely failed to realize the position that both officers
are bound to show mutual respect to and sympathetic
co-operation with each other. The Council ventures to think
that the Stationary Sub Magistrate has so far forgotten
the dignity of his office as to make petty and personal
attacks against the Council and the Chairman.

7. What is the language used in the Administration report
[illegible]

The language used, as admitted by the Sub Magistrate in para 8 of his report is "that delay in the disposal "of cases is another inconvenience to the improvement "of the system"; and it is to the use of this language that the Sub Magistrate took objection on the ground that it has called forth "the serious attention "of the Collector and urged him to call for an explanation "from him," and that as it further was an "unmerited "reflection against him", should be withdrawn by the Chairman.

8. As a matter of fact, the Sub Magistrate could not help admitting that there was a delay in the disposal of cases referred to by him as second batch, but attributes it to the non-attendance of the Inspector who lodged the prosecutions. The 9 cases were, as admitted by him in paras 4 & 5 of his report, filed on 19-3-96, of which 5 were disposed of on 10-7-96 and one on 21-7-96 and that three were still pending, so that in the cases disposed of, there was a delay of about 3 months 22 days in the case of 5 and 4 months 2 days in the case of one. But the Sub Magistrate states that for more than 3 months he could not secure the attendance of the Sub Inspector and so had to postpone them for his attendance

and that he never took up those cases, though often reminded of the same. The Sanitary Inspector further submits that this Sub Magistrate was never in the habit of taking deposition from the complainant in Municipal Cases and that for the first time he introduced the system of taking statements on oath from the Prosecutor only in these cases. This seems to be a fact. The Sanitary Inspector is the person specially directed to appear in those cases before the Sub Magistrate and the Council is the body who ordered the prosecutions. Now without going into the unpleasant question of deciding which of the two versions is true and correct it is necessary to consider here what steps has the Sub Magistrate taken to secure the attendance of the prosecutor. Except his bare statement, when called upon by Collector to explain the cause of delay in the disposal of Municipal cases, that the delay was due to the non-attendance of the Inspector, there is nothing to show that he had ever brought this to the notice of the Council or the Chairman. It is very strange that for nearly a period of 4 months, it never struck him to bring this to the notice of the Chairman when he says that inconvenience was caused to him in these cases owing to the indifference and carelessness of the Chairman in not securing the attendance of the prose conceive how the Chairman could have neglected to order the Inspector to give first deposition before the Sub Magistrate when he knew that the result of such neglect on his part will be the dismissal of the prosecutions. It is further inconsistent with the ordinary state of things that for more than 14 months, the Chairman could have persistently been indifferent to the official call rather directions of the Sub Magistrate to attend to the prosecution of cases which according to the magistrate's interpretation were instituted with a view to get over the much dreaded censure and condemnation from Government. Whatever may have been the causes, the fact that there was delay in the disposal of these cases is, beyond doubt, — admitted by him.

9. In these circumstances, the statement in para 75(b) of the Administration report, that there was delay in the disposal of these cases is quite correct and the next statement that delay was another inconvenience for the improvement of the system is the legitimate and logical conclusion. It is in connection with this reference and in explanation of para 75(b) that the Sub Magistrate and the [illegible] aspersions against the Chairman and the Council.

"Condition of their latrines, by not calling one single
witness who had seen the latrines at any time on or before
"the date of offence and in not respecting or minding the
"advice given by the Bench Magistrates that the cases
"had better be withdrawn; it would also show that
"the insanitary state of the latrines was mere guess
"work, and arrived at through a mere deduction
"worked out from the sole fact that the totis engaged
"by the owners were ordered by the Chairman not
"to cleanse private latrines, so that it cannot but
"be presumed that these 15 latrines "which were cleaned
"by scavengers employed by the owners of houses"
"were never inspected by several Councillors" and
"that these 15 owners "have been prosecuted" not "for
"keeping their latrines in insanitary condition" but
"because the totis engaged by owners were ordered
"not to clean their latrines."

Para 6. "That all the assertions without a single exception
"made by the Chairman in the Administration report
"do not contain a particle of truth in them, but that
"they are all a tissue of falsehoods. That these mis-
"-statements were not intentional but were wilful
"and quite premeditated."

