

1. Number of pages. 12 pages
2. Date of repair. 7-5/84
3. Initials of Referee

M.R.O. 1-32,400-22-11-80

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 898

Press
Mis.

Dated 6-10-

1883.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

7/5/36

To

HIS EXCELLENCY

MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE GRANT DUFF,

GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

*The humble Petition of SESHADRI IYENGAR, late
3rd Class Revenue Inspector, Conjeeveram
Taluk, Chingleput District.*

MOST HUMBLY SHOWETH,

That Petitioner presumes respectfully to submit this Appeal to your Excellency in Council against an order passed by Mr. H. R. Farmer, the late Acting Sub-Collector of Chingleput, dismissing him from his post after the long service of 24 years; this dismissal was effected on the groundless report made against Petitioner by the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu, who is now sentenced for two years' rigorous imprisonment for theft of records, and for whom a Commissioner has been appointed. That the charges brought against Petitioner were four in number, as set forth in the enclosure marked A.

1st Charge.—That Petitioner had disobeyed the instructions conveyed in the Jamabundy Circular Order, by not writing the Ajmaish remarks properly.

With respect to this charge Petitioner begs to state that he was deputed to ajmaish 18 villages, he ajmaished them all, and minutely examined the Adangal book prepared by the Village Officers, and the remarks entered therein by them respecting the condition of the tank, &c., he verified them, and he further entered all what were left out by Village Officers. Besides this, *Petitioner noted in a separate note book furnished to him by the Tahsildar, all the particulars required for the information of the Settlement Officer.*

That what the decision of the Sub-Collector says is, that the verification made by Petitioner in the Adangal book is not acceptable, but that he should have entered the said account in his own remarks. Petitioner begs to say, that this cannot be a fault on his part, in as much, as he had minutely scrutinized the Adangal book, and wrote his own remarks in the separate note book as is stated above. That it was not the Petitioner alone that did write so, but the other Revenue Inspectors, Deputy Tahsildars, and Taluk Sheristadars also followed the same course. *That however Petitioner at the permission of the Tahsildar wrote separate remarks in the said Adangal book with the exception of 4 villages, which he was not able to do as the Kurnums had taken away the accounts to their villages. The Jamabundy was conducted satisfactorily by the information furnished; had there been any defect in the information, the Settlement Officer Mr. W. A. Happel, would have noticed it, but nothing of the kind took place. That if Petitioner was considered to have been guilty of disobedience of orders, the Deputy Tahsildar, Sheristadar, and other Revenue Inspectors who followed the same course as he did, must have been guilty too of the same act, but no notice whatever was taken of them. That it is a matter of extreme regret that Petitioner alone was singled out and selected for punishment.*

2nd Charge.—That Petitioner did not keep his Diary in his own hand, but allowed his son to copy out the Diary for him.

That with regard to this charge, Petitioner begs to say respectfully, that multiplicity of the various works which Petitioner had to attend to, induced him to allow his son to write the Diary, it was minutely examined, compared, and signed by Petitioner. That Petitioner begs to add, that the whole Diary of Daseega Chari, one of the Revenue Inspectors of the said Taluq, is written by others owing to his sheer inability to write a line himself, this Mr. H. R. Farmer, is well aware of having been brought to his notice by the Tahsildar by means of an Urzee.

3rd Charge.—That Petitioner was insubordinate to the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu and absented himself without leave.

That Petitioner begs respectfully to state that he absented from duty for 3 days having had occasion to go to the Sub-Collector but he never did so without previously reporting the same to the Tahsildar, the enclosed Translations marked **C** and **D** which are copies of registered letters sent by Petitioner to the Tahsildar, one informing him of his going to the Sub-Collector, and the other of reporting his return, will convince the truth of his assertion. The ill-treatment to which Petitioner was then subjected at the hands of the said Tahsildar, induced him to go to the Sub-Collector to represent his grievance. Although Petitioner absented himself for 3 days, yet the Tahsildar stopped his pay for 15 days.

