1. Number of pages. 1-48
2. Date of repair. 2-5-32
3. Initials of Reference

M.R.O. 1—32,400—29-11-30

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 860 Press Mis.

Dated 24-10- 1883.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

G.O., dated 8th September 1882, No. 216, Revenue.
From the Collector of Chingleput, dated 20th July 1883.

Certificate and report from the Accountant-General, to the Acting Under Secretary to Government, Pension Department, dated Fort St. George, 27th August 1883, No. A.D.J.-193.

Certified that service in superior grades has been duly proved for twenty-three years ten months and five days. The applicant's age on the date from which he ceased to be borne on the establishment, viz., 10th June 1880, was about fifty-four years. To award a pension to a Government servant of that age, it is necessary that the claim for pension should be supported by a medical certificate of permanent incapacity for the public service. But the present application is not supported by such a certificate, and hence no pension would seem to be admissible under the strict provisions of the Civil Pension Code.

2. Further, from a perusal of the accompanying correspondence, and upon reference to the history of service, it will be seen that the applicant was first absent without leave from 16th April to 4th May 1880, and was then suspended from employment in consequence of certain charges brought against him. The suspension eventually resulted in dismissal from the public service. A person who is dismissed from the public service on account of misconduct or inefficiency is barred from getting a pension or gratuity for his service under Government—*vide* Section 97 of the Civil Pension Code. The Collector is already aware of the rule, but he justifies the submission of the application by referring to G.O., No. 216, dated the 8th September 1882, Revenue Department.

3. Under ordinary circumstances a pension of Rs. 7-15-10 per mensem would be admissible, subject to any reduction which the Government might think proper on account of the character and past conduct of the applicant which are reported to be "bad."

4. The delay in the submission of the application is explained in the 3rd page.

Petition from S. V. Seshadry Iyengar, dated 6th September 1883.

Order—dated 24th September 1883, No. 860, Pension.

The applicant's dismissal for misconduct was set aside by Government who directed the submission of his pension application in the usual course. As,

G.O., No. 216, dated 8th September 1882.

however, he appears to be under fifty-five years of age and is not declared incapacitated for further service, he must be provided with a suitable post in which he can remain until he qualifies for a pension under the rules.

(True Extract.)

J. D. REES,
Acting Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Accountant-General.
" Collector of Chingleput.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

Govt. of {1883} Madras.

PENSION.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 24th September 1883, No. 860.

SEPTEMBER.

S. V. Seshadry Iyengar.

Directing the Collector of Chingleput to provide — with a suitable post in which he can remain until he qualifies for a pension under the rules.

A 3854

1882

5

APPLICATION FOR {PENSION. / GRATUITY.}

1. Name of Applicant. Sevilimedu Veeravalli Seshadry Iyengar.
2. Father's Name. Sevilimedu Veeravalli Vijiaraghava Chariar.
3. Race, Sect and Caste. Brahmin, Vishnuvite.
4. Residence showing Village and Pergunnah. Sevilimedu, Conjeeveram Taluq, Chingleput District.
5. Present or last employment, including name of establishment. 3rd Class Revenue Inspector, Conjeeveram Taluq.
6. Date of beginning of service. 8th February 1856.
7. Date of ending of service. 10th June 1880.
8. Length of service, including interruptions. .. .. Y. 24 M. 4 D. 0 3
   of which superior 23-10-8
   inferior .. .. " — " — "
   non-qualifying and interruptions .. .. " — 5-23
9. Class of {pension / ~~gratuity~~} applied for, and cause of application. Pension application submitted under G.O. No 216 R.P. dated 6 September 1882.
10. [Average] emoluments or pay. Rs. 24 — " — "
11. Proposed pension. Rs. 8 — " — "
12. Proposed gratuity. Nil.
13. Date from which pension to commence. 11th June 1880.
14. Place of payment. Conjeeveram Taluq Treasury, Chingleput District.
15. Date of Applicant's birth by Christian era.† 7th September 1826.
16. Height. 5 Feet 6 inches.
17. Marks. Color fair. Bald headed. A small tumour on the left side of the belly. A scar on the right cheek. A wart on the upper part of the right nose.
18. Date. 20th July 1883.

* If the application is for a compensation pension or gratuity, the nature of the change of establishment which has given rise to the claim should be fully stated.

