

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.**Government of Madras.***Public Works* **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 32/3	Press
644-645	Mis.—
Dated 25-10-	1865.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
25th October 1865.*

No. 644. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Department Public Works, dated Pulney, 3rd October 1865, No. 1,212 :—

1. I have the honor to enclose copy of a correspondence between the Collector of Madura and myself, as I cannot believe that the Government will allow that the Tahsildar of Tirumungalum may insult me because I am supposed to have interrupted him in Court, and because the subject did not concern this Department.

2. On neither point has the Collector obtained any evidence. I wanted the Natamgar, partly because he had refused to furnish me with supplies, but principally to procure information as to the position of a village in the neighbourhood (Peria Pulankolum), from which I had received, through the Secretary of the Revenue Board, a Petition; the Collector, as you will observe, considers that I was not entitled to the attendance of the Natamgar, because Kugalapuram is a Zemindary village, although he was therefore the only Government Officer in the place; and forgetful apparently of the fact that I was dependent on the Natamgar for this very information, regarding which I had been misled by Mr. McNair.

3. The simple facts are, that I went, as I thought, to the Natamgar's house, in consequence of a message which I was told he had sent. I found myself in the Tahsildar's presence, and was accosted by him; I explained my mistake, but was most offensively treated by him. It appeared afterwards that he was making a preliminary investigation into a charge of assault made by the Natamgar against my servant, of which, I, at that time, knew nothing. Till then he considered the matter very trifling; but to punish me (as I think is clear from the amount of fine as well as from his own words) he levied two months' pay from my servant, a regular appeal was made to the Collector, on the 8th or 9th ultimo, but his decision has not yet been received.

4. Several of my Subordinates complain of the offensive manner of the Tahsildar; and now that I have had experience of it myself, I cannot insist on their carrying on the personal intercourse so frequently expedient between the authorities of the two Departments.

From the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to the Collector of Madura, dated Periapulankolum, 24th August 1865, No. 930.

1. I have the honor to enclose notes of a conversation, which took place yesterday morning between the Tahsildar of Tirumungalum and myself, for such notice as you may think proper.

2. I would observe that Mr. McNair had misled me by informing me that Kugalapuram was in the Tinnevely District, and I had every reason for knowing that the Streevelliputur Tahsildar was not there. I saw the Tirumungalum Tahsildar drive past, and when I enquired as to his presence there, I was told that he had been to Streevelliputur, and concluded that he was returning from some leave.

3. I may add that the Tahsildar's manner was still more objectionable than his language.

NOTES OF A CONVERSATION.

23rd August, about 10 A.M., I sent Baba Myah to call the Natamgar of Kugalapuram; he came back and said the Natamgar replied that he was busy with the Tahsildar, but would come when the enquiry was over. I went, as I thought, to the Natamgar's house door, passing some persons sitting near, I was stopped by a Peon saying "the Tahsildar," as I was asking for the Natamgar, who sent me an impertinent message. The Tahsildar said he was giving a deposition. I expressed my surprise, as I told him that Mr. McNair had informed me I was in Streevelliputur Taluq. The Tahsildar said I was mistaken, and that he had already sent me a message about the Natamgar. I said it was a pity he had not written two lines, as I had no idea of his being there. He cried out "am I a slave? Perhaps you would like to order me to your tent. I am your equal, the head of my Department, as you are head of yours. You did not write to me." I replied that "there might be some question as to our positions, but that had nothing to do with the matter. I had not sent any message to him, nor did I know till now that he had sent me the reply. I had sent for the Natamgar who, like many others, had not come, so that I should be driven to write to Government to enable me to do my work." He answered, "that I might make any complaint to Government; he would not allow of my coming into his Court and abusing him." I remarked

