[D. D. / 42]
1,000—10-8-96.

I. No. 824/97

Pension (1897) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 126

DATED 16-2-97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Granting an invalid pension of Rs. 45/ only p. m. to N. Krishna Row late cash keeper Collector's office Vizagapatam Dt.-

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
"	789	Pen.	16-10-97				

[A./1]
500—7-8-96.

The Hon'ble Mr. Grose, C.I.E

C. No. 61

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following papers:—

From the Coll. of Vizagapatam dated 15th Sept 1896, No. 3235

" " Bd. of Revn., L.R. dd 17-11-96, No 5176

Certificate and report from the Accountant-General, dated 23d Jany 1897, No. A.D.J./557

ORDER THEREON, 16th Feby 1897 No. 126

Character — Good

In 1885 the applicant was suspended for 2 months for insubordination in refusing to answer the questions put by the Sub-Coll. & was then degraded to the post of Revn. Inspr & transfd. to Golgonde Taluk, Vizagapatam Dt. having been found guilty of grave irregularities in his capacity both as Tahr. & Magte. of Kadiri Taluk, Cuddapah Dt. — vide G.O. 899/6.8.85 Rev.

P.T.O.

Please see the A.G.'s report. The break in the applicant's service caused by his having been left without employment from 5.11.85 to 13-11-88 may it is submd. be condoned under art: 465 C.S.R. The Collr. recommends the condonation, & the Bd. of Revn. supports the recommendation.

Flag C

Under articles 485 & 518 (b) of the Civil Service Regulations (2nd Edition), His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to grant to Nandagiri Krishna Row, late Cashkeeper, Collr's office, Vizagapatam Dt., an invalid pension of Rupees (~~[illegible]~~ 45/) Forty five only ~~[illegible]~~ form payable at Vizianagram from 28th Oct 1896 in consideration of his qualifying Supr. service of 25 years, 6 months and 1 days.

2. The interruption in the applicant's service from the 5th Novr 1885 to 13th Novr 1888 has been condoned under art: 465 of the C.S.R.

3. The full pension admissible under the rules has not been granted as applicant's conduct & character

sd/6.2.97

To the Accountant-General, with Register.
" " Bd. of Revn. L.R.
" " Collr. of Vizagapatam

C. 11/2/97
R. 11/2/97

not been thoroughly satisfactory

F.O.

L.D.
12·2·97

.⁄. A perusal of the G.O. quoted (no. 899 / 5·8·85) shows that the applicant's misconduct was of the very gravest description. The punishment inflicted – degradation from Rs. 175 to Rs. 30 – was well merited & it is most surprising that the Collector should have permitted his rapid promotion. He was degraded on the 4th Novr. 85; took leave without allowances for over three years ~~months~~ the next day, & on return to duty was permitted to act as Sub-Collector's Head Clerk, – his drawing an acting allowance of Rs. 17 – was promoted to a permanent post on Rs. 70/– two months & 7 days later, – & 10 months later was permanently promoted to Rs. 85 –

The maximum pension admissible is Rs. 49-11-3. – Rs. 40/– or Rs. 45/– is suggested. He was very fortunate in escaping dismissal.

L.D.
10·2·97

He should have R. 45
J.G.
11/2/97

Serl. C. No. 61 R.C. no [illegible]/acc of 1896, dated 11th November 1896

4460
5709

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
14 NOV 96
MADRAS

APPLICATION FOR PENSION ~~OR GRATUITY.~~

1. Name of Applicant. Nandagiri Kondapa Row
2. Father's name. Nandagiri Ramachandra Row
3. Race, Sect and Caste. Brahmin.
4. Residence showing Village and Pergunnah. Vizagapatam (at present) [illegible] (formerly)
5. Present or last employment, including name of establishment. Cash Keeper – Collector's office Vizagapatam
6. Date of beginning of service. 10th November 1866
7. Date of ending of service. 27th October 1896

	Y.	M.	D.
8 Length of service, including interruptions	29	11	18
of which superior	25	6	1
inferior	"	"	"
non-qualifying and interruptions	4	5	17

9. Class of pension or gratuity applied for, and cause of application.* Invalid Pension
10. [Average] emoluments or pay. Rs 99-6-6
11. Proposed pension. Rs 49-11-3.
12. Proposed gratuity. Nil 28th October 1896
13. Date from which pension is to commence. 28th October 1896.
14. Place of payment. Vizianagram, Vizagapatam district.
15. Date of Applicant's birth by Christian era.† 29th June 1843.
16. Height. 5 feet and 4 inches.
17. Marks. Color brown, slight marks of small pox on the face. Scar of wound about 1½ inches in length accross the middle front of the right thigh.
18. Date. 11th November 1896.

* 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).

for Collector.
SIGNATURE OF HEAD OF OFFICE.

HISTORY OF THE SERVICE (SHOWING INTERRUPTION) OF Nandigeri Krishnarow. Cash Keeper, Collector's Office - Vizagapatam.

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of beginning.	Date of ending.	Period reckoned as service Y.	M.	D.	Period not reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by the Audit Officer.
		RS.	RS.											
Cuddapah Collectorate.	Ag 2nd clerk Sub Collr's Office	.	17.8.	10.11.66	31.12.66 (a)	.	.	.	.	1	~~22~~ 21		Maintained in the Cuddapah	(a) Does not count having been rendered in acting appointments.
	do.	.	35	1.1.67	14.2.68	–	–	–	1	1	~~13~~ 14			
	2nd clerk do	35	-	15.2.68	31.8.69	1	6	~~17~~ 16						(b) Does not count having been vitiated by a break caused by degradation to a lower appointment and the applicant having been left without any appointment under Government.
	Privilege leave from			1.9.69	24.11.69	.	2	~~23~~ 24						
	2nd clerk do	35	.	25.11.69	16.11.71	1	11	22						
	Ag Taluq Sheristadar Madanapalli	35	12	17.11.71	10.4.72	.	4	24						
	2nd clerk.	35	.	11.4.72	11.5.72	-	1	1						
	Ag Taluq Sheristadar Madanapalli	35	12	12.5.72	30.4.73	.	11	19						(c) Verified from the records of the office of Collector Vizagapatam and the verification confirmed by reference to the annual Returns on record in this office.
	Ag do of Kadiri Taluq.	35	25	1.5.73	15.7.73	.	2	15						
	2nd clerk.	35	.	16.7.73	3.10.73	.	2	18						
	Acting Taluq Sheristadar of Vayalpaud.	35	12	4.10.73	31.3.74	(b) .	5	~~28~~ 27					Verified by paybills and pay abstracts Collectors Office.	
	2nd clerk.	35	-	1.4.74	27.5.74	-	1	27 26						
	Tahsildar of Kadiri	35	35	28.5.74	12.6.74	-	-	15 14						
	2nd clerk	35	-	13.6.74	15.7.74	-	1	3						
	Ag Sheristadar of Pulivendla.	35	12	16.7.74	8.9.74	.	1	23						
	2nd clerk	35	.	9.9.74	31.3.75	.	6	~~23~~ 22						
	Acting Taluq Sheristadar Pulivendla	35	12	1.4.75	6.5.75	-	1	6.						
	2nd clerk Sub Collrs Office	35	.	7.5.75	10.5.75	–	-	4						
	Acting Deputy Tahsildar of Chittoor	35	10.	11.5.75	8.8.75	.	2	28.						
	2nd clerk Sub Collector's Office	35	-	9.8.75	22.9.75	-	1	14						
	Carried over.					7	7	8	1	3	5			

	Brought forward					7	7	8	1	3	5	
Cuddapah Collectorate	Sheristadar of Pulivendla Taluq	35	12	23.9.75	11.2.76	.	4	19.				Verified by pay bills and pay abstracts maintained in the Cuddapah Collectorate Office.
	2nd clerk	35	-	12.2.76	20.2.76	.	.	9				
	Acting Taluq Sheristadar of Madanapalli	60	.	21.2.76	15.11.76	.	8	25				
	Spl Magistrate Madanapalli	60	10.	16.11.76	22.3.77	.	4	7.				
	Privilege leave from			23.3.77	15.4.77	.	.	23				
	Spl Magte Madanapalli	60	10	16.4.77	26.4.77	.	.	11				
	Taluk Sheristadar of Madanapalli	60	.	27.4.77	18.5.77	-	-	22				
	Spl Magte Madanapalli	60	10.	19.5.77	21.9.77	-	4	3				
	Sub Collector's Sheristadar	60	90.	22.9.77	11.7.78	(1)	9	20.				
	Taluq Sheristadar Madanapalli	60.	.	12.7.78	8.10.78	.	2	27.				
	[illegible] Madanapalli	60.	35	9.10.78	8.11.78	-	1	-				
	Taluq Sheristadar Madanapalli	60	.	9.11.78	5.1.79	-	1	27				
	Privilege leave from			6.1.79	5.3.79	-	2	-				
	Taluq Sheristadar Madanapalli	60	.	6.3.79	8.4.79	.	1	3				
	Sub Collr's Sheristadar	60	90.	9.4.79	27.5.79 9.6.79	.	1 ~~2~~	19 1.	5			
		60	90	28.5.79	9.6.79	-	-	12	5			
	do. Transit from			10.6.79	12.6.79	-	-	3				
Kurnool Collectorate	Tahsildar of Seravilli	60.	30.	13.6.79	31.10.79	-	4	18 ~~19~~				Verified by pay bills of Kurnool Collectorate.
Cuddapah Collectorate	Transit from			1.11.79	5.11.79	.	.	4 5				Verified by pay bills & pay abstracts maintained in the Cuddapah Collectorate
	Dy Sheristadar Cuddapah	60	.	6.11.79	10.12.79	-	1	5				
	Tahsildar of do	60	165	11.12.79	19.7.80	-	7	9				
	Taluq Sheristadar of do	60	.	20.7.80	20.8.80	.	1	1				
	Tahsildar of Madanapalli	60	35	21.8.80	9.10.80	.	1	19				
	Taluq Sheristadar of Pulivendla	60	.	10.10.80	3.1.81	.	2	24				
	Tahsildar of Pulivendla	60	35	4.1.81	3.2.81	.	1	.				
	Taluq Sheristadar of Pulivendla	60	.	4.2.81	18.3.81	.	1	15				
	Transit from			19.3.81	25.3.81	.	.	7.				
						5	6	3				
	Carried over					13	1	11	1	3	5	

Broughtward	25	6	1	4	5	17
Total period of Superior Service ..	25	6	1	4	5	17.

REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

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

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation. Copy of Government order No. 899 dated 5 August 1885 regarding the applicant's suspension and degradation is enclosed.

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by Applicant. (*See* Chapter XXI.) Nil

4. Explanation under Article 469 so far as the Head of the Office can give it. Nil.

5. Any other remarks. The applicant is a sickly man and his eye sight is bad. He is not fit to discharge the duties of Cash Keeper. He was ordered to appear before the District Surgeon and was declared unfit for further service.

6. Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the service claimed is established and should be admitted or not [*See* Article 991]. The service claimed is established and may be admitted.

for Collector
SIGNATURE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS, PENSION DEPARTMENT. 26

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS * REVENUE DEPARTMENT * 25 JAN 97

CERTIFICATE AND REPORT OF THE AUDIT OFFICER (1).