"That it is this warning of Government contained

" privileges &c. unless some marked improvement
" is shown in the Administration report, some
" how or other, that set at naught all other Considerations
" and actuated the Chairman to represent things which
" never existed, and to hide his own faults by
" mis-stating that the delay in the disposal of
" these cases is another inconvenience to the improve-
" -ment of the system. The Chairman seems
" apparently afraid of a severe censure this time
" and unable to find another means to avoid
" it, has had recourse to mis-represent to
" Government as he has done × ×

Para 7. " Nor has any latrine ever been
" inspected by any one of the Councillors these
" 18 months" × ×

9. " That the failure of the system is in my humble
" opinion due to nothing but a reprehensible
" want of interest on the part of the Council and
" its executive × × ×. The Chairman's attempts
" in extending the system appear, from the deposition
" of the Sub Inspector made on oath during
" the trial of the first batch of 18 cases referred
" to above, to have consisted in nothing but
" simply ordering those totis who occupied
" private employments to give up those employments

" have not joined the system, and then to prosecute
" some of them afterwards under Sec 221 of the
" Municipal Act, on the mere supposition that
" their premises were unclean × ×".

10. The Deputy Magistrate evidently accepting
the above observations, as data seems to have stated
in paras 3, 4 & 6, that "the measures adopted by the
"Chairman for extending the system are quite
"unique in themselves. To direct the Municipal totis
"who were privately engaged to clean latrines, not
" to clean them, so that the owners of the latrines
" might be forced to apply for Municipal
" help, and then to prosecute the owners on the
" presumption that the totis were not doing
" any service, and the premises must be consequently
" unclean, is certainly the wrong way to
" go about and likely to make the Municipal
" Administration of the town very unpopular."

11. As regards the remarks in paras 2, 7 & 8 of
the Sub Magistrate, and the Deputy Magistra
observations bearing on them, I have simply to
state that some of the statements are incorrect
and some are inconsistent with the recognizing
principles of [illegible]

Chairman's procedure in prohibiting Municipal totis from attending private latrines except making a mere reference to recent G.O. No. 1629 M dated 23rd September 1886, where it was stated that "Municipal totis should not be permitted to serve houses other than those belonging to the private Scavenging Service" and to the remarks made by the Collector A. W. B. Higgins Esquire in his inspection notes No. 221 dated 8-4-92 para 11 which run thus:—

"I was told that some of the Municipal Scavengers work also in private houses. This is an abuse which should be checked at once."

12. It may once for all be stated that prosecutions are not, and cannot as a matter of fact be sanctioned by the Chairman, and the lists of witnesses given for the same are affixed to the Charge sheet and cannot be changed by the Chairman. In a word it is the Council that has to sanction or withdraw a prosecution and not the Chairman. In the present case however, these prosecutions were ordered without [illegible] absence and in the time

a Councillor or a servant of the Sanitary Staff with ward Councillors' support about the insanitary condition of a place, the report is placed before the Council who sanction prosecution if they are satisfied with the report. This will be confirmed by a mere reference to the Resolutions of the Council. Thus it will be seen that prosecutions are not sanctioned as a matter of guess work on mere presumptions but are based on a particular procedure prescribed and followed invariably in every case. That this is so, is borne out by the Sub Magistrate's own admission that there were 6 convictions under Section 221 of the Municipal Act. If as was stated by him these prosecutions were the result of mere presumptions, it is inexplicable how he could have convicted 6 cases and fined them unless he were also guilty of the same offence.

13. With regard to the Sub Magistrate's statements in paras 2 & 7 of his report about the first batch of 15 cases, I have simply to refer to facts which are as under:—

On receipt of G.O. No. 1478 M dated 12-9-95. so repeatedly referred to by the Sub Magistrate in his report as the basis for his condemning meeting on 21-10-95 and passed the following resolution:— "Resolved that immediate steps be taken to remedy "defects pointed out by Government." Subsequent to the above Resolution, Circular letters were addressed to the Councillors requesting them to inspect private latrines and to arrange to get them under Municipal agency. Some time after on 15-1-96 another resolution was passed empowering, under Sec 276 of the Municipal Act, five Councillors for five wards to enter into or upon any building &c to inspect latrines privies, Cess-pools and dirty compounds with the result that some Councillors submitted some applications from private persons to take their latrines under Municipal agency in January, February and March 1896. The Sanitary Inspectors were ordered (as will be seen from enclosures) from January to March 96 to the effect that they should report about the Condition of private latrines not under Municipal management after Carefully examining them, that each Sub Inspector should secure some latrines

persons who keep their privies in filthy condition. In accordance with the above orders, the several Sub Inspectors and the Sanitary Inspector submitted lists of dirty latrines, and the C. Division Sub Inspector submitted a list of 15 persons with the following report:—