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
25th October 1865.*

"that I had not complained of or abused him; and that if he perverted my words in this way the less personal intercourse that took place the better, and I must decline in future to receive him when he called." He said, "I had called him impertinent." I denied it, and repeated my first expression, which referred to the Natamgar's message, and further suggested a reference to Johnson's Dictionary, which he scornfully rejected. I remarked, that if he complained to me of any offensive language in a Tamil paper I should consider myself bound to refer it to some Tamil scholar, unless it was very glaring, and that, on the same principle, I claimed the right to interpret English; if he had written his message it would have saved my coming from my tent, and the conversation that had passed. He replied somewhat irrelevantly that "he had written to me on a former occasion." I said "I did not remember it." He again cried out. "You deny it! you deny it! shall I prove it to you. It was when you wanted toddy to make bread." I replied that "I required no proof." "He might have written, I had never denied it. I had simply said I did not remember. What had it to do with the present matter. I should have expected certain civilities from him as an educated man, and one who had mixed with English gentlemen. I had not expected to see him at all. If I had considered the message, which I thought came from the Natamgar, I should have supposed that the Streevelliputur Tahsildar was intended, and should not have looked for any note from him as he knew no English, but that in fact I had supposed it was a lying excuse on the part of the Natamgar."

From the Collector of Madura, to the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, dated Madura, 30th August 1865, No. 1,479.

1. Referring to your letter No. 900, dated the 24th August, and its enclosure, I have the honor to inform you that the Tahsildar of Tirumungalum has sent me an account of the altercation which occurred between you and him at Goovalapooram. I cannot see that the Tahsildar is in any way to blame for having sent a verbal message through the Peon, and am of opinion you should not have gone into his Court and interrupted his proceedings, and as the altercation between you and him occurred on a point not concerned with your Department, I see no reason to interfere at all in the matter.

2. With reference to your letter No. 901, dated 24th August, I have to observe that the village officers have been directed to attend your office, and up to this date have never heard from you that they did not do so; if you would complain at the time of such neglect, notice would be taken of their delinquency at once. However, to ensure their attendance, another order on the subject will be sent them.

3. The village of Goovalapooram is a Zemindary village, and therefore I fail to see you had any grounds to require the attendance of the Natamgar, or in what way his non-attendance interfered with the carrying on of your duties.

From the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to the Collector of Madura, dated Madura, 1st September 1865, No. 971.

1. I have the honor to request that you will re-consider your letter of the 30th August, No. 1,479.

2. In it you justify the Tahsildar of Tirumungalum for using objectionable language, first, because I should not have gone into his Court and interrupted his proceedings; and second, because it did not concern my Department.

3. I have already repeatedly said that, until the Tahsildar told me, I knew nothing of the Court or the jurisdiction at that place of the officer; but even if I had known it, I submit that the Court is public, and that I had a right to enter it; but I never went beyond the verandah post, and was stopped by the Peon and Tahsildar, for aught I did or said the latter might have continued his proceedings without any further notice from me.

4. I submit that even if I did interrupt the Court, I explained on the spot how it occurred, and that the Tahsildar was not justified in either his words or his behaviour. I have since heard that few of my Subordinates will run the risk of personal intercourse, and after what I have experienced I certainly cannot order them to go to him.

5. I learn for the first time from your paragraph 3, that Kugalapuram is a Zemindary village. This itself, I think, shows the necessity of attendance on the part of the Natamgar, who is or should be a Government servant, under the provisions of Act XXIX. of 1802, and should as such, in my opinion, attend upon an Officer of Government travelling on duty.

From the Collector of Madura, to the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, dated Madura, 6th September 1865, No. 1,533.

Referring to your letter No. 971, dated the 1st September, I have the honor to inform you that I decline to re-consider my letter 1,479, dated the 30th August.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
25th October 1865.*

From the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to the Collector of Madura, dated Madura, 5th September 1865, No. 1,012.

1. Referring to my Nos. 900 and 971, dated 24th August and 1st September, I have the honor to bring to your notice, that the Tahsildar of Tirumungalum informed my Clerk Sooba Naick, in the presence of my servant (who understands English) that "the charge for assault made by the Natamgar of Kugalapuram was so trifling, that if I had not refused to receive him he intended to have mentioned it to me as a matter, in which I should warn my servant; but after my conduct in his Court, he thought it right to inflict a fine of Rupees 20 on a man receiving Rupees 10 per month."