CH

Submitted. The applicant was employed as Tahsildar of Kadiri in the Cuddapah District on a salary of Rs175/- a month up to 4.11.85, when owing to certain charges brought against him, he was under Govt. Order No. 899, Revenue, dated 5.8.85, degraded to the post of Revenue Inspector and transferred to the Vizagapatam District. One Govinda Row Nayudu, the then Dy Tahsildar of Parvatipur was transferred to Cuddapah, and in the arrangement made consequent on the transfer, the Collector of Vizagapatam, by an oversight, failed to provide the applicant with a Revenue Inspector's post as directed by Govt., and the result is that he remained unemployed for a period of 3 years and 9 days, i.e from 5th November '85 to 13th November '88. On the 14th November '88, the applicant reentered the Govt. service, and his service was continuous up to the date of his retirement. The Collector however recommends

465 of the Civil Service Regulations, be pleased to accede to the recommendation, which is also supported by the Board of Revenue (Proceedings 5176 miscellaneous, dated 17.11.96), the applicant's qualifying service in superior grades will in all amount to 25 years 6 months and 1 day, and will render him eligible for an Invalid pension not exceeding Rs49-11-3 per mensem, equal 30/60th of his average emoluments under Articles 485 and 518(b) of the Civil Service Regulations. Otherwise, his qualifying service reckoned from 14.11.88 will amount to 7 years 11 months and 14 days only, and will entitle him to an Invalid gratuity not exceeding Rs875 equal to 7 months' emoluments under Articles 485 and 518(a) of the Civil Service Regulations. But the pension or gratuity that may be sanctioned to the applicant, should be subject to such reduction as Govt. may see fit to make as his character and past conduct, as will be seen from the several papers printed in Govt. Order

Calculation of average emoluments.

28th October 91 to 8th January/95 at 85 Rs . . . 3262-14-6

9th January/95 to 27th October 96 at 125 " . . . 2701-9-8

10) 5964-8-2

6) 596-7-2

2) 99-6-6

49-11-3

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.

Date of commencement.

Date of sanction.

80 126/97

Cus 19/97

P. 2318
S

M 7-11-96.

15 / 31/10/96

CIVIL MEDICAL FORM No. 32.

(Certificate for retirement on invalid pension or gratuity.)

CERTIFIED that I have carefully examined Nandagiri Kristna Row Pantulu

son of Nandagiri Ramachendra Row Pantulu

a Cash keeper Collector's Office, Vizagapatam

~~in the~~

His age is by his own statement 53 years and by appearance about 54 years.

I consider Nandagiri Kristna Row Pantulu to be completely and permanently incapacitated for further service of any kind or in the Department to which he belongs in consequence of Piles & defective Eyesight

His incapacity does not appear to me to have been caused by irregular or intemperate habits.

STATION Vizagapatam
Date 27. 10 1896.

Surgeon Lt Col Name.
Rank.
Distr. Medl & Sany Offr Designation.

NOTE.—[If the incapacity is obviously the result of intemperance, substitute for the words in italics "In my opinion his incapacity is the result of irregular or intemperate habits.]

7
1
61

Countersigned.

Surgn.-Major-Genl,
Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.

STATEMENT OF CASE.

1. Rank. Cash Keeper.
2. Name. Nandagiri Kristna Row Puntulu.
3. Department or Office. Collector's Office
4. Marks of identification. Color brown. Slight marks of Small-pox on the face.
5. Age. 53 years
6. Service. 26 - 10 months.
7. Sick leave granted during the service. Nil
8. Disease or cause of Disability. Piles
9. Abstract statement of case showing how the disease or disability was contracted, the results of the treatment adopted. In case the disease or disability is believed to have been caused by irregular or intemperate habits, the reasons for such belief should be stated.

Suffers from Piles for which he refuses necessary treatment. On the ground that a brother died some years ago after an operation for piles. Eyesight is also defective.

Lieut. Col:
Surgeon
Off. Medical and Sanitary officer.

J. B. Heaney

30 OCT. 96

Forwarded to the Collector; Vizagapatam; with reference to his letter No. 4549 dated 12th October 96.

Service Register
of
Nandagiri Krishna Rao.
Cash Keeper. Collector's Office
Vizagapatam.

7
3
61

Name of Officer.	Caste or Race.	Residence.	FATHER'S Name.	FATHER'S Residence.	Date of birth.	THE ENTRIES IN THESE COLUMNS ARE TO BE REATTESTED EVERY FIVE YEARS; EACH ATTESTATION SHOULD BE CAREFULLY RULED OFF THE DATE MAY BE CLEARLY SHOWN. Age. Years	Age. Ms.	Age. Days.	Exact Height. Feet.	Exact Height. In.	Personal marks for identification.	Date of Entry.	Signature of Officer.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office.
Nundagiry Krishna Row	Andra Brahmin Vishnu.	Nellore.	Nundagiry Ramachundra Row	Nellore	29th June 1843.	23	3	2	5	5	Colour: Brown. Slight marks of Small-pox on face. Scar of wound about 1 1/2 inches in length across middle front of right thigh.	30th September 1876.	Nundagiry Krishnarow	Ag. Sub-Collector. 25-10-78.
~~Nundagiri Krishna Rao~~	~~Madhwa Brahmin~~	~~Nellore~~	~~Nundagiri Ramachandra Rao~~	~~Nellore~~	~~29th June 1843.~~	~~23~~ ~~52~~	~~3~~ ~~7~~	~~2~~ ~~23~~	5	4	~~Color brown slight marks of Small-pox on face~~	~~21-2-96~~		~~Dy Collector.~~ ~~24 April 1896~~
Nandajui Krishna Row	Madhwa, Brahmin Vishnu	Nellore	Nandajui Ramachundra Row	Nellore	29th June 1843	53 years	3 months	28 days	5 ft	4 in Chest	Color Brown. Slight marks of small pox on the face. Scars of wound about 1½ inches in length across the middle front of right thigh.	27.10.96.	Nundagiry Krishnarao	Dy Collector.

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.
2d Clerk Sub Collector's Office	Acting	"	"	Rs. 17½	10th Novr 1866	NKR
Do.	Do	"	"	35	1st Jany 1867.	Nundagiry Krishnarow
Do.	Permanent	"	35	"	15th Feby 1868	
Sheristadar of Madanapully Taluq	Acting	2d Clerk Sub Collr's office	35	12	17th Novr 1871	
2d Clerk Sub Collector's office	Permanent	"	35	"	11th April 1872	NKR
Sheristadar of Madanapulli Taluq	Acting	2d Clerk Sub Collr's office	35.	12	12 May do	NKR
Sheristadar of Kadiri Taluq	do	do	35	25	1st May 1873	NKR
2d Clerk Sub Collr's office	Permanent	"	35	"	16th July do	NKR
Sheristadar of Vollpaud Taluq	Acting	2d Clerk Sub Collr's office	35	12	4 Octr do	NKR
2d Clerk Sub Collector's office	Permanent	"	35	"	1st April 1874	NKR
Tahsildar of Kadiry	Acting	2d Clerk	35	35	28th May do	NKR
2d Clerk Sub Collector's office	Permanent	"	35	–	13th June do	NKR

85 days privilege leave from 1st September to 24th November 1889

(2) [illegible] privilege leave from 6 January to [illegible] March 1879

(3) Suspended from 25th February to 27th April 1885

(4) was on leave on loss of pay from 5th November 1885 to 13th November 1888

(6) Was on privilege leave on full pay from 16th January 1893 to 4th February 1893 i.e. 20 days.

(5) Privilege leave for three months from 2nd August 1895 to 26th November 1895.

8

Character of Officer.

No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.

Testimonials

I read Telugu with Nundagiry Kistnarow during one month. During this time I found him regular in his attendance and anxious to afford every satisfaction.

Gudur 21st December 1862 } (Signed) R. M. Embley.

Character good, works well. I wish his writing would improve

(Signed) P. L. Roberts
Acting Sub Collector

My Acting 1st English writer Nundagiry Kistnarow desires me to give him a character as he is going to apply for a post in Nellore District. He has been employed in my office for 8 months and did his duties as a writer diligently and satisfactorily. He is always willing to render any assistance in whatever department he can. He has passed General Test Examination. His conduct is good.

(Signed) P. L. Roberts
Acting Sub Collector

N. Kistnarow 2d Clerk in the Sub-Collector's office at Cuddapah has given me every satisfaction since I have been in charge of the Sub-division. He has good knowledge of English and is a useful Gumastah. He wishes to obtain employment in his own District.

(Signed), E. Stone
Acting Sub Collr.

9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e.g.*, *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
Ammanapilu Naidu Tahsildar of Madanapally	31st Decr 1866	allowed to receive full pay of the same office.	Ammanapilu Naidu Tahsildar of Madanapally
	14th Feby 1868.	Confirmed in the same office	
	16th Novr 1871.	Transfer on promotion	
	10 April 1872.	reversion to former appt for not bringing to notice the transfer of a forbidden Gumastah vide Sub Collr's order no 1400 of 1872	
	11th May 1872.	Transfer on promotion	
	30th April 1873.	Transfer to another Taluq for similar office	
	15th July 1873.	reversion to former appt on account of return of permanent incumbent.	
	3d Octr do.	Transfer on promotion	
	31st March 1874 –	reversion on account of permanent incumbent's return.	
	27th May 1874.	Transfer on promotion	
	12th June do.	~~reversion~~	
	15th July do.	Transfer on promotion	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Name of appointment.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.	Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	Date of termination of appointment.	Reason of termination *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
Shenistadar of Pulivendla Taluq	Acting	2d Clerk Sub Collector's office	Rs 35	Rs 12	16th July 1874	Nundagiri Kristnarow	Extract from Collector's letter No. 687 of 1871. I know of no one better able to fill the temporary vacancy of the Madanapully Shenistadarship than A. Kristna Row, and as requested by you, I will write to the Board for their Sanction as Kristna Row has not passed all the Tests. On receipt of their reply I will invest him with 2d Class Magisterial powers. (signed) W. D. Horsley Acting Collector.	A. Armugam Naidu Tahsildar of Madanapally	8th Septr 1874	Reversion vide S. Ord No. 23/1874	C. Armugam Naidu Tahsildar of Madanapally
2d Clerk Sub Collector's office	Permanent	"	35	"	9th Septr do				31st March 1875.	Transfer on promotion	
Shenistadar of Pulivendla Taluq	Acting	2d Clerk Sub Colr office	35	12	1st April 1875				6th May 1875.	Transfer on promotion	
2d Clerk Sub Collector's office	Permanent	"	35	"	7th May do				10th May do	On way to take up the new office	
Deputy Tahsildar of Chitwail	Acting	2d Clerk Sub-Collector's office	35	10	11th May do	NKR			8th Augst do	Reversion owing to permanent incumbent resumption	
2d Clerk Sub Collector's Office	Permanent	"	35	"	9th Augst do	NKR	Extract from a letter from the Acting Sub Collector of Cuddapah to the Collector of Cuddapah dated September 1873 &c. A. Kristna Row has been for nearly two years acting as Taluq Shenistadar and has only lost his appointment by the unexpected return of the permanent incumbent. In the mean time his juniors in the office have been promoted over his head. He has passed the necessary tests and is thoroughly well up in his work. He is clever and has a ready command of English (signed) J. D. B. Gribble Acting Sub Collector	BB	22 Septr do	Transfer on promotion	BB
Shenistadar of Pulivendla Taluq	Acting	2d Clerk sub Colr Office	35	12	23d Septr do	NKR			11th Feb 1876.	Transfer on equal pay	
2d Clerk Sub Collector's office	Permanent	"	35	"	12th Feb 1876	NKR			20-2-76. ~~18th Feb do~~	Promotion on way to take up the new office	
~~Shenistadar of Sidhout Taluq~~	~~Acting~~	~~2d Clerk Sub Colr office~~	~~36~~	~~12~~	~~19 do~~				20th do	Transferred on conformation	
Shenistadar of Madanapully Taluq	Permanent	"	60	"	21st do	NKR			15th Nov 1876.	Transferred on promotion	
Special Magistrate of Madanapully Taluq	Temporary	Shenistadar in Madanapully Taluq	70	"	16th Nov 1876	NKR			~~21st Septr 1877~~ 26-4-77	~~[illegible] permanent incumbent~~	
Taluq Shenistadar	Permanent		60		27-4-77	NKR			18-5-77		
~~Special Magistrate of Madanapully Taluq~~ Special Magistrate	~~Temporary~~ Temporary	Taluq Shenistadar Madanapalli	70	"	19-5-77	NKR			21-9-77 ~~14th June 1878~~	Withdrawal of allowance owing to permanent incumbent taking leave on half pay.	
Sub Collector's Shenistadar	Substantive pro tem acting	Do	150	"	22 September 1877	NKR			15 July 1878.	Reversion to substantive appointment	
do		do	60	20	1877	NKR					

