

20/11/66 ✓
16-6-59 ✓
17-3-60
5-7-60

[]
Local & Munl. (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 69 M.

DATED 11-1-98

INDEXED. CR

DESPATCHED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mun. Council - ordering with remark
that the election of Mr. R. N. Aravamudan
Pillai as a member of the District
- be notified

11/1/98

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 4046 M

Cus 4046 + 4079 m

From

The Collector of
Madura

Order. No. 6944 of 11-1-98

RoC. No. 1998 of 97

The Government considers that there
is no valid grounds for cancelling the
petition in question, as the list of voters
conclusive as to the right to vote and
correctness cannot now be questioned.
The petition of objection will accordingly
be rejected and the name of the successful
candidate published in the Fort. St.
Gazette.

Dated 20th

Received 22-11-

Registered 22-11-97

Enclosures 10

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Requesting to ~~order~~ that, in the circum-
stances stated within that a
fresh election be held for the
vacancy in the 6th ward of
the Diindigul Municipality.

Tr. of Madura
11/1/98
Supd-15/1/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTIFICATION.

UNDER Section 10 of the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1884, the under-mentioned gentlemen have been duly elected Municipal Councillors of the Municipality of *Dindipal*.

L.R.P. M. Arsham Pillai aasgal.

Ref. no. 1998 of 97
Enc. 1 file.

Madras Collector's Office
20 November 1907

Col. 4046. 2997

From 4046 M.

J. Twigg Esq. Esq.
Collector of
Madras

To
The Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department
Madras.

Gazette Part I. A.

Sir,

An election was held on the 25th September 1907 in the 6th Ward of the Hindigul Municipality for the purpose of filling up the vacancy in the Council caused by the expiry of the term of office of Mr. Arakiam Pillai avergal on the 4th inst., and Mr. Arakiam Pillai avergal secured the majority of votes namely 23. A petition was presented to me questioning the validity of the election under rule 35 by one of the candidates who failed, having got 22 votes. The Divisional officer was requested to inquire into the objection and his report is enclosed.

2. The grounds of objection are that intemperance was practised and that the Counterpetitioner was not duly elected by a majority of votes.

Yd. Abdul Ali
Sahib

1/7 R.
4-9 Aug 1906.

The Collector has said nothing as to the first ground, but on the second ground recommends that a fresh election be held. The facts are as follows:- No. 22 in the 6th ward voters' list is "K. Bannu Alagiri-
swami Chetty - father's name Nagalu Chetty - door no 188, house-tax Rs 4-7-0". There are two individuals of the same name - "K. Bannu Alagiriswami Chetty", the father's name of the one who pays the house-tax of Rs 4-7-0 being Venkatachalam Chetti, while that of the other is Nagalu Chetti. The entry of Nagalu Chetti in the list as the father is therefore incorrect, but otherwise the description applies correctly to the right man, i.e., the son of Venkatachalam. Both men appeared and claimed to vote, and the decision was given in favor of the son of Nagalu Chetty on the strength of the wrong entry of the father's name in the list.

3. Had the list contained only voter's name and father's name, the decision would, I think, have been correct and the vote valid; but as further particulars were given of qualification and residence and then applied correctly not to the son of Nagalu, but to the son of Venkatachalam, it would seem that the decision was wrong and

and the vote invalid. Rejecting this vote which was given to the Count petitioner, Candidates obtained the same number of votes, 22.

4. Under these circumstances I have the honor to submit that the Government may be pleased to order that a fresh election be held.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Yours most obedt. servt.

Alagiri

For Collector

20.11.27

one
meo

Collector has said

[G.]
[26]

250-7-4-97.

LOCAL AND *Signifying this v.*

C. No. *4046* and *4079* in *1997*.

SUBJECT. *Election of a*

Councillor, Diindigul Municipality

FOR ORDERS.