† (If not known exactly, must be stated on the best information or estimate.)

Chingleput Collectorate Office 30 JUL 83 Madras

Collector.

SIGNATURE OF HEAD OF OFFICE.

REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant. Bad

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation. The applicant was suspended pending enquiry into some charges against him, Vide Translation of Sub Collector's Takid No 275 3-5-80 enclosed and this suspension was followed by dismissal - Vide translation of Sub Collector's Takid No 342 11-6-80 enclosed. Translations of orders despatching Chm are also enclosed.

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by Applicant. See Chapter ~~XV~~ XIII Nil

4. Explanation under Section ~~88~~ 100, Rule 1, so far as the Head of the Office can give it. None.

5 Any other remarks. This individual was dismissed for misconduct by the Sub Collector. Vide Takeed quoted supra and the same was confirmed by the Collector. Vide enclosed copy of Proceedings No. 38 of 1881 and of the two Proceedings therein read - and eventually by the Board of Revenue in their Proceedings Mis: No. 10,484 dated 9th December 1881 (copy enclosed). The Government have, however, on a petition presented by the Applicant praying for restoration, ordered that his pension application be submitted in the usual course. Vide G. O. R. P. No. 216 dated 8 September 1882 communicated with Board's Proceedings Mis: No. 7264 of the 18 idem. This application is accordingly forwarded.

2. The applicant's Service Register and Last Pay Certificate are enclosed.

3. There has been a delay of about 10 months in the submission of this application, which is due to the difficulty with which the verification of the individual's services was attended. Several references had to be made to the Sub Collector, General Charge by Collector and Treasury by Collector in connection with this and the necessary information was finally received in the Collector's office on the 16 Instant.

6. Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the service claimed is established and should be admitted or not. (See Rule 6 under Section 127.)

The records relating to the period during which the applicant was License Head clerk having been destroyed, it was not possible to have his services on this occasion verified. Affidavits have, however, been (under clause 5, Section 127 C. P. Code, 5th Edition) obtained from the applicant and a contemporary of his in testimony thereof. The rest of the service claimed is established by records. Should it be admitted.

Chengleput District Collector's office
Saidapet 20 July 1883

Redmelshed
Collector.

J. R.

6. Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the service claimed is established and should be admitted or not. (See Rule 6 under Section 84.)

SIGNATURE.

CERTIFICATE AND REPORT OF ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL.

No. A.D.C. / 193. Certified that service in Superior Grade has been duly proved for 23 years 10 months and 5 days. The applicant's age on the date from which he ceased to be borne on the establishment viz.t 10th June 1860 was about 54 years. To award a pension to a Government servant of that age, it is necessary that the claim for pension should be supported by a Medical Certificate of permanent incapacity for the Public Service. But the present application is not supported by such a Certificate and hence no pension would seem to be admissible under the strict provisions of the Civil Pension Code.

Further from a perusal of the accompanying Correspondence and upon reference to the history of service it will be seen that the applicant was first absent without leave from 16th April to 4th May 80 and was then suspended from employment in consequence of certain charges brought against him. The suspension eventually resulted in dismissal from the Public Service. A person who is dismissed from the Public Service on account of misconduct or inefficiency is barred from getting a pension or gratuity for his service under Government vide Section 94 of the Civil Pension Code. The Collector is already aware of the rule, but he justifies the submission of the application by referring to G. O. No 216 dated the 8th September 82 Revenue Department.

Under ordinary circumstances a pension of Rupees 7-15-10 per annum would be admissible subject to any reduction which the Government might think proper on account of the character and past conduct of the applicant, which are reported to be "Bad".

The delay in the submission of the application is explained in the 3rd page.

Fort Saint George,
Acct. Genl's Office,
27th August 1883.

To
The Under Secretary to Government
Pension Department

H.H. Clerke
Asst. Accountant General
for Accountant General

29-8-83

Order thereon 24 Sept 83 No 860

The applicant's dismissal for misconduct was set aside by Govt. who directed the submission of his pension application in the usual course. As however he appears to be under 55 years of age & is not declared incapacitated for further service, he must be provided with a suitable post, in which he can serve on until he qualifies for a pension under the rules. [illegible] 3/9/83.