12th July

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.
Taluq Sheristadar of Madanapalle	Permanent		60	"	12th July 1878	NK
Acting Tahsildar of Madhanapalle Taluk	Acting	Taluk Sheristadar	60	35	9 October 1878	NK
Taluk Sheristadar of Madhanapalle	Permanent	"	60	"	9th November 1878	NK
tors Sheristadar	Substantive protem	Taluk Sheristadar of Madanapaley	150	"	9th April 1879	NK
Do	Do	Taluk Sheristadar of Cuddapah	150	"	28th May 1879	NK
Collectorate of Kurnool Tahsildar of Sirvell	Acting	Transit from Taluk Sheristadar of Cuddapah	10 60	to 30	12 June 1879 13th June 1879	NK
~~Collector~~ of Cuddapah NK	Permanent	Transit from "	1 60	to 5 "	November 1879 ~~1st Nov 1879~~ 6-11-79	NK
Tahsildar of Cuddapah	Acting	Taluk Sheristadar Cuddapah	225	"	11th December 1879	NK
Ditto	Do	Do	60	45	13th April 1880	NK
Ditto	Do	Do	225	"	5th July 1880	NK
Taluk Sheristadar	Permanent	"	60		20th July 1880	NK
Tashildar of Madanapully	Acting	Do.	60	35	21 August 1888	NK
Do	Do	Taluq Sheristadar of Pulivendla	160	35	28th September 1880	NK
Sheristadar of Pulivendla	Permanent	"	160	"	10 October 1880	NK

8

Character of Officer.

No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.

I have known Nandagiry Kristnarow for many years and also his brothers, they belong to a respectable family in Nellore. During the last four months while I have been acting as Sub Collector here, Kristnarow has been working under me as Taluq Sheristadar. I was quite satisfied with the way he did his work as far as it came to my notice, he is industrious and an intelligent [illegible] well up to his work. He has passed all the Tests. and having been the requisite time in grades qualifying for the post of Tahsildar I think he is quite qualified to fill that post. He knows English very well.

Madanapully
5th August 1876.
Signed C. J. Knox C.S.
Acting Sub Collr

No. 561 Dated 11th December 1876

To
The Acting Collector
of Cuddapah.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward an application from N. Kristnarow Taluq Sheristadar of Madanapally. Kristnarow is one of the senior, if not the senior, taluq Sheristadar in the District, qualified for romotion. He is very active and nergetic and does his work well. e has shown himself very useful

[Contd]

9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e.g.*, *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
Ammapilu Naidu Tahsildar of Madanapally	8th October 1878	+ Transfer on promotion	Ammapilu Naidu Tahsildar of Madanapally
	8th November 1878	Reversion to former appointment	
	8th April 1879	Transfer on promotion	
	27th May 1879	Transferred to Cuddapah as Taluk Sheristadar but to act as Sub Div. Sheristadar	
	9th June 1879	Transferred to Kurnool district.	
	31st October 1879	Reversion on account of the return of permanent incumbent	
	10th December 1879	~~Promotion~~	
	12th April 1880.	Transfer on promotion	owing to the absence of permanent incumbent on privilege leave
	4th July 1880	Do	Do
	19th Do	Reversion to former appointment	Owing to the appointment of permanent Officer as Dy. Collector
	20th August 1880	Transfer on promotion	
	27th September 1880	Transfer to Pulivendla as Taluq Sheristadar but to act as	Madanapully Tashildar
	9th October 1880	Reversion to permanent appointment	
	3rd January 1881	Transfer on promotion	

+ Vide G.O. No 288 / 21-1-79

6.

9

3

6.

3

TATEMENT OF CASE.

in the matter of relief works. If my recommendation carry any weight and in the event of no other arrangements having been made by you I beg to support his request.

(Signed) J. D. B. Gribble.
Ag. Sub Collector

Remarks entered in the return recommending for second class magisterial powers.

"Has been a Taluq Sheristadar and Sub-magistrate for more than five years and is well qualified".

3d November 1877.

Signed J. D. B. Gribble
Ag Sub Collector

Remarks entered in the Return of persons qualified for the post of Tahsildar

"Working well as Special Sub-magistrate and fit".

26th July 1877 — (Signed) A. J. Stuart
Sub Collector

Remarks in Jamabundy report No 3109 dated 16th December 1877.

Satisfactorily and promptly prepared.

(Sd) A. J. Stuart
Sub Collector

Extract from the conduct and qualification Register book.

Spares no pains to do all that is expected of him — is energetic and diligent — With attention to accuracy and regularity in business will turn out a very useful officer.

(Sd) A J Stuart
Sub Collr

Madanapalle
March 1878

Extract from the letter sent to the Board No — dated 22d August

X X X X

Para 2 N. Krishna Row is in my opinion about the best man that Mr Stuart could have selected him in the Sub Division.

(Sd) J. F. Price
Ag Collector.

SERVICE BOOK
OF

Name. Nandagiry Krishna Row
Caste or Race. Andra Brahmin Vishnu
Residence. Nellore.
FATHER'S. Name. Nandagiry Ramachandra Row
FATHER'S. Residence. Nellore.
Date of birth. 29th June 1843.

THE ENTRIES IN THESE COLUMNS ARE TO BE REATTESTED EVERY FIVE YEARS; EACH ATTESTATION SHOULD BE CAREFULLY RULED OFF THE DATE MAY BE CLEARLY SHOWN.

Name of Officer.	Caste or Race.	Residence.	FATHER'S Name.	FATHER'S Residence.	FATHER'S Date of birth.	Age. Years	Age. Ms.	Age. Days.	Exact Height. Feet.	Exact Height. In.	Personal marks for identification.	Date of Entry.	Signature of Officer.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office.

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e.g.*, *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
Tashildar of Pulivendla	Acting	Taluk Serishtadar	60	35	4th January 1881		Extract from a letter No. 177 of 23rd March 1878 from A. J. Stuart Esquire Sub-Collector of Cuddapah. 1 In leaving the Cuddapah District I think it my duty in continuation of a D.O. report submitted some months ago to Government through your predecessor to lay before you the enclosed brief statement of the manner in which some of the officers under my orders have discharged their duties during the Famine hoping that you will see fit taking their services to the notice of Government. 4. The Special Sub Magistrate of Madhanapally now acting Sheristadar of the Sub Collector's office N. Kristna Rao and other officers who have done good service e.g. the Head Clerk Sub Collector's office Rama Rao, the late Shr. Voilpad Taluk Madava-Row have a claim of recomd		3rd February 1881	Reversion to former appointment owing to return of permanent incumbent	
Taluk Serishtadar of Do	Permanent	"	60	"	4th February 1881				~~19-3-81~~ ~~25th March 1881~~	Transfer on promotion	
		Transit		N	19-3-81				25-3-81		
Tahsildar of Madanapalle Taluk	Acting	Taluk Sheristadar	60	35	26th March/81				~~30th March 1881~~ 3-6-81 ~~3rd June~~	Confirmed in it.	
Do	Permanent	"	175	"	4-6-81 ~~31st March 1881~~				14th August 1884.	Transfer	
Tahsildar of Kadiri	Sub pro:	Tahsildar of Madanapally	175	"	15th August 1884				11th Novr 1884.	Confirmation	
Do	Permanent		175		12th Novr 84				4th Novr 1885	Reduced as Revenue Inspector Golcondah taluk Vizagapatam Dt. vide G.O. No 899 d. 5-8-85 Communicated with the B.P. No 7845 d. 24th Augt 1885.	
First class Revenue Inspector, Golugonda Taluq.	Permanent	"	30	"	5th November 1885				Ag: 13-11-88	Dy Collector Promotion	
Head clerk. P.A. Collector's office, Vizagapatam Dist.	acting	Revenue Inspector Golugonda Taluq	30	17	14-11-88			ag. P.A. Collector	20-1-89	confirmed as Vernacular Hd. clerk, Collector's Office on Rs 70.	
Do	Do	Vernacular ~~Head~~ Head clerk Collector's Office	70	15	21-1-89				9.12.89	confirmed with retrospective effect from the date of T. Ramamurthipantulu garu's confirmation.	Principal Asst. Collector
		service in Vizagapatam district verified up to the end of December 1888 Volulata Ramadas									
Do	Permanent	Head clerk, P.A. to Collector							14.5.91	Promotion	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Name of appointment.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.

Verified upto 30 Sept 84.

Dy Collector

Verified upto 28 February 75.

Dy Collector.

8	9	10	11	12
Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	Date of termination of appointment.	Reason of termination *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.

treatment.

2. I have no one to recommend this year for the post of Dy. Collector.

(S) A. J. B. Atkinson
Ag. Sub Collector.

I have nothing more to say about Nandagiri Krishna Rao. He went to the Kurnool District on 9th June 1879 as an acting Tahsildar for which he is quite fitted.

Atkinson
Sub Collector July 19. 1879

Nundial.
30th October/79.

To.
Nundagiry Kristna Row Garu.

My dear Sir.—

I am returning to Kurnool. It is but right that I should take this opportunity of expressing my satisfaction of the way in which you have done your work in Shirvel during my time. It was very pleasing to see you as Tahsildar moving taking great interest in the welfare of the people who seem to be satisfied with you. I am sorry, you have no chance of

ATEMENT OF CASE.

of being Confirmed, but I have no doubt your abilities & good character will soon secure to you a good appointment.—

Yours faithfully.—

(Signed). A. Gopala Kristama Chetty.

Deputy Collector.

This is to Certify that Nandigiri Kristna Row was acting Thasildar of Sirvail Taluq in my Division for some months, during which he gave me entire satisfaction. He is a very zealous, industrious and useful public Officer. He cleared a large amount of arrears of revenue and Correspondence, unfortunately he is about to leave the District owing to the return of the permanent incumbent. I sincerely hope he will ere long be favored with a permanent Thasildari, as I regret to hear that he has lost a good chance in Cuddapah District owing to his temporary transfer to this District. I wish him every success and advancement.—

(Signed). Mohomed Azam Ghattalah.—

Deputy Collector.

Kurnool Distt.

Nandial.
30th October/79.—

Cuddapah.—
4-7-80.

Nandagiri Krishna Rau. Ag Tahsildar and Sub Magistrate of Kadapa Taluk has been known to me for the last three months. I think that he is a good Officer both in Revenue and Magisterial business.—

(Signed). W. M. Thorburn.

Assistant Collector

SERVICE BOOK

OF

Name.

Caste or Race.

Residence.