That about 2 years ago Petitioner was transferred from Ponneri Taluq to Conjeveram. No sooner he assumed charge of his duties, then the said Tahsildar addressed an Urzee to the Sub-Collector, that *he did not wish* to have him in his Taluq, but as no notice of the Urzee was taken, the Tahsildar a few days after this stopped Petitioner's 10 days' pay under some frivolous pretence. Petitioner was molested in various ways, *viz.*, sending for him from his station by summons, and detaining him in his Cutcherry, 10 or 15 days, by taking Kypith or Memo. accusing him of various groundless charges, and threatening him to put him in Jail or commit him to the Sessions Court, and insulting him publicly. His unnecessary detention for days together in the Taluk Cutcherry tended to throw his work in disorder. Besides this, he was on divers occasions deputed by the Tahsildar to attend to some works in other villages not appertaining to his range. This was done with a view to prevent him from conducting his legitimate work efficiently, and thereby subject him to a fine. Petitioner is able to prove the fact of his vexatious detention in the Taluk Cutcherry, by unimpeachable testimony, *i. e.*, the enclosed marked **E, F, G, H, I**, which are some of the summonses issued by the Tahsildar, to attend his Cutcherry; besides this, Batta Peons were frequently sent to bring him to the Taluk Cutcherry from his station, and on each occasion he had to pay the Batta Peon 8 Annas, 12 Annas, and a Rupee as batta, as per chit produced by the Peon from the Tahsildar; unfortunately Petitioner has not preserved all such chits, but however the enclosure marked **J**, is one of the chits produced by a Batta Peon bearing the signature of the Sheristadar for Tahsildar, and he paid the Rupee to the Peon as directed therein. That the frequent harsh treatment, to which Petitioner was subjected having given him cause for apprehension of disastrous consequence, he was prompted to address two

registered Petitions to the Sub-Collector to transfer him to another Taluk (Enclosure marked **F**), dated 2nd May 1880, but to no purpose.

That Petitioner begs to state, that his transfer from Ponneri Taluk, to that of Conjeveram was not for any fault but on public grounds, *i. e.*, that he had been allowed to remain in the same Taluk for a period of 20 years. It was not *he alone that was transferred*, but 5 others were also transferred on the same ground at the same time; considering that the transfer of Petitioner might be a point open to question in the eye of justice, the Tahsildar of Ponneri was persuaded to send a report to the Collector as if Petitioner had been guilty of neglect of duty, there is no record to show anterior to such transfer, that he was subjected to any punishment for a space of 20 years. That a few months subsequent to Petitioner's transfer to Conjeveram he was, on a report made by the Tahsildar to Mr. H. R. Farmer, reduced to 3rd Class Revenue Inspector from that of 2nd Class. The degradation was based on the ground that Petitioner omitted to collect Interest of nearly 5 or 6 Rupees on the arrears realized by the sale of certain distrained property in the village of Pichevaukum, he begs to state that he omitted to collect the Interest as the other Revenue Inspectors and Tahsildars did in accordance to Hoozoor order issued suspending the collection of Interest. When a Kypith was taken from Petitioner by the Tahsildar respecting the omission of the collections of the Interest, he stated, that he omitted to collect the Interest as per the order received by him from the Tahsildar suspending the collection of Interest but he wrote down as if Petitioner did so through forgetfulness, and obtained his signature through compulsion, Petitioner addressed a registered Urzee to the Sub-Collector that the Tahsildar took a false Kypith or memo. from him, and further informed that the Tahsildar in conjunction with the Deputy Tahsildar Kistna Row of Streepermatoor, concocted certain records to ruin him, but the Sub-Collector without taking any notice of it returned it to him with an endorsement that it bears no adhesive stamp of 8 Annas value. Petitioner is not aware of any rule that an Urzee addressed by a public servant should have an adhesive stamp affixed. The enclosure **V** is the copy of the endorsement passed by Mr. H. R. Farmer returning the said Petition. That the Appeal which Petitioner had made to the Collector, and the Board of Revenue respecting his degradation had no effect. Mr. H. R. Farmer took no notice of the other Revenue Inspectors who also omitted to collect Interest at the same time with the Petitioner. Nor was the said Tahsildar questioned why he himself omitted to collect Interest on the sum of 255 Rupees. A reference to the chitta in the Taluk Cutcherry will testify to the truth of Petitioner's assertion. It is your Excellency alone who should consider this which presents glaring act of injustice.