Vide

Material facts in accd. Gen. Sir's report & draft order.

[illegible]

The Hon. Sir C. Sullivan

Pension 1883 Sept
No 998

Application for { Pension or Gratuity—

Date of application.

Name of applicant.

Last appointment.

Class of { pension or gratuity.

Amount of pension sanctioned.

Amount of gratuity sanctioned.

To the Accountant General
Collector of Chargeable

Date recommended 4-10-83

Date of sanction

With our order

No 997

From

The Collector of
Chingleput

To

The Accountant
General
Madras.

Dated 20. Sep 1883.
Del 28 "

No. 3854.

Rule 12

Pension application
on behalf of Seshadri
Iyengar late 3d Class
Revenue Inspector
Conjeeveram Taluq.

Before R. Sewell Esquire, Af: Lt Collector
of the Chingleput District.

Kyfeat given by Sevilimedu Seshatteri
Iyengar, late a Revenue Inspector of the
Conjeeveram Taluq.

I have heard Collector's letter No 2814
dated 12th Instant read.

In 1867 I was License Head Gumastah
for 5 Months & 17 days in the Ponneri Taluq.
My permanent post then was a Gumasta-
ship on Rs 15- in the said Taluq. The pay
of the said License Head Gumastaship was
Rs 20. No Taked was given to me for my
appointment as License Head Gumastah-
But the order of the Collector in the matter
was received by the Tahsildar of the said
Taluq. The particulars are known to
Ramanuja Iyengar of Madrantakam
who was appointed to my permanent
post. He is now a Zilladar in the Tri-
vellore Taluq. I affirm that the State-
ments made above are true.

26th June 1883
Chingleput

(Signed) Seshatteri Iyengar
Late Rev: Inspector.

(Signed) R. Sewell
Af: Lt Collector.

(True translation)

A Ly Carden
Asste Collector
for Collector.

J.R.

Before P. Ramaswami Iyer Avergal, Tahsildar of the Trivellore Taluq.

Kyfeat given by Ramanuja Iyengar, Zilladar of the Pattiswaram Firka.

I know Seshathri Iyengar of Savilimedu. He was a Emmastab on Rs 15- in the Ponneri Taluq. Either in 1867 or 1868 a License Clerkship on Rs 20 was created temporarily in that Taluq. This appointment was given to the said Seshathri Iyengar and I was appointed to his Emmastaship - His License Emmastaship was abolished in about 6 months. The aforesaid individual reverted to his Emmastaship on Rs 15- as before. Then I had no permanent appointment. During the aforesaid 6 months, I acted on full pay only. I do not remember whether or not a Sakid was given to me for the aforesaid acting appointment. These particulars are also entered in my Service Register.

5th July 1883, Trivellore.

(Signed) Ramanuja Iyengar
Zillador

(Signed) P. Ramaswami Iyer
Tahsildar

(True translation)

A Cardew
Asst Collector
for Collector

TR.

No. 235.

15

Takid from W. A. Hasfell Esquire, Lb Collector, Chingleput District, to P. Seethapathy Naidu, Tahsildar of Conjeveram.

Read your arzi No. 142 dated 22d. Instant with its enclosures.

I have suspended Seshadri Iyengar 3d. Class Revenue Inspector pending the completion of the enquiry into the charges made by you against him.

You should send him to me to reply to these charges.

Chingleput
3d. May 1880.

(Signed) W. A. Hasfell
Offg. Lb Collector.

(True Copy)

(Signed) N. Pichai Pillai
Sheristadar.

(True translation)

A. G. Cardew
Asstt. Collector
for Collector

J. R.

No. 342.

Forwarded to Mr. Farmer Esquire, Asst. Sub Collector, Chingleput district, to P. Seethapathy Naidu, Tahsildar of Conjeveram.

I have dismissed Seshadri Iyengar, 3d. Class Revenue Inspector of the Taluq with reference to your letters about him, marginally noted, because he has slighted the orders of the Collector in as much as he has not written the remarks &c. for having made Ajmoish in the adangal &c. accounts, in accordance with the Collector's Jamabundy circular order (published in the Gazette Supplement dated 19th November 1879); because he has not written the diary himself, but caused it to be written by others contrary to the orders of the Collector; because he has not obeyed your orders but behaved himself impertinently towards you; because he has not improved his conduct in spite of his transfer to a lower appointment and an order that his conduct should be reported upon after three months; and because he has been unable to prove the frivolous charges brought by him against you.