FATHER'S, Name.

Residence.

Date of birth.

OF CASE

of being Confirmed, but I have no doubt

Memo:

	Rs - a - p.
From 28th October 1891 to 8th January 1895 at Rs 85 per mensem as Head clerk of the Principal Assistant Collector's office. Vizagapatam District.	3262 - 14 - 6.
From 28 to 31 October 1891	10 - 15 - 6
for November & December 91.	170 - 0 - 0.
for the year 1892.	1020 - 0 - 0.
Do 1893.	1020 - 0 - 0.
Do 1894.	1020 - 0 - 0
from 1 to 8 January 1895.	21 - 15 - 0
	3262 - 14 - 6
From 9 January 1895 to 27th October 1896 at Rs 125 per mensem as Cash Keeper, Collector's Office. Vizagapatam	2701 - 9 - 9
from 9 to 31 January 1895.	92 - 11 - 10.
from 1st February to 31st December 1895 for 11 months.	1375 - 0 - 0.
from 1st January to 30th September 96 for 9 months	1125 - 0 - 0.
from 1 to 27 October 1896.	108 - 13 - 11
	2701 - 9 - 9
for 60 months.	5964 - 8 - 3
Average pay for one month	99 - 6 - 6.
Proposed Pension	49 - 11 - 3

7
2
61

Vizagapatam
11th November 1896

For Collector

Page 2.

LECTOR'S OFFICE
23-JUL-1896
CUDDAPAH

1 Name of Appointment.	2 Nature, i. e., whether substantive or acting permanent or temporary.	Sng ere	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination e. g., *transfer, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signatur designation mediate hea the Office.
Sheristadar of Pulivendla Taluq.	Acting permanent.			11-2-76	Transfer	✓
2nd clerk Sub Collr's Office.	Substantive permanent		Sd	20-2-76 ~~18-2-76~~	Promotion on [illegible] to the [illegible] new office	✓ Sd
Sheristadar of Sidhout Taluq.	Ag permanent.		✓ Sd	~~20-2-76~~	Transfer on Confirmation	✓
Sheristadar of Madanapalle Taluq.	Substantive permanent.			15-11-76	Promotion.	✓
Special Magistrate Madanapalle Taluq.	Temporary.		✓	22-3-77	on leave	✓
on privilege le			✓	15-4-77	Returned to duty.	✓
Spl Magte Madanapalle.	Temporary		Sd	26-4-77 ~~21-9-77~~	~~Promotion~~	
Taluq Sheristadar of Madanapalle	Permanent			18-5-77	Promotion	
Spl. Magistrate Do	Temporary			21-9-77		
Sub Collr's Sheristadar	Ag permanent			10-7-78 11	Return of permanent incumbent.	
Taluq Sheristadar of Madanapalle Taluq	Substantive permanent.		✓	8-10-78	Promotion	✓
Tahsildar of Madanapalle Taluq.	Ag permanent		✓	8-11-78	Return of permanent incumbent.	✓
Taluq Sheristadar of Madanapalle	Substantive permanent.		✓	5-1-79	on leave	✓
On privilege			✓	5-3-79	Returned to duty.	✓
Taluq Sheristadar Madanapalle	Substantive permanent.		✓	8-4-79	Promotion.	✓
Sub Collr's Sheristadar	Ag permanent		✓	27-5-79	Transfer.	✓
do	do		? Sd	9-6-79 ~~12-6-79.~~	Transfer to Kurnool.	
×					×	
Taluq Sheristadar of Cuddapah.	Substantive permanent		✓	10-12-79	Promotion	✓
Tahsildar of Cuddapah.	Acting permanent		Sd	19-7-80.	Promotion	✓
Taluq Sheristadar do	Substantive permanent			20-8-80	Promotion.	
Tahsildar of Madanapalle	Ag permanent		✓	27-9-80	Transfer	
do	do		✓	9-10-80.	Reversion to permanent appointment.	✓
Sheristadar of Pulivendla	Substantive permanent		✓	3-1-81.	Promotion	✓

Page 3.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
22 JUL 1886
CUDDAPAH

1 Name of Appointment.	2 Nature, i. e., whether substantive or acting permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination e. g., transfer, return of permanent incumbent.	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
Tahsildar of Pulivendla.	Acting permanent	Taluq Sheristadar of Pulivendla.	60	35	4-1-81.	✓		✓	3-2-81.	Return of permanent incumbent.	✓
Taluq Sheristadar Pulivendla.	Substantive permanent	.	60	.	4-2-81	✓	Pay drawn for the [illegible] appointed		18-3-81 ~~25-3-81~~	Promotion	✓
Tahsildar of Madanapalli.	Acting permanent	Transfer Taluq Sheristadar Pulivendla	60	35	19-3-81 26-3-81.	✓			25-2-81 3-6-81 ~~30-3-81~~	Confirmed.	✓
Tahsildar of Madanapalli.	Substantive permanent	.	175	.	4-6-81 31-3-81			✓	14-8-84	Transfer.	✓
Tahsildar of Kadiri	Acting permanent	Tahsildar of Madanapalli.	175	.	15-8-84.	✓		✓	11-11-84	Confirmed.	
do	Substantive permanent.	.	175	.	12-11-84.	✓		✓	24-2-85.	Suspended	
On suspension from			175	.	25-2-85	✓	2 Whether this period shall count towards pension or not.		27-4-85	Returned to duty.	2
Tahsildar of Kadiri	Substantive permanent.	.	175	.	28-4-85	✓		✓	4-11-85.	Reduced as Revenue Inspector. Golconda Taluq of Vizagapatam Dist. Vide G.O. No 899 dated 5-8-85. Communicated in B.P. No. 7845, dated 24th August 1885.	

Vizagapatam
Collector's Office
20th July 1886 } Deputy Collector

Extract from the Service Register of N. Krishna Rao Pantulu Garu, Huzoor Cash Keeper, Collector's Office. Vizagapatam.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
23-JUL-1896
CUDDAPAH

1 Name of Appointment.	2 Nature, *i. e.*, whether substantive or acting permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e. g., transfer, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
2nd Clerk, Sub-Collector's Office Cuddapah.	Offg. permanent	.	.	17-8-0	10.11.66				31.12.66	allowed to receive the full pay of the same office.	
do	do.		.	35	1.1.67.				14.2.68	Confirmed in the same office.	
do	Substantive permanent		35	.	15.2.68				31.8.69	on leave	
Privilege leave	from		35		1.9.69	✓		✓	24.11.69	Returned to duty	
2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office. Cuddapah.	Substantive permanent.	.	35	.	25.11.69	✓		✓	16-11-71	Promotion	✓
Sheristadar of Madanapalle Taluq.	Acting permanent.	2nd Clerk Sub-Collr's Office. Cuddapah	35	12	17.11.71	✓			10-4-72	Reversion to former appointment for not bringing to notice the transfer of a forbidden Gumastah vide Sub Collr's order No 140 of 1872.	✓
2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office.	Substantive permanent		35	.	11.4.72	✓		✓	11-5-72	Promotion	✓
Sheristadar of Madanapalle Taluq.	Acting permanent	2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office Cuddapah.	36	12	12.5.72.	✓		✓	30-4-73	Transfer	✓
Do of Kadiri taluq	do	do	35	25	1.5.73	✓		✓	15-7-73	Return of permanent incumbent.	✓
2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office Cuddapah	Substantive permanent	—	35	-	16.7.73	✓		✓	3.10.73	Promotion	✓
Sheristadar of Vayalpad Taluq	Acting permanent	2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office.	35	12	4.10.73	✓		✓	31-3-74	Reversion on account of permanent incumbent	✓
2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office Cuddapah	Substantive permanent	.	35	.	1.4.74	✓		✓	27.5.74	Promotion.	
Tahsildar of Kadiri	Acting permanent	2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office. Cuddapah	35	35	28.5.74	✓			12-6-74	Return of permanent incumbent.	✓
2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office Cuddapah	Substantive permanent		35	.	13.6.74	✓		✓	15.7.74	Promotion	✓
Sheristadar of Pulivendla Taluq	Acting permanent	2nd Clerk Sub-Collr's Office	35	12	16.7.74.	✓		✓	8.9.74	Return of permanent incumbent.	✓
2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office Cuddapah	Substantive permanent		35	.	9.9.74	✓		✓	31-3-75	Promotion.	✓
Sheristadar of Pulivendla Taluq.	Acting permanent	2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office.	35	12	1.4.75	✓		✓	6.5.75	Transfer on promotion.	✓
2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office Cuddapah.	Substantive permanent.	-	35	.	7.5.75	✓		✓	10.5.75	On way to take up the new office.	
Dy Tahsildar of Chitvel.	Acting permanent	2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office.	35	10.	11.5.75	✓		✓	8.8.75	Return of permanent incumbent.	✓
2nd Clerk Sub Collr's Office Cuddapah.	Substantive permanent	.	35	-	9.8.75	✓		✓	22.9.75	Promotion.	

Cir No $\frac{3235}{ac}$ of 1896. Vizagapatam Collr's Office
20 - 7 - 96

From
W. O. Horne Esquire C.S.
Acting Collector
Vizagapatam

To
The Collector of
Cuddapah District.

Sir,

In forwarding herewith an Extract from the Service Register of N. Venkatachellam Pantulu, Huzoor Cash Keeper Collector's Office, Vizagapatam I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to verify and return it at a very early date.

2. I also request you to send true copies of correspondence regarding his suspension and reduction and also to intimate to me whether 29th June 1843, the date of his birth as per Service Register, was entered in all the annual returns forwarded to the Accountant General on 1st April of each year, if not, the cause of variation will have to be explained in Col 8 of the extract.

3 From an entry in the Service Register it appears that he was confirmed as 2nd clerk Sub Collector's Office

7
4
61

11th November 1896

with effect from 1st January 1867. Information is requested as to how the original vacancy occurred and whether any one else counted service on it from 1st January 1867 to 14 February 1868.

4 As the information is urgently required an early reply is requested.

I have &c

(Sd) R Boornader
for Collector

(True Copy)

R Boornader

11th November 1896 for Collector

R.B.

Dis No 1813/an of 1896. Cuddapah
20 August 1896.

From
A. C. Tate Esquire
Collector of Cuddapah

To
The Collector of
Vizagapatam

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 3235 dated 20 July 1896 I have the honor to return herewith the extract from the Service Register of N. Krishna Row, Huzur Cash Keeper of your district duly verified from the old pay abstracts of this Office.

2 Details regarding his suspension & reduction are contained in G.O. No 899 dated 5 August 1885, a copy of which seems to have been communicated to your Office also. However a printed copy of G.O. communicated to this office is herewith sent for perusal.

3 The date of his birth is entered as 29th June 1843 in all the annual returns sent to the Accountant General on the 1st April of every year from 1879 to 1885. The exact date of his birth is not entered in the annual returns previous to the year 1879 but the age of the individual was being noted which if deducted from the years to which the returns relate leads to the result that the year of his birth was 1843.

7
5
61

4 The information asked for in para 3 of the letter under reply cannot be furnished as the necessary records are not available.

11th November 1896 for Collector

5 As regards his suspension from 25.2.85 to 27.4.85 I have to say that it cannot be taken to count towards pension in as much as nothing is noted in Remarks Column of the leave Statement for April 1885 or in the detailed lists of the Establishment of 1885 or 1886 as provided in articles 55 (c) and 60 note 2 of the Civil Account Code.