"I also prepared a charge sheet form for prosecution of 15 persons who had dirty premises." This report was placed before the Council and sanction to prosecute the owners was given. When with such preliminaries and precautions the Council proceeded to improve the Private Scavenging System as per G.O. in question, it is not possible for any to accuse the Council and the Chairman of indifference and wilful premeditation to mis-represent things which never existed as stated by the Sub Magistrate. As regards the Sub Magistrat Statement that the Bench Magistrates advise the Council to withdraw these 15 cases, there is nothing to show that it was the Case.

Vide Hussain Khan's deposition? d/17.4.96.

14. As has already been stated in para 4 Sup all papers connected with these prosecutions are missing in office. The Sub Inspector

-- and

8

complained to the Council of the harsh treatment he then received at the hands of the Chairman delegate; and here is the admission of the Manager of his having without instructions and before receipt of Government reference on this subject, made a search for these papers in vain. These are facts which are enough to show that the Sub Inspector conducted himself most stupidly, shamefully and wantonly. Here is his statement and here is his diary in his own hand, which distinctly show that he had submitted a report that 15 latrines were found in an insanitary condition. If the real state of things was ever brought to the notice of the Council, or the Chairman 9 before this, proper steps would have been taken and convictions would have been secured.

15. As regards the Sub Magistrate's statements in para 6 of his report that all assertions &c made by the Chairman in the Administration report were all a tissue of falsehoods &c x x that mis-statements

8/.

was careless and indifferent, that the Chairman was actuated to represent things never existed and to hide his own faults, he has had recourse to mis-represent things to Government, and that the failure of the system (private scavenging) was in his humble opinion due to nothing but a reprehensible want of interest on the part of the Council and its executive &c, the Council considers that these are statements which, to say the least, are malicious, spiteful and unbecoming. The Sub Magistrate forgetting entirely his position, that he has to submi an explanation to a reference made to hi by the Collector, seems to think that by such reference he was authorized

Administration and to condemn it attributing mean and sordid motives to the Chairman. The Sub Magistrate has no business to assume or to assert that a responsible Administration is inert, careless or culpable. The Council further thinks that to permit such unfair criticism and unwarrantable insinuations, without proper check will be productive of much mischief.

9 16. Under these circumstances the Council trusts that the Government will be pleased to call upon the Sub Magistrate to withdraw all the undignified and unbecoming remarks in his report and to tender an ample apology

!!

17. I regret to state that owing to my absence at Madras for some time there was some delay in the submission of this report.

18. No. 1102 with its enclosures is herewith returned.

19. Extracts from the proceedings of the Council dated 7-11-96 and 6-1-97, are herein enclosed.

20. Written statement from Kotta Ramanna referred to by the Sub Magistrate as one of the complaints against the Private Scavenging System is enclosed to show that he never made any such statements to any body.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

C. S. [illegible]

Chairman

From

The Chairman

Municipal Council

Ellore.

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Encls:

No.

Subject.

Reference.

Urgent

At Present

Ellore 25th May 1896

Recd [illegible]/96
Sd/ C.S.

To M.R.Ry. C. Sita Ramayya Pantulu garu
Chairman Municipal Council
Ellore.

Sir,

I beg to submit for your sanction a Summons received from Cocanada and request you will return it with the necessary order.

I beg &c.

/Sd/ C. J. Chapman
Manager.

Order thereon.

Yes you can attend to the Summons & go to Cocanada. Give me all the Administration papers before you leave the place in whatever condition they may be. You know I have been sick and cannot conveniently attend to the report. It has already been delayed. Send them all to me with a report of the papers sent and also all my orders in this connection.

/Sd/ C.S. 26/5.

/ True Copy /

Urgent

I have returned the Account Statement forms as requested by you. They must be sent to me before you leave the place duly filling in the forms to enable me to go through them.

/Sd/ C.S.
26-5.

Sir.

Please let me know if I can leave to day whether the Statements are ready or not. If you want them to be ready I cannot leave to day or tomarrow

26-5 /Sd/ E. J. Chapman
Manager.