You should recommend

a

Arzi No. 141 dated 22d. April 1880.
" 142 " 1880.
" 160 " 3d. June 1880.
" Punishment Roll No. 2 dated 29 June 1880.

a suitable person for the post.

11 June 1880
Kanungoe 3

(Signed) H.R. Farmer
Asst: Lt Collector.

(True Copy)

(Sd) N. Pichai Pillai
Sheristadar.

(True translation)

A.G. Cardew
Asstt. Collector
for Collector

Penstr No 997/8 7/13

Taken from M.R. Weld Esquire,
Asst: Lt Collector, Chingleput District,
by P. Seethapathy Naidu, Tahsildar of
Conjeveram.

With reference to my order on the
Proceedings of the Collector bearing docket
No 2186, dated 19th Ultimo, I make the
following order.

I have transferred Seshadri
Iyengar 2d Class Revenue Inspector of the
Taluq to the post of 3d Class Revenue
Inspector in the place of Venkat Row
who will take the place of Seshadri
Iyengar as 2d Class Revenue Inspector,
for a period of 6 months from the 15th
Instant to 15th June next. They should
be ordered to do duty accordingly.

12 December 1878
Wallajabad. 3

(Signed) M.R. Weld
Asst: Lt Collector.

(True Copy)

(Signed) W.J. Tate
Asst: Lt Collector.

(True translation)

A.G. Cardew
Asstt: Collector
for Collector

No. 946. 21

Extract from H.R. Farmer Esquire, A.S. Sub Collector, Chingleput District, to P. Seethapathy Naidu, Tahsildar of Conjeveram.

Read your punishment roll dated 14 Ultimo recommending that Seshadri Iyengar, Revenue Inspector, may be reduced to a Taliary Gumastah's post on Rs 15- for having slighted your orders to collect Batta and Interest along with certain Revenue arrears of the village of Pichuwakkam, which he was sent to realize by sale of moveable property.

It is observed from the above punishment roll that this Seshadri Iyengar has been, since November 1878, fined 8 times and once degraded to a lower appointment. The Collector's Proceedings No. 17 dated 16 November 1878 clearly shows in what way this Seshadri Iyengar has been working. In the concluding portion of the said Proceedings it is said "if it is known that this man still continues to behave himself in an improper manner the result will be quite unfavourable to him". It appears that of these 8 fines, at least 6 might have been imposed since the date of the Collector's Proceedings.

Pensh No 997/8 973

Perhaps, he might have been fined even all these 8 times subsequent to the Collector's warning in the aforesaid manner. This Seshadri Iyengar has intentionally slighted the Collector's orders in the present case; therefore, any punishment less than that of degrading him to a lower appointment may not be an adequate one to the case in question. You have recommended to degrade him to a Gumastah's post on Rs 15. As his present pay is Rs 25 I have resolved to make him a 3d Class Revenue Inspector and give him a trial for 3 months. I have therefore transferred him to Venkat Row's post of 3d Class Revenue Inspector and the aforesaid Venkat Row to the 2d Class Revenue Inspector's post. You should submit a special report regarding the conduct of this Seshadri Iyengar at the end of 3 months. If he should behave himself in the same improper manner as he has hitherto done, he will be degraded, as recommended by you, to a Gumastah's post on Rs 15.

Chingleput
3d November 1879.

(Signed) H. R. Farmer
Asst Collector

J.R.

(True Copy)

(Sd) N. Pichai Pillai
Sheristadar.

(True translation)

Aly Cardew
Asst Collector
for Collector

28

No. 17 of 1878.

Proceedings of the Collector of Chingleput dated 16th November 1878.

Read again Arzis No. 190 dated 8th June, No. 212 dated 2d June, No. 272 dated 25th July, No. 387 dated 14th September 1878, all from the Tahsildar of Ponneri.

Read enclosures received with the above.

Read remarks of the Collector in notes on Jammabundi of the Ponneri Taluq under villages Nos. 11 Perungavur and 134 Kayar.