I have &c

(Signed) Syed Khader Patcha
for Collector

(True copy)

11th November 85 [illegible]
for Collector

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
dated 24th August 1885 No. 7845 Mis.
Read the following:—

5th August 1885, No. 899, Revenue.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th June 1885, No. 1818:—

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 4th March 1885, Mis. No. 2037:—

Read—the following letter from C. A. BIRD, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 25th February 1885, No. 119:—

I have the honor to submit copy of my order suspending N. Kristna Row, Tahsildar of Kadiri, for two months, together with copy of a letter from the Sub-Collector and Joint Magistrate, which finally decided me to do so.

2. I have had several demi-official letters, showing that the work of the taluk is greatly impeded and that at the rate at which this Tahsildar is preparing for jamabandi it will take several months to complete that of Kadiri Taluk.

3. There are, as mentioned in my proceedings several serious charges against this Tahsildar for disposal, and I should have to make him come in, as he says he can explain all the charges against him, although he admits that he has not done so in the written explanation taken by the Sub-Collector. I think this is to delay the inquiry.

4. I consider his insubordination in refusing to answer the questions put by the Sub-Collector deserves punishment, and that two months' suspension is not too severe. I request the Board will sanction the same.

Read—the following telegram from NUNDAGIRI KRISTNA ROW, Tahsildar of Kadiri, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 1st March 1885:—

Government said they gave instructions to Board in my case. Mr. Farmer required under Collector's orders written explanation. I gave one and promised to supplement in writing if required. Deposition required from me. I was sick and so certified. I prayed permission to give in writing. Collector on Mr. Farmer's report suspended me for two months in spite of repeated representations regarding serious injustices. I suffered much for having already given depositions before Mr. Farmer; ready to prove my innocence. Instructions solicited regarding public investigation. Pray order to take written explanation only.

Resolution—dated 4th March 1885, Mis. No. 2037.

The Board observe that the punishment awarded is within the Collector's competence to inflict; meanwhile, he will furnish a detailed report upon the various serious charges alleged to be pending against N. Kristna Rao, whose telegram, received this day, will also be forwarded to Mr. Bird for early report.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. F. MacCARTIE,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Collector of Cuddapah.

Read—also the following letter from N. KRISTNA ROW, to the Honorable Members of the Board of Revenue, dated Madanapalle, 5th March 1885.

Abstract—Explains the cause of petitioner's suspension and prays that, should the Collector communicate his order of suspension to the Board, orders may not be passed before calling for the Sub-Collector's report, petitioner's written explanation (already given), and other papers relating to the subject.

7
9
61

READ—also the following letter from C. A. BIRD, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Pullampet, 13th April 1885, No. 244 :—

I have the honor to forward herewith petitions from N. Krishna Row, Tahsildar of Kadiri, for such notice as the Board may see fit to take of it.

2. The facts which I will give relating to it will show how your petitioner for some reason known only to himself attempts to delay the disposal of anything relating to himself.

3. You will observe that the petition to the Board was returned to him for submission through the usual channel after being stamped.

4. He sent it to me on the 19th March 1885 with a petition requesting me to send it on. It was unstamped and I returned it. He thereupon removed a one rupee stamp from the petition to Government and replaced it with a stamp of two rupees value, leaving the petition to the Board still unstamped. I again returned it as unstamped, and he has a third time submitted it to me unstamped but has put a one rupee stamp on the petition addressed to me.

5. As I am unwilling to throw any obstacle in the way of his petitioning the Board and Government, I submit the petition.

Reference on the above, dated 20th April 1885.

The object of returning such a petition as this for submission through the Collector is to save correspondence by giving that officer an opportunity of reviewing and, if necessary, of traversing petitioner's allegations.

2. As the Collector has not availed himself of this opportunity, he will be good enough to report, within one week, on the various complaints brought forward in the petition.

(Signed) C. F. MACCARTIE,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Collector of Cuddapah, with file to be returned.

READ—also the following letter from C. A. BIRD, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Sattram Agraharam, 11th May 1885, No. 332 :—

I have the honor to state that the Sub-Collector and Joint Magistrate, Mr. Farmer, has reported to me on several occasions regarding the conduct of N. Kristna Row, formerly Tahsildar of Madanapalle.

From these reports, I came to the conclusion that it was desirable to remove him from Madanapalle Taluk. I therefore transferred him to Kadiri pending disposal of the matters against him and have since had occasion to suspend him for two months for insubordination in regard to a Magisterial case regarding which I called on the Joint Magistrate to report.

2. With regard to the detailed charges brought against him, I now consider it my duty to report to the Board. I regret that a long time has elapsed since some of the reports were made to me; this is partly owing to their length and complicity and partly to my being led to imagine from the Tahsildar's numerous lengthy and vague appeals and petitions that he wished to explain matters personally to me.

On taking verbal explanations from him, I have not been able to discover that he had anything to add to the written explanations given by him to me and the Sub-Collector, and he has since stated that he was not desirous of giving verbal statements. However that may be, he has now had every opportunity of exonerating himself if that had been in his power.

On his asking me to formulate the charges against him, I drew out nine charges, which I will treat separately.

3. The first is, that in the case of a relative, a Revenue Inspector named Batsu Kristna Row, improperly acquiring land, he not only delayed reporting on the petition, sent for report, but, with the assistance of a Gumastah mutually related, prepared a report improperly screening the said Revenue Inspector and so obstructed the inquiry that it has not yet been disposed of, though the complaint was made in June 1882.

The report regarding this case commences at paragraph 8 of letter, dated 24th July 1884, No. 358, from the Sub-Collector.

The facts of the case are as follows—

A complaint was made against the Revenue Inspector on 20th June 1882, and Mr. Thompson, then Acting Sub-Collector, called on the Tahsildar for report. A report was not submitted till more than four-and-a-half months after, and, when received, Mr. Thompson had to write the remark : "This report is written improperly screening the Revenue Inspector." It is arzi No. 584 of 16th November, and it undoubtedly seems to be so drawn up as to conceal all relevant facts. Mr. Thompson had to call for further information, which was not received till 23rd February 1883, when Mr. Thompson passed an order, dated 21st May 1883, that the conduct of the Revenue Inspector was unsatisfactory and he was to divest himself of the land and that the Tahsildar was to report how he did so.

No answer was received till 21st December 1883, when a reminder was sent, which elicited a reply on 15th January 1884, nearly eight months afterwards. Mr. Farmer found this to be an evasive one and called on the Tahsildar to state whether any document had been registered, by which, as ordered, the Revenue Inspector had divested himself of the land. This remained unanswered till 3rd June, when another reminder was sent. In the meanwhile, the Revenue Inspector had left the taluk without the Tahsildar reporting his failure to obey orders, and up to the date of the Sub-Collector's report no written document had been registered to the purpose. It is proved that the Tahsildar's relative improperly acquired land, that he failed to enter it in the list of lands acquired by public servants, that the Tahsildar omitted till reminded to furnish a reply, and then sent one which complicated the matter rather than cleared it up, that on receiving definite instructions regarding the matter, he failed to see that these instructions were carried out and failed to report that the orders had not been obeyed. As the Revenue Inspector was his relative and as he had, by acquiring land and failing to report it, rendered himself liable to dismissal, it is not likely that this inordinate delay was the result of the matter escaping his memory but rather for the purpose of evading the order altogether.

4. The second charge formulated was, I find, not fully reported on by the Sub-Collector, as the Tahsildar had not, at the time the report was written, submitted his explanation. The outline of the case is given in paragraph 9 of the above quoted letter, and with regard to it, the Sub-Collector writes :—"In that case the Tahsildar has failed up to date to submit the explanation promised in his Arzi, No. 23, dated 4th February 1883. The case is now sixteen months old. If there had been a simple wish to do justice without favor, I don't see how this case could ever have arisen much less have occupied so much time of the Divisional Officer and the Tahsildar. The records, like those in the case of the Revenue Inspector, for whom the Curnam acts, form a considerable bundle, which may become much larger before the Tahsildar will place his superiors in a position to dispose of the case."

5. The third charge is, that the Tahsildar attempted to favor certain Brahman Curnams by obtaining more favorable terms regarding land taken up for a Government tope than they were entitled to. With regard to this, I do not find anything proved, but that the Tahsildar made some mistakes in his reports which tended to enhance the compensation claimed or recommended to be given. It seems, however, probable that had the Tahsildar made full inquires it would have been found that the land was given up as worthless and in such circumstances as to render compensation altogether unnecessary. No doubt there was a great deal of unnecessary delay and many suspicious circumstances, but I do not feel confident that there was any deliberate intention on the part of the Tahsildar to gain unfair advantage for his caste men. The particulars of this are given in paragraph 10 of Mr. Farmer's letter above quoted.

6. The fourth charge is, that he attempted to obtain for a distant relative a post of Reddy, which should be given to the hereditary claimant in the village of Kondamarri, in opposition to distinct orders.

This I find proved, except that the man on whose behalf the attempts were made appears to be only very * distantly connected with this Tahsildar. He was, however, as admitted by him, a relation of another Brahman Tahsildar in the district. The details of this are given in paragraph 11 of the letter above quoted and are briefly as follows :—

* *Note.*—The list of relationship sent by Mr. Farmer shows that by intermarriage a connection can be traced through Nos. 48, 30, 27 and 28 of the list.

7. About twenty-five years ago, one of the hereditary village heads of Kondamarri was dismissed, as alleged, for not detecting a torch-light robbery.

His post, until recently, was held by Choutai Raghavendra Row, a connection of the Ráyachóti Tahsildar.

This man became old, and the hereditary claimant put in a petition at Jamabandi stating that the temporary incumbent intended to try and get his son appointed and praying that this might not be complied with. The Tahsildar had this entered in the Takarar book and added "nothing can be done to dispossess the present incumbent from his office."

As no request to oust the then holder of the office was made, this remark was altogether uncalled for and is the first intimation of the interest taken in the matter by the Tahsildar.

Mr. Higgens, the Jamabandi officer, agreed to that, of course, as there was no apparent reason then for removing the man, but he very properly added that if Raghavendra Row died or resigned petitioner could put forward his claims.

Next jamabandi leave was applied for, and the Tahsildar, N. Kristna Row, recommended that it should be granted on the substitute of his son, without any mention of the hereditary claimant. The son was accordingly appointed to act.

Next year, just as the year's leave was expiring, the Tahsildar personally brought to Mr. Farmer's notice that Raghavendra Row, as he was getting old, wished his son put into the Reddy's post, nothing being said about the hereditary claimant who Mr. Higgens said was to apply when a vacancy occurred.* Mr. Farmer called for Raghavendra Row and found him quite too infirm to work and recorded the order : "He is too old to work, let him make way for a man capable of working."

* *Vide* also Board's Standing Order, Maclean's Edition, No. 172, paragraph 3.

This order the Tahsildar ignored, and at the expiry of his leave allowed him to re-enter on his duties, sending up the sunnud granted to the son to be cancelled, notwithstanding that the man himself as well as the Sub-Collector said he was unfit for the post owing to old age.

On this, the Tahsildar's attention was drawn to the jamabandi order, and after three months' delay an arzi was written recommending the son of the said Raghavendra Row to be his deputy without any mention of the hereditary claimant Sidda Reddy.

There can, I think, be no doubt in this instance that the Tahsildar persistently tried to obtain the appointment of a man to an hereditary office to which he knew he had no hereditary right, concealing the claims of the representation of the Mirasi family, and this at a time when inams, which were the emoluments of the village offices, were being enfranchised, as a general rule, in the name of the holders of the office.