That it is stated in the Collector's proceedings, enclosure marked **B**, that the Petitioner in less than 3 years has been severely warned, reduced once for six months, fined 8 times and permanently reduced. It is no matter of surprise that one like helpless Petitioner who was placed under the tyranny of a superior as Seethapathee Naidu, the Tahsildar should have been treated so. It is true, that Petitioner was fined 8 times by the said Tahsildar, 2 Annas 4 times, and 8 Annas 4 times, in all Rs. 2-8-0, but it must be for your Excellency in Council to consider from the

circumstances explained above whether such an imposition of fine is right or wrong. Nothing can do greater injury to the public interest than by harassing an innocent public servant like helpless Petitioner by detaining him in the Taluq Cutcherry for days *together preventing him from attending to his duties* and thereby fining him frequently for acts involving no real fact, and asking him to resign his post after shutting him up in the Treasury room at night at 10 o'clock, and threatening him to commit him to Sessions Court, and taking deposition whenever the Tahsildar pleased. Cries of justice, and voice of reason have no effect upon the conscience disposed to ruin one. Petitioner does not exaggerate things, but he solemnly asserts as they really occurred. The copies of the several registered Petitions which he addressed to the Collector Mr. J. F. Price, and Sub-Collector Mr. H. R. Farmer on each occasion, and which accompanies this Petition will testify the truth of his assertions. That it is stated in the Proceedings of the Collector, that Petitioner not only refused to sign the Kypith given before the Tahsildar, but also remarked in an insolent tone to that officer in open Cutcherry, that all the papers in the Cutcherry was being wasted in taking Kypith from him, it is true, that the Petitioner refused to sign the Kypith on two or three occasions, the reason of Petitioner's refusal was because the Tahsildar used to write whatever he chose, but he never made the remark in such insolent tone, it was an invention of the Tahsildar; the evidence of two witnesses adduced to support the allegation is unworthy of credit, they being the Tahsildar's own subordinates. The several allusions made in the Sub-Collector's decision, and the Collector's proceedings respecting Petitioner are untenable, inasmuch as they were led to do so by the implicit confidence, they placed in the alleged truth of the charges which were artfully and ingeniously prepared by the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu. That the unfair means employed by the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu to bring your poor Petitioner into scrape, was very great and various. That what the helpless Petitioner craves your Excellency in Council is to judge whether Petitioner could be so blind to his prospects as to wilfully just at the close of his official career for the long period of 24 years, to do any unjustifiable acts which he knows would draw on him punishment. He humbly trusts, that he should be punished after a service of 24 years without legitimate cause is what your poor Petitioner fully believes, that the justice and generosity of the just administration of your Excellency in Council will not permit.

4th Charge.—That Petitioner failed to prove his allegation, that the Tahsildar was making cases against him.

That with reference to the allusion made in the Sub-Collector's decision, that Petitioner failed to prove his allegation, that the Tahsildar was concocting cases against him, he begs to be permitted with the greatest modesty to state, that had the Sub-Collector taken proper notice of it, Petitioner would have been then able to prove it in as much as some correspondence have been formed between the Tahsildar, and the Deputy Tahsildar, Petitioner, and the Sub-Collector. That when the Acting Sub-Collector Mr. H. R. Farmer, took a statement from Petitioner in the presence of the Tahsildar respecting the matter, he does not know what he wrote in it, Petitioner asked to read it out to him, the gentleman said never mind, but he was however obliged to sign it, lest he would incur the displeasure of the Sub-Collector. That the matter of the fact is