Order

You can go to day leaving the State-ment & all to me - Send them now to me. Send all my orders in connection with the Administration repo
this year.

/Sd/ C.S.
26-5.

Urgn

u need not come to my ho

you can arrange

20 Tho of 1807

Send this back again to me

/Sd/ 26.6

/True Copy/

Chairman

8½ A.M.

Memo. Urgent

The Head Clerk, the Second Clerk and the 3rd clerk are directed to attend at the house of the Chairman at precisely 11 A.M. after break-fast to fair copy the Administration Report.

The Manager should keep ready all fair copies of Statements for Submissi to Government with the Administration befor this Evening & Submit them to me for Signature.

/Sd/ C. Sita Ramayya
Chairman
8.6.26.

/True Copy/

Chairman

21/FWJ Mis of 1911

8/6

Memo. Urgent

The Head Clerk and the Second Clerk have not supplied the information before last evening, nor have they sent the fair Copy of the portion given them.

They must both come at once with those papers and also bring the Resolution book.

The report must be sent to day.

/Sd/ C.S.
8-6-96.

To
Head Clerk + Second Clerk

/True Copy/

Chairman

22/ColW1 Mof 1897

Godavari Dt.

Memo.

Urgent.

Copies of office letters No 87/7-5-96 and No 115/16-5-96 to the Inspector of Police and his reply No 27/8-5-96

|Sd| C.S

These are not found among enclosures. This is very careless. The manager is requested to explain why these were not enclosed. They must now be sent to me. The whole report will have to await.

|Sd| C.S

You must also enclose copies of the Sa[illegible] Inspectors or Sanitary Inspectors repo[illegible] to me that Police declined to give help in connection with the above lett[illegible]

|Sd| C.S
10/6

|True Copy|

Chairman

3 Aug 1897

Godavari Dt Collector's Offe

Dis no $\frac{1073}{Genl}$ of 96 Cocanada 9-9-1896

From

V. A. Brodie Esquire
Collector
Godavari Dt.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department
Madras.

Sir,

In this office remarks on the Administration report of the Ellore Municipality for 1895-96 submitted with this office Dis No $\frac{722}{Genl}$ of 96 of 4-7-96 it was promised (1) That the Superintendent of Police would be addressed in regard to the lukewarmness of the Police in prosecuting persons for nuisances and (2) That due notice would be taken of the Sub-magistrate's delay in the disposal of cases filed against persons for keeping insanitary latrines.

[illegible] No of 1897

2/ The Superintendent of Police and the Dy Magistrate Ellore to whom the extracts from the Administration report, relating to these subjects, were forwarded, report to the following effect.

The Superintendent of Police states that in 1893-94, 974 Cases were prosecuted, in 1894-95, 1316 and in 1895-96, 1310 Cases and that the remarks made in the extract are not in accordance with facts. The Deputy Magistrate, Ellore submits the explanation of the Sub-Magistrate in which the latter states that the figures shown in the extract sent to him are incorrect and the statements made by the Chairman incorrect.

The Deputy Magistrate agrees with the Sub Magistrate and remarks as follows:-

4/ "The means adopted by the Chairman for extending the system are quite unique in "themselves. To direct the municipal totis who "were privately engaged to clean latrines, not "to clean them, so that the owners of the latrines "might be forced to apply for municipal "help and then to prosecute the owners on the "presumption that the totis were not doing "any service, and the premises must be "consequently unclean, is certainly the wrong "way to go about and likely to make the "Municipal Administration of the town very "unpopular."

The Sub Magistrate's explanation

with

with the Deputy Magistrate's Endorsement is enclosed for perusal.

I have &c

(Sd) V. A. Brodie
Collector

(Sd)
for Collector

/True Copy/

Chairman

Ellore Municipal Office,
2nd October 1896

To

M.R.Ry C. Sitaramayya Pantulu Garu
Chairman, Municipal Council,
Ellore.

Sir,

Referring to your order dated 1-10-96 on reference No. 1102 dated 23-9-96 from Government, I beg to state, that during the time the administration report was redrafted I was at Cocanada until the end of May and sick up to the 6th June last and therefore I cannot say how the figures 51, 5, 15 & 31 with reference to private scavenging — prosecutions were arrived at by Councillor S. Sitaramayya Garu who drafted that portion as Subbarayudu Garu, the then acting Head Clerk and Venkataswamy, Sanitary Inspector say that no information of the kind was given by them.