The persistency of the attempts, the ignoring not only of the general orders of the Board, but the express orders of two Jamabandi officers, and the well-known fact that the office of Reddy is never, with hardly any exception in the Sub-Division, held by a Brahman preclude the idea that this was done without ulterior motive.

8. The next charge I will treat is, that he delegated the disposal of a durkhast case to a Process Ameen, or if not, that he disposed of it inequitably contrary to rules and neglected the orders of three Jamabandi officers.

With regard to this, I may mention that the durkhast decision is written in the hand-writing of a Process Ameen, and this is admitted by the Tahsildar, who says he

dictated it! If that be so, he is responsible wholly for the contents. With regard to the iniquity of the decision, details will be found in the Sub-Collector's letter, No. 327, dated 12th June, but I would call attention to the portion marked A, page 4, of the elaborate defence attempted by the Tahsildar, dated 24th August 1884, bearing my initials and the date, 30th April 1885. From this it will be seen that the Tahsildar admits that the whole field was cultivated in Fasli 1291 by certain ryots, that it was ordered by the Jamabandi officer to be given on putta after two months' notice, that two months' notice was given presumably without objection, that it was again cultivated in Fasli 1292 by the same ryots, and yet he granted the field on durkhast to the Brahman Curnam of an adjoining village. There are other reasons why the durkhast should have been given to the said ryots, but I have simply taken those two reasons, as they are shown and admitted in a single page of the Tahsildar's defence.

9. The whole of that defence is a piece of special pleading to cover, what I must believe the Tahsildar knows to be, a wrong decision; and I do not think that any one who read it could continue to believe N. Kristna Row who wrote it fit to hold the responsible post of Tahsildar. I consider the defence of that decision to be a hundred times worse than the decision itself.

10. The next charge is, that he obtained the payment of Rs. 5 a month to two relatives from the Chittecherla Estate for work which might be valued at a few annas, concealing the fact by false entries in the accounts.

The Sub-Collector has gone fully into the conduct of all the persons concerned in his letter, No. 326, and the memorandum and list of documents which are enclosed in it.

It is proved that two paid servants of Government, whose duty it would be to do what was necessary in regard to the administration of the estate without remuneration, were paid Rs. 5 a month for doing very little, if anything; that no sanction was obtained for the payment; that at first these payments were entered openly in the taluks accounts and subsequently, when there was probability of closer scrutiny, the payment was concealed under such items as household expenses and education. The Tahsildar who first ordered the payment is dead. One, if not both, of the two officials receiving the Rs. 5 a month was relative of the Tahsildar N. Kristna Row. During the time this payment was made he was sometimes Sub-Division Sheristadar, sometimes Taluk Sheristadar and sometimes Tahsildar of the taluk. As Tahsildar he was ex-officio guardian of the minor. While Sheristadar, Sub-Collector's office, he appears to have recommended as estate gumastah a relative of the Tahsildar, who ordered the payment of Rs. 5 to his relative. There seems little doubt but that he was aware of this payment from beginning to end. He must have known it was not one which could be classed as coming under Clause III, Section 21 of Regulation 5 of 1804, for it was not to the advantage of the minor that these men should be paid for what they ought to have done as servants of Government; and the fact of the payment being concealed in the accounts shows that it was felt to be an illegitimate charge on the estate.

N. Kristna Row, when Tahsildar, continued the payment and continued to have it entered under the head of private expenses. In his statement, taken in reference to this letter, No. 326, on the 20th April, he shows how they are distinguished in the accounts. The payments to these shroff and cash gumastahs are shown as the minor's expenses, and ordinary expenses are shown as the minor's *own* expenses.

His defence is, that he found the practice in force when he became Tahsildar and continued it, and that the Board of Revenue even order items to be transferred from one head to another, and gives as an instance, that the pay of the horsekeeper was so changed from the head of establishment to that of household expenses.

It cannot be thought for a moment that a man of N. Kristna Row's intelligence would really believe that these are parallel cases.

11. The next charge is, that the Tahsildar wastes the time of himself and others by suppression and misrepresentation. This, I think, can be gathered from the above facts, and I must say the little experience I have had of him convinces me that he would not hesitate to waste time with irrelevant matter.

12. The other charges relate to delay in Magisterial work and Revenue work. The Sub-Collector mentions this in paragraph 12 of his letter No. 358. At the request of the Tahsildar, I called for a return of magisterial work of cases dismissed, under Section 203, by him during the year 1884. I enclose it. From this list I find only four out of forty were disposed of on the day the complaint was filed. This seems a very small proportion. I find only nine out of the remaining thirty-six were disposed of without referring them for inquiry; to dispose of seven of these he took a week or more, in other cases a fortnight, twenty-three days, one month, one month and thirteen days, and in one case one month and twenty-four days. He disposed of most of those he referred for inquiry soon after receipt of report, but on one occasion he delayed four months and twenty-three days after receipt of report from the Revenue Inspector, and in another one month and five days after report from the police, and he often allowed a considerable length of time to elapse without receiving the report; for instance in one case four months and twenty days, in another four months and five days and still in another seven months and seven days. It is thus found that this return, which he himself asked me to obtain, bears out what Mr. Farmer says of him to a very great extent. The list that the Joint Magistrate sent in shows the delay in replying to proceedings calling for explanation.

13. The last matter to be mentioned is a criminal case No. 64 of 1884 on this Magistrate's file.

On seeing the judgment of the Joint Magistrate, I asked for report after the Joint Magistrate had called for certain records not sent up with the original record.

From the report * of the Joint Magistrate, it appears that a distant connection of the Magistrate, who had known him for ten or fifteen years, conferred a favor on him by attending him in camp and acting as his cook. While so occupied, a complaint was made that some of his property had been stolen, and this fact is intimated to him by the Magistrate's son. The complainant is said to have a grudge against the accused in the case. The case was not tried in the Magistrate's Court but in the hospital, though it does not appear that there was any reason for his doing so; the compounder of the hospital to some extent acting as the Magistrate's clerk.

* No. 44, 21st March 1885.

There are several discrepancies in the different statements made by the complainant. Records which would have brought this to light were not submitted with the records of the case when sent up to the Appellate Court and the discrepancies were not noticed by the Magistrate.

One of the papers kept out of the record was the original complaint, which is one of the most important in any criminal case.

The Magistrate allowed a good deal of inadmissible evidence to come in the record.

He appears to have seized on every point of the evidence that told in favor of the prosecution and to have ignored what would tell in favor of the accused: as an example, he has laid stress on the fact of the accused persons having been arrested with certain property in Mysore territory, while he omitted to note the fact that they had been residing there for several months prior to the alleged offence.

The head constable in the case deposes that the accused made a confession, this statement was admitted though the confessional statement was not put in. Notwithstanding this grave omission and some other irregularities on the part of the said head constable, the Magistrate has recorded his approbation of the way in which the case was conducted.

The Magistrate has also carefully excluded all mention of the fact of the complainant having officiated as his personal servant and the fact that, at the time of the alleged offence, he was actually with the Tahsildar-Magistrate performing the duties of cook.

14. To say the least of it, the Magistrate was wanting in straightforwardness in omitting to mention these facts; his procedure was full of irregularities; he has convicted on evidence, which was quite insufficient, and has commended a police officer in a case where he has shown himself even from the record to have been most careless.

In fine, I must say that it is difficult not to take the view that the judgment was dictated by partiality and attempts made to conceal its weakness.

My own opinion, looking at the foregoing, is that Nundagiri Kristna Row has shown himself unfit for his present or for any responsible post, and I recommend his dismissal. If the Board and Government should consider that this is too severe a punishment, I strongly urge that he may be removed from this district, where he is surrounded by his relatives, and that he be reduced to some less responsible position on less pay, which I may mention would make the change practicable.

15. He has already rejoined his appointment after his suspension, and I request that speedy orders may be passed.

16. I enclose the original reports of the Sub-Collector and Joint Magistrate and connected records as per enclosed list.

Read—also the following letter from C. A. BIRD, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Anantaraypett, 18th May 1885, No. 333:—

I have the honor to re-submit the petition of N. Kristna Row, referred to in the Proceedings * of the Board on letter, No. 244, dated 13th April 1885, with the following remarks.

P. R. No. 1363, dated 20th April 1885.
* File returned.

2. If I had thought that the Board did not really require that the petition to them should bear a stamp, although they had in the endorsement, No. 1070, dated 24th February 1885, directed that it should be stamped, I would have sent it up with such remarks as might appear necessary at once. I regret that my desire to have the orders of the Board carried out led me into what I now understand to be an error.

3. I find nothing in the petition to the Board or that to Government that requires report or needs traversing except by stating that I believe Mr. Farmer is not actuated in his proceedings by any personal prejudice against your petitioner, and I can assure the Board that I have been only too anxious to accord him a patient hearing.

4. The petitions appear to me to be the result of a conscience ill-at-ease, fearing that his very explanations will go against him.

5. I have found in every occasion in which I have listened to him that he has a habit of evading a direct explanation, and that he prefers to bring forward a mass of irrelevant matter rather than to come to the point. These petitions are examples of his style of defence.

6. It is true that Mr. Farmer has made several long reports against him, and no doubt has come to the conclusion that he is not always actuated with the purest motives.

7. These reports would have been disposed of long ago had not your petitioner led me to believe that he wanted to give a personal explanation.

8. I have since found an opportunity of hearing him at length, and I will, under the same cover, submit my report regarding these charges.

Read—also the following letter from C. A. BIRD, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Nundalore, 28th May 1885, No. 365:—

In continuation of my letter, No. 332, dated 18th instant, I have the honor to forward, herewith, petition No. 784, dated 11th April, from Nundagiri Kristna Rao, Tahsildar of Kadiri, with its enclosures, being his explanation to charges 5 to 8, and also copies of takids as per list obtained from the Sub-Collector as requested by him in the petition.

Resolution—dated 17th June 1885, No. 1818.

The papers noted at the head of these Proceedings explain the punishment of two months' suspension inflicted by the Collector of Cuddapah upon N. Krishna Rao, Tahsildar of Kadiri, for insubordination, and furnish the Collector's report and opinion upon certain serious charges against this Tahsildar, for detailed information regarding which the Board called in their Proceedings, dated 4th March 1885, No. 2037.

2. Nine charges have been formulated by the Collector, which are briefly as follows :—

3. *A*—Screening a relative, Revenue Inspector B. Krishna Rao, accused of improperly acquiring land, and by obstruction intentionally delaying the disposal of the case though dating from 1882, on June 20th of which year, the original complaint was preferred and sent to the Tahsildar for report, who, after a delay of four-and-a-half months, submitted a reply, dated 16th November 1882, which a former Sub-Collector condemned as indicative of partiality and called for further information, on receipt of which, the Tahsildar was ordered on 21st May 1883 to see that the accused divested himself of the land. With this order he neglected to comply in defiance of frequent reminders, and in point of fact up to the date of Mr. Farmer's report, dated 24th July 1884, when the Revenue Inspector had left the taluk, no definite reply was ever extracted from the Tahsildar. The latter has submitted an explanation, which is a vague disclaimer of interested motives, and appeals to his lofty moral tone and unblemished reputation, at the same time it fails, in the opinion of the Board, to explain the established delay and the omission to carry out the Sub-Collector's orders before the Revenue Inspector left the taluk.

4. Charge *B* is dismissed by the Collector, with a passing allusion to the difficulty experienced by Mr. Farmer in obtaining an explanation from the Tahsildar, which, it is observed, is still due. As Mr. Bird has not been at the pains to furnish the Board with any description of, or opinion on, the case, they naturally infer that it possesses but little importance; from Mr. Farmer's report, however, they gather that the case was of a miscellaneous Revenue nature, in which the Sub-Collector upset an order of the Tahsildar refusing certain trees to some Mussulman applicants to whom he had originally promised them. The Tahsildar promised an explanation in Arzi, dated 4th February 1884, No. 23, which is still awaited.