These papers relate to the conduct of Seshadriyengar, who was in June last 2d. Class Revenue Inspector of the Ponneri Taluq, but who has since been transferred to Conjeveram.

The first arzi relates to the matter of certain alleged collections which the Revenue Inspector in view to escaping punishment on account of the exceedingly unsatisfactory way in which it was found on examination that he had been attending to this branch of his duties, — falsely stated to me had been collected, were then with the Monigar and would be paid into the Treasury by 3 P.M. on the day upon which I spoke to him.

His excuse is that he repeated what the Monigar had told him, but I most distinctly asked him whether he was personally aware that

Revenue Dept 997/8783

that the money had been collected and he most positively stated that it was.

The next azi is in regard to the Inspector's allowing an exceedingly heavy arrear to accrue in his range and no less than Rs 6000 in the village which is his head quarters. He tries to shuffle this off upon the Monigar and Kurnam but it turns out that he has never attempted to look up the arrears lists or indeed to trouble himself with the subject of collections.

At the time of Jammabundi it came to my notice that there had been in the village of Perumgavur an utter cooking of the accounts in regard to which the Inspector had made no remark- signing them however in token of examination. But he took care to mark "Sari" (correct) opposite every entry in the Shavi shown in the cultivation account. This having been examined by the Taluq Shirisladar was found to be anything but "Sari" and out of a large claim made, but Rs 83 were admitted. In this village also there was a very heavy arrear. The money due by Sudras had all been collected and the Brahmins left alone.

In Hayer, which is his Head Quarters, the Inspector having first written no remark in the azmoish account beyond that there was not, on the 30th March 1878, any water in the Tanks. Subsequently on the overleaf of the page [illegible] which this was written wrote in different ink, and without date, a most dismal account of the condition of the Tanks, which was done with the evident intention of procuring remissions. This remark proved on inspection by another Officer to be, in almost every particular, untrue. Seshadriengar, when asked by my late Sheristadar when he wrote the remark, stated that he had done so some 4 or 5 days after returning to Pomeri from Hayer i-e about the first week in April, but on being cross examined by me, he was compelled to admit that his first statement was false and that the remark had been written at the end of May. He could not assign any explanation of this or of the cause of his not having, when he made the first remark in the azmoish book, stated the condition of everything. There can be no doubt that he hoped that the second remark would not attract attention and that the matter would pass in due course.

Conduct such as this cannot be permitted to pass unnoticed. The Inspector neglected his work and was true, during the course of the Jammabundi, guilty of telling falsehoods in regard to important subjects. The state of matters throughout his Range was found by me to be exceedingly unsatisfactory and the Tahsildar has spoken in anything but favourable terms of

of his mode of working and his regard for orders. His ability to do his work is not questioned.

Had he remained in the Ponneri Taluq, I would have considered it necessary to permanently reduce him to the post of 3d. Class Revenue Inspector.

He has, however, been transferred to a strict Tahsildar and I am willing to give him a chance of reforming his ways.

I therefore direct that Seshadriyengar be reduced for six months from the rank and pay of 2d. Class Revenue Inspector to that of 3d. or to a post the pay of which is equivalent to it and that he be warned that any further misconduct on his part will lead to consequences serious to him.

The Sub Collector will, as Seshadriyengar is now in his division, be good enough to give effect to this order.

Sub Supt. 3
16.11.78.

(Signed) J. F. Price
Collector.

(True Copy)

A. G. Cardew
Asst. Collector
for Collector.

J.R.

Print'd 2:997/8 W3

97

No 86 of 1880.

Appeal No 66 of 1879.

Proceedings of the Collector of Chingleput,
dated September 23d, 1880.

Read petition dated 16th December 1879 presented by S. Seshadriyengar late 2-d Class Revenue Inspector, Conjeeveram Taluq appealing against the order passed in Taluk No 946 dated November 3d, 1879 from the Acting Sub Collector Mr Farmer to the Tahsildar of Conjeeveram degrading him to the rank and pay of a 3 d class Revenue Inspector.

Read order appealed against.

Read letter No 394 dated 1st May 1880 from the Acting Sub Collector Mr Farmer.

Read records transmitted therewith.

Read Proceedings of the Collector No 17 dated 16th November 1878.