2/ Under these circumstances, if you would be pleased to ask Councillor S. Sitaramayya Garu how he has arrived at the figures and get his reply and after the subject passes through the meeting of the Council I will be in a position

25
[illegible] No of 1897

a position of easily drafting a reply on the Subject.

3/ The subject must pass through a meeting of the Council as the papers were referred to them for remarks and not to the Chairman.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient Servant.
(Sd) E. J. Chapman
Manager.

(True copy)

Chairman

Ellore
3-10-96

From
S. Sitaramayya
Municipal Councillor
Ellore

To
The Chairman
Municipal Council
Ellore

Sir

In reference to your order on the letters of the manager dated 2nd October 96, I have the honor to state that I could not offer my remarks on the figures of the Administration report before I know to whom the following order referred to (vide page A after para 94) and by whom it was so attended. The connected papers are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Sd) S. Sitaramayya
M.C.

(Copy of order)

Urgent

See if the figures and statements are correct in this draft. Fill in all blanks.

26/647 No 8 1897

lanks and see the minor heads are
roperly put in. I must get the draft
efore this evening with all the necessary
hanges as per statements in the draft.

(Sd/ C. Sitaramayya
5/6/96

True copy/

(Sd/ S. Sitaramayya

True copy/

Chairman

Ellore $\overset{6}{5}$th October 96

To

M.R.Ry C. Sitaramayya Pantulu Garu
Chairman Municipal Con
Ellore

Sir

Referring to your order dated 5-10-96 on Councillor S. Sitaramayya Garu's reply dated 3-10-96 to your memo of the same date, I beg to inform you that I cannot state who gave the figures to him when he was redrafting that portion of the report, for I was not here for a time and sick for sometime more. On the 9th June your administration report came to office with an order to be returned before the evening which was done. If you would be pleased to see your order quoted by Councillor S. Sitaramayya Garu you will find that it was carried out to the letter. The draft will show that I have made about or more than 200 corrections in accordance with the figures and information I had at command and filled in all blanks found. About the private scavenging figures there is no information of the kind.

2/ After hearing about this dispute in the

27
Flw Mof 1897

in the early part of last month I made all enquiries and search and was unable to find out how Councillor S. Sebaramayya Garu arrived at these figures. You will also see from his report, that almost all figures he did not know he left blank to be filled in and the way that information was filled in, it will not strike one reading through, that they were wrong, for, he wrote, "fiftyone owners have been prosecuted for keeping their latrines in an insanitary condition of which 5 were convicted and 15 acquitted &c and the rest 31 are still pending &c" and who will doubt it, ~~carrying~~ coming from the hands of a Councillor. If I was in possession of these figures I would have entered them in the draft prepared by me.

3/ Also Councillor S. Sebaramayya Garu was during the close of the official year Chairman delegate and was taking much interest in increasing the number of houses under the Private Scavenging System and therefore what he wrote about was taken to be reliable and it never for a moment struck me that he worked out those figures without data or information.

4/ The above are the only facts and I know nothing more.

I beg to remain &c

True copy / (Sd) E. J. Chapman
Manager

Chairman

Ellore Municipal Office
8th October 96

To

MRRy C. Sitaramayya Pantulu Garu
Chairman Municipal Council
Ellore

Sir,

Referring to your official memorandum dated 7-10-96 No. A Extra, I beg to inform you that the figures were filled in all blanks and to the correctness of statements was also attended to and the same has been communicated to you in my other two letters.

I beg to remain Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Sd) E. J. Chapman
Manager.

(True copy)

C Sitaramayya
Chairman

28
F447

Hussain Khan Late Sub Inspector C. Division

ఈ 1896 సం॥ మే నెల 3 తేది [illegible] నేను సి. డివిజను [illegible]

[illegible] సి. డివిజను లో [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 26 తేది [illegible]

[illegible] Send a charge sheet of all those persons who keep their premises in filthy condition before tomorrow without fail. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 15 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1897 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 21 [illegible]

[illegible] 7 [illegible]

[illegible]

29

[illegible] Detected 2 cases for private Scavenging improvement and collected the money of the above cases. I also prepared a charge sheet form for prosecution of 15 persons who had dirty privies. collected fees for 2 cases. [illegible]

[illegible] dirty [illegible]

[illegible] dirty [illegible]

[illegible]

/Sd/ [illegible]

Taken [illegible] by me in the presence of the undersigned

/Sd/ [illegible] Gavarraju

(Sd) P. Subbarayudu

12-10-96

/Sd/ S. Sitaramayya

/ True Copy /

[illegible]

Extract from the proceedings of the Municipal Council, Ellore of 6th November 1896.