At an election held on the 25th Sept 17. 97 to fill up a vacant seat on the Diindigul Municipal Council, M.R.R. Arakiam Pillai, one of the candidates was elected by a majority of votes. The validity of this election was questioned by one of the unsuccessful candidates on the grounds (1) that intimidation was practised at the election and (2) that the successful candidate was not elected by a majority of votes.

The first ground of objection is vague and it does not appear from the record that any attempt was made to substantiate it. From para. 4 of the statement filed by the counter-petitioner in the case by the Sub-Collector of Diindigul, however, it appears that the Sub-Collector was of opinion that this objection was indefinite and did not therefore propose to enquire into it. As regards the second objection

Vide Rep. H.

is in evidence that one of the persons
who voted in favor of the successful can-
didate, viz. K. Banu Alagirisami Chetty, son
of Nagalu Chetty was not qualified to vote,
as he paid a house-tax of only Rs. 1-12-0,
although his name appeared in the
voters' list and that the right person
was K. Banu Alagirisami Chetty, son of
Venkatachallam Chetty, who was paying
a house-tax of Rs. 4-7-0, as entered in
the voters' list. The question for decision
now is whether the vote given by K. Banu
Alagirisami Chetty, son of Nagalu Chetty,
is valid. This man's name appears
in the list of voters and following the
decision contained in G.O. No. 6442. dated
15th June 1888, viz: that the list of
voters is conclusive as to the right to
vote, it does not appear that there is
any good ground for invalidating
his vote. If the entry in the voters' list
was incorrect, it was open to the proper
authorities or to anybody else to have come
forward on the publication of the list
and pointed out the error in it under
No. 9 of the Election Rules issued in G.O. No. 1876.2.
dated 8th December 1890. This was not done
and the list having been prepared and
completed in accordance with the
election

election rules; it must be accepted
as accurate, and the Government
cannot go behind the list and inquire
into the qualifications of each indi-
vidual voter.

In these circumstances, the objection
petition must be rejected and the
name of the successful candidate
published in the Fort St. George Gazette.
The draft order on the current is
submitted for approval.

L.R.
21/1/98

R. S. S.
10-1-98

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 4079M

From

Sayed Abdul Ali Sahib
Sindigul.

Order

No.

Dated 22-11-97

Received 25-11-97

Registered 25-11-97

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Praying that in the circumstances stated
his name may be gazetted as a duly
elected councillor of the Sindigul
Municipality.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT 4179M

To

HIS EXCELLENCY

THE RIGHT HONORABLE

THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL

Fort Saint George.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:—

1. I am a Mahomedan of Syed dynasty belonging to a noble descent and a resident of the Town of Dindigul, Madura District.
2. I was a candidate at the Election of a Municipal Councillor for the 6th Ward held on the 25th September 1897.
3. My competing candidate was one Mr. Arockiam Pillay.
4. We both secured 22 votes each and one vote was illegally allowed to my competitor by the Chairman through the influence of the Polling Officer which increased the number of votes to 23 to Mr. Arockiam Pillai.
5. The right man who had a legal vote was present at the polling booth and appeared with the necessary documents before the Chairman to set forth his claims. He was not heard but was ordered to go out, the wrong man being admitted.
6. The same legally qualified man was prepared to vote for me which he has declared in the petitions given by him to the Sub-Collector and the Collector of Madura.
7. Had it not been for the misleading of the Polling Officer who was decidedly in favour of my competitor I would have been already elected by a majority of votes.
8. The Collector of Madura has not caused any enquiry to be instituted into the other allegations set forth in my objection petition except as to the illegality of one vote under dispute.
9. The Municipal Council of Dindigul has at present no Councillor to represent the Mahomedan community whose interests have to be constantly watched.
10. I had the honour of securing the votes of almost all the European Gentlemen of Dindigul.
11. Under these circumstances I have approached Your Excellency with a humble prayer that Your Excellency may be pleased to have a perusal of the records concerned and to order my name to be gazetted as a duly elected Councillor.

I beg to remain,
Your Excellency's
Most humble servant,

Dindigul,
22nd November 1897.

Abduli

(Sayad Abdulali sahib)