The petitioner, who was 2-d class Revenue Inspector of Conjeeveram Taluq appeals against his reduction to the post of 3 d class Revenue Inspector.

The grounds upon which this was done were
1st That he had neglected the positive orders of the Tahsildar to, in compliance with strict instructions issued by the Govt, collect interest and batta upon all arrears of Revenue.

2nd That though transferred in November 1878 and reduced for six

for misconduct when in the Pomeris Taluq, to the grade of 3d Class Revenue Inspector, and warned that if he again misconducted himself he would be severely dealt with, he was, between that date and August 1878, fined no less than eight times for neglect of duty and was again found to have misconducted himself as described in para 1.

The petitioner's appeal consists of of a denial that the Tahsildar gave him any orders as alleged and assertions that that officer is his enemy, that he favours others and that the late ex Tahsildar, being a friend of the Tahsildar, entered into a conspiracy to ruin him.

The Proceedings of the Collector read above give a history of the misdeeds of the petitioner whilst 2nd class Revenue Inspector of Pomeris. The Tahsildar of that Taluq so frequently complained of his carelessness idleness and insubordination, that the Collector removed him from the Principal division to a Taluq where it was known that he would have to work or else would get into trouble. In consequence of what came to light in regard to this Inspector's conduct when in Pomeris and the utter falsity of every thing that he stated at the Jamabandi of 1278, he was, under the Collector's orders, reduced for six months to the grade of 3d class Revenue Inspector, and distinctly warned that if he again offended, he would be severely dealt with.

How little effect this warning had upon him, is apparent from his misconduct and punishment even whilst under degradation.

The Collector in consideration of Shesha Iyengar's service and standing inflicted upon him for his numerous misdeeds when in the Pomeris Taluq a very lenient punishment. What he was distinctly proved to have done was sufficient to have warranted, if not his actual dismissal, certainly permanent reduction to the post of Taluq Goomastah. Though this leniency was shown to him, he paid no heed to it and continued his evil ways, the consequence of which was the punishment appealed against. There is only his assertions in denial of the statement of the Tahsildar, who is known to be a very strict and careful officer and one not in the least likely to forget to personally see that instructions issued to him were carried out. The petitioner was shown to, when in the Pomeris Taluq, have told the grossest falsehoods not only in writing and to his immediate superiors but to the Collector himself. The Collector, therefore, has not the slightest hesitation in accepting the Tahsildar's statements in preference to those of the appellant, which he considers utterly false.

As regards the alleged enmity between the petitioner and the Tahsildar, no ground whatever is assigned for it and there is no reason that there should be any. All that the Tahsildar appears to have done was to try his best to keep an idle good for nothing officer up to his work and this, which was the Tahsildar's duty, the appellant seems to consider "enmity".

As for the friendship so confidently stated to have subsisted between the Tahsildar and late deputy Tahsildar, it certainly, as the Collector is aware, did not exist.

The tale told in regard to the Tahsildar's love of Sesiga Charri and the favour shown by him to that officer, is one in which the petitioner is as the Collector is personally aware, utterly wide of the truth. The real facts are that the Tahsildar tried all that he could to get rid of the man who was sent to him from another Taluq, but on being told that he must retain him, said that he would rather have him as a Revenue Inspector than a goomastah, as in the latter post, he could do less harm and make fewer of those mistakes which his ignorance of writing would lead him into

It is unfortunate for the petitioner's already very questionable veracity that the Collector is personally able to contradict the majority of his assertions.

He was, in the Collector's opinion, most justly reduced by the Acting Sub Collector.

The order of the Divisional Officer is therefore confirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

Camp Ennore } / Sd. / J. F. Price
Collector.

/ True Copy /
A. G. Cardew
Asst to Collector
for Collector.

J. R.

No. 38 of 1881.

Appeal No. 59 of 1880.

Proceedings of the Collector of Chingleput, dated 17th June 1881.

Read peletion dated 2nd July 1880 presented by Seshadriyengar late 3rd Class Revenue Inspector Conjeveram Taluq appealing against the order passed in Taluq No. 342 dated 11th June 1880 from the Acting Sub Collector to the Tahsildar of Conjeveram dismissing him from the Service of Government.

Read order appealed against.

Read letter No. 1168 dated 27th November 1880 from the Acting Sub Collector.

Read records transmitted therewith.