2. The two subjects, I would observe, are totally distinct, and my servant pleads against my recovering the advance, which I made to enable him to pay the fine, on the ground that it is really me whom the Tahsildar is punishing.

From the Collector of Madura, to the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, dated Madura, 13th September 1865, No. 1,580.

In reply to your letter No. 1,012, dated the 5th September, I have the honor to inform you that as Collector I have no authority to interfere in the matter referred to, and as Magistrate I decline noticing your communication.

(True Copies.)

(Signed) F. J. MOBERLY, Lieut.-Colonel, R. E.,
Superintending Engineer, 8th Division.

No. 645. ORDER THEREON, 25th October 1865, No. 3,213.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 55.

1. Before passing orders on these papers, the Government resolve to request the Collector of Madura to submit, for their consideration, the explanation which the Tahsildar of Tirumungalum appears, from paragraph 1 of the letter* marginally noted, to have laid before him on the subject of the complaint made by Lieutenant Colonel Moberly.

* From Collector of Madura, to the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, dated 30th August 1865.

2. The Superintending Engineer of the 8th Division will likewise be requested to furnish a copy of the docket of the Board of Revenue on the Petition from the Peria Pulankolum villagers, and to state in what language the conversation between himself and the Tirumungalum Tahsildar was held.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Collector of Madura.
" Superintending Engineer, 8th Division.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

N^o 900

To

The Collector of
Madurai

Sir,

I have the honor to enclose notes of a conversation which took place yesterday morning between the Tahsildar of Tirumungalam, and myself, for such notice as you may think proper.

2. I would observe that Mr. McNair had misled me by informing me that Kugulpur was in the Tinnevely District and I had every reason for knowing that the Streveliputur Tahsildar was not there. I saw the Tirumungalam Tahsildar drive past and when I enquired as to his presence there I was told that he had been to Streveliputur, and concluded that he was returning from some leave.

3. I may add that the Tahsildar's manner was still more objectionable than his language.

I have &c

Periappalancolin
24th Aug 1865

Signed J. J. Moberly Lieut. Col. R.
Superintending Engineer 8th D.

Notes of a Conversation
23rd August about 10 A. M. I sent
Baba

Baba Nyah to call the Nattamgar of ^{W. K. K. K. K.} Kugalupur. - he came back and said the Nattamgar replied that he was busy with the Tahsildar but would come when the inquiry was over. - I went as I thought to the Nattamgar's house door. - passing some persons sitting near. I was stopped by a peon saying "the Tahsildar", as I was asking for the Nattamgar who sent me an impertinent message. - The Tahsildar said he was giving a deposition. - I expressed my surprise as I told him that Mr. Mc. Nair had informed me I was in Streveliputur Talug. The Tahsildar said I was mistaken and that he had already sent me a message about the Nattamgar. I said it was a pity he had not written 2 lines as I had no idea of his being there. - He cried out "am I a slave? perhaps you would like to order me to your tent. - I am your equal. the head of my Department as you are head of yours. You did not write to me." I replied that "there might be some question as to our positions. but that had nothing to do with the matter. I had not sent any message to him, nor did I know till now that he had sent me the reply. - I had sent for the Nattamgar. who like many others had not come so that I should be driven to write to Government to enable me to do my work." He answered that I might make any complaint to Government, he would not attend of my coming into his Court and abusing him. - I remarked that I had not complained of or abused him. - and that if he persisted,

my words in this way the less personal intercourse that took place the better. - and I must decline in future to receive him when he called. He said "I had called him impertinent." I denied it and repeated my first expression which referred to the Nattamgar's message. - and further suggested a reference to Johnson's Dictionary. - which he scornfully rejected. - I remarked that if he complained to me of any offensive language in a Tamil paper I should consider myself bound to refer it to some Tamil scholar, unless it was very glaring. - and that on the same principle I claimed the right to interpret English. - if he had written his message it would have saved my coming from my tent, and the conversation that had passed. - He replied somewhat irrelevantly that he had written to me on a former occasion. I said "I did not remember it." He again cried out. "You deny it! you deny it! Shall I prove it to you. - It was when you wanted toddy to make bread." I replied that I required no proof. - He might have written. - I had never denied it. I had simply said I did not remember what had it to do with the present matter. - I should have expected certain civilities from him as an educated man and one who had mixed with English gentlemen. I had not expected to see him at all. - If I had considered the message, which I thought came from the Nattamgar, I should have supposed that the Streveliputur Tahsildar was

intended and should not have looked for any note from him as he knew no English - but that in fact I had supposed it was a lying excuse on the part of the Nattamgar.