On such imperfect information, the Board are unable to arrive at any conclusion beyond the inferential one already noted.

5. Charge *C* relates to undue favoritism shown to certain Brahmin claimants of compensation for land taken up by Government.

The Collector's review expressly absolves the Tahsildar of corrupt intent, and, with a hint at the existence of suspicious circumstances, finds nothing established but unnecessary delay; the fact, however, remains that, after two years and four months' delay in a case manipulated by four of his relatives, the Tahsildar recommended nearly double the proper compensation, which, at best, is discreditable from an administrative point of view.

6. Charge *D* is dealt with in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Collector's letter, who accuses the Tahsildar of attempting to obtain, for a distant connection, the post of Reddy in supersession of the hereditary claimant.

7. The Collector accepts the charge as proved, with the reservation that the connection is very distant, and the Board consider that grounds do exist for suspecting that the Tahsildar did suppress all notice of the existence of hereditary claims, in order either to advance a friend or to serve a fellow-casteman. To say the least, his procedure in ignoring Mr. Higgens' jamabandi order, and Mr. Farmer's takeed, dated 6th January 1884, has a disingenuous appearance; at the same time, the case is not free from doubt, and the Board are not prepared to say more than that an element of suspicion does attach to the Tahsildar. It is observed that, at a subsequent date, he did recommend the hereditary claimant, and there is something to be said for his explanation that respect for the long-continued occupation of the actual incumbent induced him to overlook the claims of the hereditary claimant, when submitting his original recommendation in the case. This defence, however, does not cover his retention of Raghavendra Rao in office after the latter had been condemned as incapacitated by age.

8. Charge *E* is that the Tahsildar either delegated the disposal of a darkhast case to a Process Amin, or disposed of it himself inequitably and in defiance of the jamabandi orders of three Revenue officers.

9. As the Process Amin appears to have acted as amanuensis only, the responsibility of the decision rests with, and is accepted by, the Tahsildar, who, in January 1884, gave a putta to the Curnam of an adjoining village for a field, although the Collector in 1880 and the Sub-Collector in the two next years had ordered it to be given to the ryots who had actually cultivated the land in whole or part for five successive faslis, and paid assessment thereon. After expiry of the appeal time in 1880, the ryots' claim became absolute, and the Curnam's durkhast, dated January 1883, should have been summarily rejected, in place of which, it was kept pending one year and then accepted.

10. The Tahsildar's explanation for neglecting to issue putta in accordance with orders passed in July of Fasli 1291 is that he was under the impression that such orders should have effect only from the beginning of the next fasli before the advent of which an objection had been filed. The Board see no ground for such a supposition, which they regard as a piece of special pleading, and they are constrained to apply the same criticism to the excuse alleged for ignoring the preferential claim of one of the ryots under G.O., No. 104, dated 25th January 1883, whose uncle relinquished the land in 1879, viz., that well-to-do cultivators are excluded from the benefit of the Government Order. On the whole, the Board consider that, although the explanation has been framed with ability, it fails to place the Tahsildar's attitude in disposing of this case in a satisfactory light.

11. In Charge *F*, the Tahsildar is accused of obtaining the honorarium of Rs. 5 per mensem from the funds of the Chittecherla Estate for two relatives—the Shroff and Cash Gumastah of the Taluk Cutcherry—supporting and covering the charge by fictitious entries in the accounts.

12. It is proved that this payment was made without sanction, at first being openly entered in the accounts till September 1879, but subsequently, when the affairs of the estate began to attract attention, being concealed under debit to Education and Household Expenses.

13. The payment was originally ordered by a Tahsildar now dead, but during the whole period, viz., from 10th October 1877, N. Krishna Rao held the appointments of Taluk Sheristadar and Sub-Divisional Sheristadar, while after he succeeded to the Tahsildari, he continued the payment, debiting it to Private Expenses.

14. His defence is that he merely maintained an existing practice, and points to the transfers between minor heads of expenditure occasionally ordered by the Court of Wards. The Board observe that the cases are not parallel, and that the explanation is unsatisfactory, as it is clear that the payments were most objectionable, while the Tahsildar must be held responsible for accounts which he adopted and signed. These accounts are so framed as to conceal the irregular nature of the transaction.

15. The next specific charge is that the Tahsildar wastes the time of himself and others by suppression and misrepresentation, for proof of which, the Collector points to what he terms "the above facts," whatever they may be, and has no hesitation in believing that he would waste time with irrelevant matter.

16. The Board concur with the accused in considering that a general and vaguely-worded charge of this nature should not have been preferred, unless supported by distinct and incontrovertible instances. Prolixity and diffuseness are not indictable offences.

17. The last charge relates to delay in disposing of Magisterial and Revenue work in general, and to alleged partiality disclosed in Appeal Case, No. 64 of 1884, on the Joint Magistrate's file.

18. To support the general portion of the indictment, the Collector relies on a return of cases dismissed under Section 203, Criminal Procedure Code, as indicating gross delay. The Board observe that some of these cases have been subjected to more

or less delay on the part of the officers to whom they were referred, but as regards disposals by the Tahsildar, the statement is entirely in his favor, as two cases only appear to have been subjected to delay by him—whether on good grounds or not the Board are unable to decide without perusing the record in each case, which is an unnecessary task, as they are quite unable to gather on what grounds the Collector has denounced the Tahsildar, so far as this return goes. They observe, however, from Enclosure A to Mr. Farmer's letter, dated 24th July 1884, which furnishes a list of Magisterial cases in which explanation had been called for and not supplied, that there are eight cases in which the delay is abnormal and very inadequately explained.

19. The remark in paragraph 12 of the Collector's letter, that the Tahsildar often allowed a considerable period to elapse "without receiving the report," is not understood.

20. Turning to the particular charge of undue partiality instanced in Appeal Case, No. 64 of 1884, on the Joint Magistrate's file, the Board observe that the Sub-Magistrate is accused of improperly convicting an offender of stealing the property of the Magistrate's friend and cook, under circumstances which point to partiality.

21. These facts are the admission of secondary evidence regarding an alleged confessional statement which was never made, as it turns out, and which secondary evidence was inadmissible under Section 91, Evidence Act, and Section 164, Criminal Procedure Code; the admission of irrelevant evidence and the suppression of the original complaints made to the Village Magistrate and to the Police.

22. Stress is further laid upon the fact that the Sub-Magistrate omitted to notice flagrant discrepancies between the complainant's statement, dated 24th November 1884, and the original complaint of October 12th, while he utterly ignored the cogent circumstance that four distinct and irreconcileable accounts had been given of the persons who visited complainant's house on the night of the crime. It is also urged that an unfair inference of guilt was sought to be derived from the assertion that defendants absconded to Mysore, whereas the Magistrate well knew from the charge sheet that they had been residents of Mysore for some time before the date of the alleged offence.

23. The foregoing ungarnished record of facts raises a most unfavorable presumption against either the *bona fides* of the Magistrate, or of his competence to appreciate evidence, which his explanation totally fails to meet. He is thus placed on the horns of a dilemma; either he has misapprehended the evidence and neglected the common rule of procedure which necessitates reference to the Police report and original complaint, or he has perverted facts to gain a conviction in the interests of his friend. The Board incline to the latter view of the case, as accused's antecedents are not such as to warrant the supposition that he is afflicted with crass stupidity.

24. It remains now only to notice the fact of this Tahsildar's suspension for two months under Collector's Proceedings, dated 23rd February 1885, to which the above criminal case gave rise, the District Judge having called for certain explanation on perusal of the Joint Magistrate's appeal judgment.

25. Armed with this authority communicated through the Collector, Mr. Farmer propounded certain questions of fact of a simple nature to the Tahsildar, who stubbornly declined to furnish an oral explanation, or any explanation at all, unless by way of written replies to written questions.

26. This circumstance was duly reported to the Collector, and resulted in the infliction of suspension as punishment for insubordination. This punishment was, in the Board's opinion, warranted by the circumstances of the case, and in their view, the Collector had no option but to assert his authority, which he did without undue severity, in the interests of discipline, which has of late become somewhat relaxed in the Cuddapah District.

27. From the petitions received from the Tahsildar in connection with his suspension, the Board consider that he has entirely misapprehended his position, while the attitude he has assumed of a martyr to Mr. Farmer's severity verges on the farcical, as does the description of his hysterical emotion, which led him into making what he calls a "*suicidal*" statement, when confronted with his accuser and asked for a plain answer to a plain question.

28. Having perused the voluminous papers connected with this case and given it very careful consideration, the Board are satisfied that Nandagiri Krishna Rao has been shown to be unfit to be either a Tahsildar or a Magistrate, and they therefore recommend that all magisterial powers be taken from him, and that he be degraded to the post of Revenue Inspector and transferred to the Golgonda Taluk of Vizagapatam.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. F. MACCARTIE,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with file of papers to be returned.

Copy to the Collector of Cuddapah.

Read—also petition from N. KRISTNA RAO, dated 17th July 1885.

ABSTRACT.—Praying that copies of Mr. Farmer's reports may be furnished to him and his written explanations taken.

ORDER—dated 5th August 1885, No. 899, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

On a careful perusal of the papers forwarded with the foregoing Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, the Government are of opinion that N. Kristna Rao has been guilty of grave irregularities in his capacity both as Tahsildar and Magistrate, and that, though he has been afforded every opportunity of vindicating his conduct, he has entirely failed to do so. The records further show that he is thoroughly untrustworthy and quite unfit, therefore, to hold the responsible position of the head of a taluk. He is evidently a man of considerable ability, and the several transactions described in the Board's Proceedings and in Mr. Farmer's reports cannot be explained away on any plea of stupidity or carelessness. In these circumstances, the Government have no hesitation in accepting the Board's recommendations in full.

2. Steps will be taken in the Judicial Department for the cancellation of the magisterial powers with which N. Kristna Rao is invested.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. WILSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, with records returned.
" Judicial Department.
" Accountant-General.

Exd. J. Henricus.

60 Copies.

Resolution

Communicated to the Collectors of Cuddapah and Vizagapatam who will arrange the transfer of N. Kristna Row as ordered by Government.

2 If desired by the Collector of Vizagapatam the Collector of Cuddapah will receive in exchange the officer displaced by Kristna Row.

(True Copy and Extract)

Secretary

To
The Collector of Cuddapah
" Vizagapatam

Reg No 241
1885

Record

Govt. of (1885) Madras.

REVENUE.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
GENL. RECD. NO. 7014
RECORD
VIZAGAPATAM

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 5th August 1885, No. 899.

B.S. Pro. 24, do. No 7845 Mis

591.

AUGUST.

N. Kristna Rao (Tahsildar of Kadiri, Cuddapah District)

degraded to the post of Revenue Inspector and transferred to the Vizagapatam district; the question of cancelling his magisterial powers referred to the Judicial Department for disposal.

[V. C. P.—No. 144.—19-11-95.—300.]

Re. C. ~~Dis.~~ No. 3235/an of 1896.

VIZAGAPATAM COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Dated 15th September 1896.

From
W. O. Horne Esquire C.S.
~~W. A. WILLOCK ESQR.,~~
Acting Collector,
Vizagapatam District.

To

The SECRETARY TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF
~~SALT, ABKARI AND SEPARATE~~ Land REVENUE,
MADRAS.