simply this, that Petitioner collected arrears of revenue in the village of Sommun-galum and Nuduveraputt, and credited the same in the Thandal account, while so, Kistna Row, Deputy Tahsildar, at the instigation of the Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidu, sent a memo. to the Tahsildar as if no arrears was collected in these two villages by the Petitioner, but that he had simply credited in the said account as if really collected, and consequently that he (Kistna Row) was obliged to collect it, and credit it in the account, upon this a report was submitted by the Tahsildar to the Sub-Collector, who sent an order calling upon the Tahsildar to submit to him the said Thandal account, but the Tahsildar on examining the said account found that there was no collection whatever made by Kistna Row, or credited in those 2 villages as averred in his report to him, the Deputy Tahsildar observing, that his assertion was proved untrue, began to say that Petitioner destroyed the account in which he entered the collections and substituted another, and thus they both wanted to concoct a charge against Petitioner. The evidence adduced by the village officials who were also examined on the subject by the Tahsildar went to show, that Kistna Row had not made any collections, but that Petitioner was the person who did so, and upon this the matter was left unnoticed by the Tahsildar to shelter the Deputy Tahsildar, and burk the charge altogether. That upon this Petitioner addressed a registered Urzee to the Sub-Collector on the 16th December 1879, bringing to his notice respecting the exertions on the part of the Tahsildar and Deputy Tahsildar in concocting a case against him, and requesting that he should be transferred to another Taluq. The translation of the Urzee marked **K**, is herewith submitted for your Excellency's inspection. That this Deputy Tahsildar was a very short time after this reduced to a gomastah's post for gross misconduct, *viz.*, for having submitted a false report against his Registration gomastah. That the Collector in his proceedings states, that Petitioner was idle, careless, inefficient, and insubordinate. Petitioner humbly trusts, that he shall be held excused by asking your Excellency in Council's attention whether it may reasonably be conjectured that he might be so. Were he found in want in the requisite qualifications to discharge the duties that devolved on him, would it be possible that he should have remained in the Government service for a period of 24 years. Petitioner ought to have in justice obtained a higher post, partly by his possessing sufficient qualifications required for it, and chiefly by having passed the Special Test as will be seen by the enclosure marked **M**.

He humbly trusts under the circumstances and grounds set forth above, that your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to take his deplorable case into your merciful consideration, and order his restoration to his former post.

The endorsement passed by the Board of Revenue on Petitioner's Appeal and other papers connected with the subject of the Petition are herewith sent with a list.

For which act of charity your Excellency's Petitioner as in duty bound,

Shall Ever Pray,

August 14th 1882

74
To

HIS EXCELLENCY

MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE GRANT DUFF,

GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

*The humble Petition of SESHADRI IYENGAR, late
3rd Class Revenue Inspector, Conjeveram
Talug, Chingleput District.*

MOST HUMBLY SHOWETH,

That, with the highest degree of respect, your Memorialist begs to state, that he made an Appeal to your Excellency in Council in August 1882, against his dismissal from the post of 3rd Class Revenue Inspector, after a length of service of 24 years. That upon which it appears, that, the Collector was ordered to place your Memorialist on pension list, and recommend him for grant of pension. That your Memorialist now learns, that the pension list has been submitted to your Excellency in Council, and that the Collector has recommended for grant of a pension, not exceeding a sum of 8 Rupees, being one third of his salary.