N^o 1479

To, The Superintending Engineer
8th Division
Sir,

Referring to your letter N^o 900 dated the 24th August and its enclosure, I have the honor to inform you that the Tahsildar of Tirumungalam has sent me an account of the altercation which occurred between you and him at Govalaipooram. I cannot see that the Tahsildar is in any way to blame for having sent a verbal message thro' the peon, and am of opinion you should not have gone into his Court and interrupted his proceedings and as the altercation between you and him occurred on a point not concerned with your Department, I see no reason to interfere at all in the matter.

2. With reference to your letter N^o 901 dated 24th August, I have to observe that the village Officers have been directed to attend your Office, and up to this date have never heard from you that they did not do so; if you would complain at the time of such neglect, notice would be taken of their delinquency at once. However, to ensure their attendance

attendance, another order on the subject will be sent them - 5

3. The village of Govalaipooram is a zemindary village and therefore I fail to see you had any grounds to require the attendance of the Nattamagar or in what way his non-attendance interfered with the carrying on of your duties.

I have &c

Madura, 30th
August 1865.

(Signed) T. H. Levinge
Collector

N^o 971

To, The Collector of
Madura
Sir,

I have the honor to request that you will reconsider your letter of the 30th August N^o 1479.

2. - In it you justify the Tahsildar of Tirumungalam for using objectionable language first because I should not have gone into his Court and interrupted his proceedings - and second because it did not concern my Department.

3. I have already repeatedly said that, until the Tahsildar told me, I knew nothing of the Court or the jurisdiction at that place of the Officer - but even if I had known it, I submit that the Court is public, and that I had a right to enter it - but I never went beyond

the veranda post and was stopped by the peon and Tahsildar - for aught I did or said the latter might have continued his proceedings without any further notice from me.

4. I submit that even if I did interrupt the Court I explained on the spot how it occurred and that the Tahsildar was not justified in either his words or his behaviour. I have since heard that few of my subordinates will run the risk of personal intercourse, and after what I have experienced I certainly cannot order them to go to him.

5. I learn for the first time from your para 3 that Hugulapuram is a zemindary village. This itself I think shows the necessity of attendance on the part of the Natamgar who is or should be a Government servant under the provisions of Act XXIX of 1802. - and should as such, in my opinion, attend upon an Officer of Government travelling on duty. *fact that I did not know would be*

I have &c.

Madura 1st September 1865 / Signed / F. J. Moberly *Superintendent of Zemindaries*
Superintendent Engineer 8th Div.

N^o 1532

To, The Superintending Engineer
8th Division

Sir

Referring to your letter N^o 971 dated

the 1st September, I have the honor to inform you that I decline to reconsider my letter N^o 1479, dated the 30th August.

I have &c.

Madura 6th September 1865 / Signed / W. H. Loring
Collector.

N^o 1042
To, The Collector of
Madura

Sir

Referring to my N^o 900 & 971 dated 24 August and 1st September, I have the honor to bring to your notice, that the Tahsildar of Tirunungalam informed my Clerk Sooba Naick, in the presence of my servant, (who understands English) that "the charge for assault made by the Natamgar of Hugulapur was so trifling, that if I had not refused to receive him, he intended to have mentioned it to me as a matter, in which I should warn my servant - but after my conduct in his Court he thought it right to inflict a fine of Rs 20 on a man receiving Rupees 10 per month."

2. The 2 subjects I would observe are totally distinct. - and my servant pleads against my recovering the advance, which I made to enable him to pay the fine, on the ground that it is really me whom the

Tahsildar is punishing.

I have &c

Madura
5th September
1865

Signed / F. J. Moberly / Secy. C. E.
Superintending Engineer 8th Div.