Read again the Proceedings of the Collector No. 17 dated 16th November 1878 and No. 86 dated 30th September 1880.

The appellant was dismissed from the post of 3rd Class Revenue Inspector for neglect of the most distinct orders, not doing his work himself but employing his son to write his diaries, insubordination and insolence to the Tahsildar, and bringing against his superior, the Tahsildar, charges which he was, in no way, able to prove.

The grounds of appeal are.

1 That the petitioner entered the Service of Government in 1856 and held various

various posts in which he gave satisfaction, until 1878 when whilst he was holding the post of 2d. Class Revenue Inspector of Pomeri Taluq, he was transferred "on public grounds" to Conjeveram.

II That after this transfer, the Tahsildar being evilly disposed towards him, in 1879, managed to get him reduced to 3d. Class Revenue Inspector, an order against which he appealed but in which, at the time of presenting this petition, no orders had been passed.

III That after this, there were brought against him charges of disobeying the Jammabundi Circular orders, by not writing his agnoish remarks properly, being insubordinate to the Tahsildar and having brought complaints against that officer which he failed to prove and that he was thereupon dismissed.

He argues that though he was frequently fined, that is no proof that he was a careless or inefficient man, as in the Conjeveram Taluq the major portion of the fines imposed are unjust.

IV That he supposed that the Jamabundi Circular order only required him to write as regards remissions, and that on learning from the Tahsildar that this was wrong, he had made proper entries in some adangal books; that he was not singular in this error, but that he alone was selected for punishment. 37

V. That the Tahsildar compelled him to give and sign a certain statement.

VI. That he wrote the diary required of him from notes; he and his son, occasionally copying these out and that it is not much of an offence not to write ones diary one self.

VII. That he refused to sign certain Kaifeats as he wished to read before so doing so what was written, and that he never was insubordinate.

VIII. That the Tahsildar had reported him absent without leave, though he had applied for leave, and that he was waiting for the Tahsildars orders at the cutcherry which that officer did not give, and that he consequently remained absent from his firka.

IX. That he did not make any false charges against the Tahsildar but that the truth of his complaint that the Tahsildar made groundless allegations against him, will be shown from the records.

The first statement made by the petitioner in his grounds of appeal, is one confirming the opinion already expressed by the Collector in the Proceedings quoted above, touching his utter disregard for the truth.

Having

Having been found to have been guilty of the grossest misconduct in the Pomeri Taluq, the Tahsildar of which had spoken most strongly against him on the very points upon which the Tahsildar of Conjeveram subsequently did the same, the appellant was transferred on anything but "public grounds", in the meaning which he wishes put upon the words, to Conjeveram. He was personally told by the Collector, why he was transferred and that a further order as regards him would follow and very shortly afterwards, he was by the Collector's Proceedings of the 16th November 1878 reduced for 6 months to 3d. Class Revenue Inspector and then strictly warned that if he again misconducted himself he would be severely dealt with. He has in the petition, now presented, entirely omitted all mention of this transaction and has deceitfully attempted to make out that he was a meritorious servant transferred only because the exegencies of the public service required it - the truth being that he was a particularly black sheep who was very leniently dealt with.

Hardly had the period of his punishment, during which he was several times fined for misconduct and carelessness of various kinds expired when he again got into trouble. The order passed upon his case by the Divisional Officer was that he should

should be permanently reduced to a 3d Class Revenue Inspector, and that a report of his conduct should be made by the Tahsildar at the expiry of three months. Against this order he appealed, but the Collector who considered that he had on the whole been very leniently treated, dismissed the petition a decision which was subsequently confirmed by the Board of Revenue.

Whilst this punishment was but recent, the appellant again committed himself. He has written a voluminous excuse of his conduct, the major portion of which is shown by actual records, not prepared by the Tahsildar, to be untrue. The remainder of his defence rests upon his own word, the utter valuelessness of which has been repeatedly shown by proofs in the production of which his alleged enemy, the Tahsildar of Conjeveram, has had certainly no hand.