That your Memorialist now ventures, with great humility, to take this opportunity, to lay his distressed case before your Excellency in Council, and to state, that had he been allowed to remain in the service one year longer, to complete his full term of service, he would have been entitled to a moiety of his pension *i. e.* 12 Rupees. That your Memorialist regrets to add, that he had the misfortune to have had the undeserving antipathy of the late Tahsildar Seethapathee Naidoo. It was upon his groundless reports, to the effect, that your Memorialist was insubordinate to him, the dismissal was effected. That the enclosed copy of the Petition addressed to your Excellency in Council in August 1882 will show, how often your Memorialist was unnecessarily dragged from his Station, by the said Tahsildar to his Outcherry, by means of Summons, and detained there for days together with a view, that his work might be thrown into disorder; that how often Kypiths, or depositions were taken by the said Tahsildar from your Memorialist, accusing him of various groundless charges, threatening him at the same time to put him in Jail, or commit him to the Sessions; that how often under various pretexts your Memorialist was molested by the said Tahsildar; that how often your Memorialist was compelled to address Urzees to the Sub-Collector, to afford him relief, by rescuing him from the ill-treatment of the said Tahsildar, by transferring him to another Talug, but to no purpose.

That your Memorialist begs respectfully to state that he served your Honorable Government in various capacities, for a period embracing 24 years, and during the whole course of which, he obtained the approbation of all his Superiors; his character for integrity, and efficiency, had ever been unimpeached; that he had faithfully, and honestly, performed his duties, will be abundantly clear, from the fact of his having never been subjected, to any punishment, either by means of fine or suspension, while so, it unpropitiously occurred in October 1878, that your Memorialist should incur the undeserving displeasure of his Superior, and before June 1880, he should be dismissed. What your Memorialist now humbly craves your Excellency in Council, is to judge, whether he could have been so blind, as to his own prospects, as to wilfully just at the close of his official career do any unjustifiable act, that could bring down punishment on him. He would not certainly in justice to his personal interest do so. It is to be regretted, that it sometimes happens, that the efficiency, and probity, of a good public servant is impugned, and his proceedings misrepresented to his official Superiors, to such a degree, as to occasion an unfavorable impression, and produce lamentable consequence to him.

That your Memorialist has a large family of children, and is at present utterly destitute of all necessaries of life. That if your Memorialist were so unfortunate, as to get one third of the pension that has been recommended, it would be a misfortune, to an honest old public servant like your Memorialist, to cast him aside without any future means of adequate support, for he fears, that the small pittance of 8 Rupees will be barely sufficient for the support of your poor Memorialist who is now in the evening of life, he therefore humbly presumes to approach your Excellency in Council, and prays, that your Lordship will deign to look with compassion, and clemency, on so distressed a family, and order the one year which is wanting to complete the full term of service, to be taken into the account of pension, and thereby cause your Memorialist to obtain a pension to a moiety of his salary *i.e.* 12 Rupees.

That, although your Memorialist's dismissal was effected, on the groundless report of Seethapathee Naidoo, the late Tahsildar of Conjeveram yet, your Memorialist was never accused, of having ever been guilty, of any illegal act, affecting the interests of the State, or that of the Ryots, that he may not be considered an object of mercy, to your noble Government.

That your Memorialist humbly trusts under the circumstances set forth above, that your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased, to take his deplorable case into your merciful consideration, and thereby grant him the prayer sought for by allowing him to have half pension.

For which act of charity, your Memorialist, as in duty bound,

SHALL EVER PRAY.

SAVELLEMADU
CONJEVERAM TALUQ
SEPTEMBER 6th 1883.

Conjeveram
Date 3rd Claps Revenue
Inspector.

184

ABSTRACT.

184

184

184

184

184

184

24

60-860/26-9-83

[8]

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(Pensⁿ. BRANCH.)

N^o 1064

7478186476

From

Seshadri Sengar

Occupation Late 3rd Class

Village Rev. Inspector

Taluk Coimjeveram Talug.

District Chingleput.

Dated 6th } September/83
Received 12th }

Enclosures — 1 —

(Hick)

SUBJECT.

DESP

Pray^{that} either he be
restored or granted a
1/2 pay pension.

Col^{li} This S.O. orders his re-employment.

For 6-864/83 N^o 898
60. The petitioners will be furnished with a
copy of S.O. no 860 of 24th Sept 83.

60-864-10-83 16/9/83