N^o 1580

To, The Superintending Engineer
8th Division

Sir,

In reply to your letter N^o 1012
dated the 5th September, I have the honor
to inform you that, as Collector, I have
no authority to interfere in the matter
referred to and as Magistrate I decline
noticing your communication.

I have &c

Madura
September 1865

Signed / W. H. Levinge
Collector

(True Copies)

F. J. Moberly / Secy. C. E.
Superintending Engineer 8th Div.

Inclosure in a letter
from the Sup^r Engineer
8th Divⁿ 1212 dated
3rd October 1865-

9077 09 69 / 65

Copies of Correspondence
between the Sup^r
Engineer & the Collector
of Madura regarding
the Conduct of the Tah-
sildar of Tirumangalam.
Prov^d 25th October / 15- B.N. 644

No 1212 Sup^d Engineer's Office 8th Divⁿ
To, Pulney 3rd October 1865
From,

Sir, Col^l F. J. Moberly R.E.
Superintending Engineer 8th Divⁿ

Colonel C. A. Orr R.E.
Secretary to Government D.P.W.

I have the honor to enclose copy of
a correspondence between the Collector of
Madura and myself as I cannot believe
that the Government will allow that the Sah.
sildar of Kimmungalam may insult me
because I am supposed to have interrupted
him in court and because the subject did not
concern this Department.

2. On neither point has the Collector
obtained any evidence. I wanted the Nadam
gar, partly because he had refused to furnish
me with supplies, but principally to procure
information, as to the position of a village
in the neighbourhood (Peria Pulankulam)
from which I had received, through the Secre-
tary of the Revenue Board, a petition. The
Collector, as you will observe, considers that
I was not entitled to the attendance of the
Nadamgar, because Kugalapur is a zemindary
village, although he was therefore the only
Government Officer in the place, and
forgetful.

What subject?

Account of
affair

forgetful apparently of the fact that I was dependent on the Natamgar for this very information regarding which I had been misled by Mr. McVair.

3. The simple facts are, that I went, as I thought, to the Natamgar's house - in consequence of a message which I was told he had sent. I found myself in the Tahsildar's presence and was accosted by him. I explained my mistake - but was most offensively treated by him. It appeared afterwards that he was making a preliminary investigation into a charge of assault made by the Natamgar against my servant, of which, I, at that time, knew nothing. Till then he considered the matter very trifling, but to punish me, (as I think is clear from the amount of fine, as well as from his own words,) he levied 2 months pay from my servant. - a regular appeal was made to the Collector on the 8th or 9th Ult. ^{who has no authority in the matter} but his decision has not yet been received.

4. Several of my subordinates complain of the offensive manner of the Tahsildar, and now that I have had experience of it myself, I cannot insist on their carrying on the personal intercourse so frequently expedient between the authorities of the two Departments.

I have &c

H. Lieber, Secy. C. P.

Superintendent Engineer S. D.

C. 16500/16500. 1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

Public Works Department

3213

Proceedings of the Madras Government Under date the 25th October 1865 Read the following

From the Super. Engineer of the 8th Division

Forwards Copies of correspondence between himself and the Collector of Madurai regarding the conduct of the Tahsildar of Tirumangalam.

Before passing orders on these papers, the Government resolve to request the Collector of Madurai to submit for their consideration the explanations which the Tahsildar of Tirumangalam appears, from para 1 of the letter marginally noted, to have laid before him on the subject of the complaint made by him Colonel Moberly.

The Superintending Engineer of the 8th Division will likewise be requested to furnish a copy of the docket of the Board of Revenue

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

1702/1702

C. 165016/165017
165017

on the Petition from the Peria
Pulankolam, Villagers, and
to state in what language
the conversation between himself
and the Tirumangalam
Sahsildar was held -

W. B.

5-7 The Collector of Madras ✓
6 - - - - - Supt Engineer & District
21 - - - - - Revenue Dept ✓

42

4

Recd 25th Oct 18

P. V. 1865 Depo
Proc. of Court for Octo

No 213

Proc. of Court
D / 25 October / 65

No. 644. 645