It is established by the adangal books which contain the most meagre of entries, that the petitioner entirely disregarded the strict and perfectly definite instructions issued in respect to the preparations for the Annual Settlement. The entries are in the petitioner's handwriting and there can be no doubt about them. He had no business if he ever thought, which the Collector entirely

disbelieves

disbelieves that he did, to "think" that distinct orders required anything but what they did. The real truth was that the appellant had thought that he might repeat what he did when in the Pomeri Taluq viz make no agnoish at all except all that the Village Officers said, and write the briefest and most useless of remarks.

The writing out occasionally of diary notes with the aid of some member of his family though an irregularity - as being contrary to distinct rules laid down by the Board of Revenue - might where an Official was overworked, be excusable, but petitioner having first told a falsehood as he has now also done on the point, was forced to admit to the Sub Collector that the whole of the diaries for the year 1880, which were those produced, had been written by his son.

It was shown before the Sub Collector that the petitioner not only refused to sign his kaifeat given by him before the Tahsildar but also remarked in an insolent tone to that Officer in open cutcherry that it "appeared that all the paper in the cutcherry was being wasted in taking kaifeats from him". The Collector is personally aware that the petitioner's manner is insolent and his former superior the Tahsildar of Pomeri

personally complained on the same subject to the Collector.

The petitioner himself admits that he did absent himself without leave asking for leave and going away as the petitioner did before it was granted, is absence without leave and the Tahsildar was perfectly right in acting as he did.

The Sub Collector against whose integrity the appellant advances nothing states that he personally examined the petitioner in regard to the allegations made by him against the Tahsildar and that the petitioner had to admit that they were without foundation.

It is to be remarked that it is singular that the petitioner if he thought the fines inflicted upon him unjust, never appealed against one of them. Judging from his character and habits and taking into consideration his accepting his punishments without complaining the only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that his statement that the fines imposed upon him were unjust is a further addition to the numerous falsehoods which he has already in this and other cases been shown to have been guilty of

of.

Was the present the first case against the petitioner, the punishment inflicted might be held to be too severe, but when it is considered that since 1878, when he received, for offences for which, had he not been of considerable standing in the service, he would, if not dismissed, have been, and that most justly, reduced to the rank of an ordinary Joomartab, he has in two years time been in scrapes showing his utter carelessness, disregard of orders, and inefficiency, the Collector is of opinion that it is not too much, and could not without harm to discipline and the interests of the public service, be reduced.

The petitioner in less than three years has been severely warned, transferred reduced once for six months, fined eight times and permanently reduced, and with all this he has gone on committing himself as he did heretofore. He has been shown during this time to have been repeatedly guilty of gross falsehoods, to have been idle, careless and insubordinate. To retain a man of this kind in the service of Government in any capacity whatsoever, would be most undesirable.

The decision of the Acting Sub-Collector is therefore confirmed and this appeal is dismissed.

Saidapet. (Signed) J. F. Price
Collector.

(True Copy)

A. G. Cardew
Asst Collector,
for Collector.

IV

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 9 December 1881
No. 10484 Miscellaneous.

Read petition No. 2330 of 1881 from S. Sheshadri Iyengar, late 3d Class Revenue Inspector in Conjeveram Taluq, Chingle-put Dist., for restoration.

The Board regret that a public servant of such long standing should be found unfitted to remain in the employment of Government, but looking to the long record of Petitioner's misdeeds they resolve to confirm the Collector's order. The Collector will inform the Petitioner.

/True Extract/
/Signed/ E. Gibson
Ag Subsecretary.

/True copy/

A.G. Cardew
Asst Collector
for Collector.

J.R.

Pensn. No. 997/87

[*Despatch*]

READ AGAIN Order of Government, dated
188 , No. Miscellaneous.

BACK PAPER, No. OF 1883.

FURTHER PAPER, No. OF 1883.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

TATEMENT WITH DITT

ORDER, &c. OF GOVERNMENT—A.

PAPERS KEPT OUT OF FILE FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINA
(not paged.)

Order
Letter
Collection

N.B.—
A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.
R = Print, but not for monthly volume.

Penar No. 997/8

Rev. Bd. 2:216d 8/9/82

PRESS.

Pension DEPARTMENT.
G.O. DATED 24 September 83
No. 860
Dispd 4-10-83

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

[Despatch Abstract.]

S. V. Seshadry Iyengar

Directing the Collr of Chingleput to provide ___ with a suitable pat. in which he can remain until he qualifies for a pension under the rules.