Present.

1 M.R.Ry C. Sitaramayya Pantulu garu, Chairman.

Councillors

2 " K. Kristnamorty Pantulu garu
3 " D. [illegible] Row Pantulu garu
4 " S. Sitaramayya Pantulu garu
5 " Moty Venkataswamy garu
6 " Chundru Subbarayadu garu
7 " Sreeram Venkata Kristnayya garu
8 " Kanipolla Manikyam garu
9 " [illegible] garu
10 " Subadar Major C. Chendraiah Bahadur garu
11 " Munshi Mohmad Yacoob Sahib garu
12 Subadar Major Mohmad Beg Saradar Bahadur garu

× × ×

VII Read Correspondence regarding the discrepancy in figures in the Administration Report.

As it appears from the Sub Magistrate's report that the prosecutions actually instituted were only 24 under Private Scavenging the Council resolves to request Government to correct wording accordingly in the Administration report. The Council however feels it its duty to take exception to the arguments advanced and the language used by the Sub Magistrate as highly objectionable and most unparliamentary, and resolves to request Government to call upon the Sub Magistrate to withdraw those objectionable statements.

× × ×

(Sd) C. Sitaramayya
Chairman

/ True Extract /

30/[illegible]

C. Sitaramayya
Chairman

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council, Ellore dated 6-1-97

Present

1 Messrs C. Sitaramaiah Pantulu Garu
Chairman.

Councillors

2 " Sattiraju Sitaramayya Garu

3 " Duggirala Sundararama Row Garu

4 " Chendani Subbarayudu Garu

5 " Sreeram Venkata Krishnayya Garu

6 Munshi Mohamad Yacob Sahib Garu

7 Subadar Major Mohamad Beg Saradar Bahadur Garu

× × ×

IV Read and approved the draft reply to reference No 1102 dated 25-9-96

× × ×

(Sd) C. Sitaramayya.
Chairman

True Extract /

31/8/97 [illegible] 1897

C. Sitaramayya.
Chairman

Statement made by K. Ramanna 21-1-97

Recd 21/1/97

[illegible]

[illegible] — —

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] —

[illegible]

[illegible]

32/6147 no of 1897

133/Eng of 6th February 1897.
dated 10th February 1897

Forward to the Secretary to Government Local and Municipal department.

2 The attention of Government is invited to to this office letter Dis. No 1073/Eng of 9.7.96 (enclosed). The Sub Magistrate need not have waited more than 3 months for preliminary depositions in the second batch of the 9 cases referred to in his explanation. As a second class Magistrate he could have taken the cases on his file at once, as is done in other municipal towns. On the strength of the Chairman's reports supported by the Council's resolutions under Sec. 191C of C.P.C.: and issue processes to the accused & witnesses at one and the same time.

3 The Sub Magistrate's general condemnation of all the statements in the administrat report as false (vide the opening sentence of pa of his explanation) was wrong & unauthorised though it did contain some statement

which were undeniably false. In other respects his conduct seems open to no objection.

4. The other statements of the Submagistrate seem to be based on the depositions of witnesses the judgment in the 1st batch of Cases disposed of during his absence on leave and on his experience. The acting Deputy Magistrate's remark in para. 3 of his endorsement No. $\frac{709}{12.8.96}$ relating to the latrine in his office compound corroborates the Submagistrate's statements.

5. The false statements contained in the administration report, whether intentional or unintentional about Police prosecutions and about the pendency of Cases before the Submagistrate called forth the Submagistrate's explanation which, though strongly worded, is on the whole satisfactory. The Chairman's request for an apology from the Sub Magistrate, in the face of the depositions of his own subordinates is not understood.

(Sd) V. A. Brodie
Collector

for Collector

Forwarding with remarks
Ellore M. Chairman's –
eport on the Condition of
rivate

n for copying
n ted Lll · 5/4
an[illegible]red 5/4
gned 5/4
189 7

RE AGAIN G.O., No. 189 , DATED							
CURRENT No.							
URES TO C. No.							
ORDER GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT							
MENT WITH DITTO							
NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH N ORIGINAL.							

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