7
10
61

SIR,

I have the honor to state that N. Krishna Row, my present Cash Keeper was a Tahsildar in the Cuddapah District. It will be seen from G.O. No 899/Rev, dated 5th August 1885 that he was degraded to the post of Revenue Inspector and transferred to the Golgonda taluq of this district; but there was no vacancy at the time in the grade of Revenue Inspectors either in the taluq or in the district. M.R.Ry. A. Govinda Row Naidu Garu, the then Deputy Tahsildar of Parvatipur was transferred to Cuddapah in place of Krishna Row; but in filling up the vacancy caused by the Deputy Tahsildar's transfer from this district no post was provided for Krishna Row by an oversight.

Krishna Row was on leave from 5 November 1885, the date on which he was relieved in the Cuddapah district to 13th November 1886. He was appointed

11 November [illegible]

1st Class Revenue Inspector of the Golgonda Taluq on the 4th July 1888 in the arrangement of the vacancy caused by the retirement of N. Narasimhaswami Pantulu, the Taluq Sheristadar of Sarvasiddhi. From this it will be seen that Krishnarow was without any Government appointment from 5th November 1885 to 3rd July 1888. As this is no fault of his, I request that the ~~Government~~ Board will be pleased to move Government to condone the break in Krishnarow's service under articles 465 & 465 (a) of the Civil Service Regulations.

I have &c
(Sd) W. O. Horne
Collector

(True Copy)

for Collector.

11th November 96.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue)
No. 2620. R.S. 24th September 1896.

Read letter from W. O. Horne Esquire C.S. Acting Collector of Vizagapatam to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras, Ref. Cir. No 3135/occ of 1896. dated 15th September 1896

Resolution.

The Board is not prepared to submit the case for the orders of Government at the present stage.

2. The Collector's attention is drawn to article 995 of the Civil Service Regulations in which it is ruled that questions affecting the pension of an officer should only come up for decision when the application for pension is submitted. Vide also para 2 of the Government of India letter embodied in Government order No 1285 Judicial, dated 26 May 1879, copy of which is forwarded herewith.

(True Extract)
(Sd) L. W. D. Swamikannu
Asst. Secretary 24/9/96
for Ag Secretary.

To The Collector of Vizagapatam, with a copy of B.B. – G.O. 1235 Jud. d/26-5-79.

(True Copy)

11th November 1896. for Collector

Government of Madras.
Judicial Department.
26th May 1879. No. 1235.
High Court.

Read the following paper.

No. 283 from C. Bernard Esquire, C.S.I., Officiating Secretary to the Government of India Home department (Judicial) to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, dated Simla, 14th May 1879 No. 571.

No. 423, dated 1st March 1879.
" 636, A, dated 22nd March 1879

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of the proceedings of the Madras Government, forwarded with your endorsements, noted on the margin, and in reply to say that, under the circumstances explained, the Governor General-in-Council is pleased to confirm the orders of His grace the Governor in Council, condoning the break in the service of A. Rathnavelu Modelliar.

2. I am to add that ordinarily the question of condoning a break in service should only come up for decision when an application for pension is submitted.

7

No 284.

12 Order thereon, dated, 26 May 1879, No. 1235

61 Communicated to the Honorable the Judges of the High Court and the Accountant General with reference to G.Os dated 7th February, No 243, and 1st & 22nd March, 1879, No 422 and 636

2. The break in A. Ruthnavelu Moodelliar's service having occurred by an oversight of the orders in force, it was considered desirable that the oversight should be corrected at once.

(True Extract)
(Signed) C. G. Master
Acting Chief Secretary

To

The Honorable Judges of the High Court
& Accountant General.

Fort St George }
Acctt Genl's Office }
21 – 11 – 1887 }

(True Copy)
(Signed) W. Donald
Officiating Acctt General

(True Copy)
(Sd) L. D. Swamikannu.
Asst Secretary.
25-9-96
for Cg Secretary

(True Copy)

Donald
for Collector

11th November 1896.

[V. C. P.—No. 144 – 19 11-95. – 300.]

Re. C. ~~Dis.~~ No. 4549/Acc of 1896

VIZAGAPATAM COLLECTOR'S OFFIC

From
W. O. Horne Esquire
~~W. A. Willock Esq.~~,
Collector,
Vizagapatam District.

Dated 11th November 189

To

The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land ~~Salt, Abkari and Separate~~ Revenue,
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to Board's Proceedings No 2620, R. S. dated 24th September 1896, I have the honor to inform you that K. Krishna Row, the Huzoor Cash Keeper was declared unfit for further service by the District Surgeon on the 27th October 1896. His Application for pension has been forwarded to Government through the Accountant General. I request that the Board will be pleased to move Government to condone the break in the service of K. Krishna Row as recommended in my letter No 3235/Acc, dated 15th September 1896.

I have the honor
to be Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Sd) R Suria Row.

(True Copy) For Collector

Donald
for Collector

7
13
61

1896.

Revenue Department.

From

The Collector of
Vizagapatam

To

The Accountant General
Fort St George
Madras

Dated 11th November 1896

Despatched 11th November 1896

No. R.C. $\frac{4549}{acc}$ of 1896.

16 Enclosures

Subject.

Submitting the pension application of Nandagiri Krishna Rao Pantulu Huzur Cash Keeper Collector's Office Vizagapatam.

17 DEC 96

Copy of para 3 was sent to Vizagapatam Collector on 8.12.96.

Reminder on 19.12.96.

Revenue (1896) Department.

CURRENT No.

Order

From

The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue, Madras.

No. 5176 Misc.

Dated 17th November 1896.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting for the orders of Govt. letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam, requesting to move Govt. for the condonation of the break in the service of N. Krishna. Rao, Huzur cash keeper.

1801

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

[V. C. P.—No. 249—5-3-96—1,000.]

Ref No. Current No. 3235/ACC of 1896
Dated 15th September

BOARD'S GEN. REG. No. 5741 OF 1896
LAND REVENUE.

VIZAGAPATAM COLLECTOR'S OFFICE.
Dated 15th September 1896.

From
W. O. Horne, Esquire, C.S.
~~W. A. Willock Esq.r~~
Acting Collector,
Vizagapatam District.

To
The Secretary to the Commissioners
of Land Revenue,
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to state that N. Krishna Row, my present Cash Keeper, was a Tahsildar in the Cuddapah District. It will be seen from G.O. No 899, Revenue, dated 5th August 1885, that he was degraded to the post of Revenue Inspector and transfered to the Golgonda Taluk of this District, but there was no vacancy at the time in the grade of Revenue Inspectors either in the Taluk or in the District. M.R.Ry. R. Govinda Row Naidu Garu, the then Deputy Tahsildar of Parvatipur was transferred to Cuddapah in place of Krishna Row, but in filling up the vacancy caused by the Deputy Tahsildar's transfer from this

7
14
61

District, no post was provided for Krishna Row by an oversight.

2 Krishna Row was on leave from 5th November 1885, the date on which he was relieved in the Cuddapah District, to 13th November 1888. He was appointed 1st class Revenue Inspector of the Golgonda Taluk on the 4th July 1888. in the arrangement of the vacancy caused by the retirement of N. Narsimhaswami Pantulu, the Taluk Sheristadar of Sarvasiddhi. From this, it will be seen that Krishna Row was without any Government appointment from 5th November 1885 to 3rd July 1888. As this is no fault of his, I request that the Board will be pleased to move Government to condone the break in Krishna Row's service under Articles 465 and 465(a) of the Civil Service Regulations.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant

[V. C. P.—No. 144.—19-11-95.—300.]

Re. C. ~~Dis.~~ No. 4549/Acc of 1896.

VIZAGAPATAM COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Dated 11th November 1896.

From
W. O. Horne Esquire C.S.
~~W. A. WILLOCK ESQR.~~
Acting Collector,
Vizagapatam District.

To

The SECRETARY TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF
Land
SALT, ~~ABKARI AND SEPARATE~~ REVENUE,
MADRAS.

SIR,

With reference to Boards Proceedings No 2620, R.S. dated 24th September 1896, I have the honor to inform you that N. Krishna Row, the Huzoor Cash Keeper, was declared unfit for further service by the District Surgeon on the 27th October 1896. His application for pension has been forwarded to Government through the Accountant General. I request that the Board will be pleased to move Government to condone the break in the service of N. Krishna Row as recommended in my letter No. 3235/Acc, dated 15th September 1896.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant

7
15
61

for Collector

1896. 6067

Revenue Department.

BOARD'S GEN. REG. No 6067 OF 1896
LAND REVENUE.

BOARD OF REVENUE
14 NOV. 96
MADRAS.

Ref 16/11

From

The Collector of
Vizagapatam

To

The Secretary to the
Commissioners of
Land Revenue
Madras

Dated. 11th November 1896
Despd. 11th do

No. Re 4549/acc of 1896.

Enclosures. nil

Subject.

Requesting to move Government for the condonation of the break in the service of N. Krishna Rao, Huzoor Cash Keeper, as he now retired.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

No.2620 ~~Misc~~R,S.,dated 24th September '96.

Read letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam,Ref.Cur.No. 3235/acc. of '96,dated 15th September 1896.

Resolution

The Board is not prepared to submit the case for the orders of Government at the present stage.

2. The Collector's attention is drawn to article 995 of the Civil Service Regulations in which it is ruled that questions affecting the pension of an officer should only come up for decision when the application for pension is submitted. Vide also para 2 of the Government of India letter embodied in Government OrderNo. 1235 Judl.,dated 26th May ~~189~~ 1879,copy of which is forwarded herewith.

(True Extract)
/signed/ R.C.C.Carr
Acting Secretary.

To

The Collector of Vizagapatam with a copy of G.O. 1235 Judl,d/ 26-5-79.

(True Copy)

Acting Secretary.

7
16
61

Md.R.H.

True Copy of Board's

Proceedings
No.2620 Routine.
Dated [illegible]4th September 1896.

460. M. Krishna Rao
Huzur Cash Keeper Vizag

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE. MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
23 NOV 96
MADRAS

No.5176 Misc.,dated 17th November 1896.

Read the following-

1. Again Board's Proceedings No.2620 Routine,dated, 24th September 1896.

2. Also letter from W.O.Horne Esquire,C.S.,Acting Collector of Vizagapatam,to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue,Madras,Re.C.No.4549/acc of '96,dated 11th November 1896.

Resolution

Submitted for the orders of Government through the Accountant-General.

2. The Board at first declined to take any action in the matter as it was not reported that the individual in question was about to apply for pension.It is now stated that his pension application has been submitted to Government.The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.

(True Extract)

Acting Secretary.

7
17
61

To

The Secretary to Govt.R.D.,through the Accountant-General with both Collector's letters in original & copy of B.P. 2620,d/ 24 September 1896.

Corr.—500—1-10-96.

(TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.)

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

No. A.D.K. / 426.

Fort St. George,
Accountant-General's Office,
1 December 1896.

From

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Collector of
Vizagapatam

26 DEC 96

Attention is drawn to No. 9 of the printed Memo. of Instructions from this office.

The marks entered in the Application should be made to agree with those in the service book.

The information mentioned in 6(2) of the memorandum should be furnished with reference to the acting appointments held by the applicant during the last 5 years of his service.

In the annual returns for 1880 and 1881 the date of appointment is entered as 28-2-79. and 18-10-80 but no such dates are traceable in the application. The discrepancies should be explained.

Cont

SIR,

I have the honour to inform you that the application for pension ~~gratuity~~ of Naudagiri Krishna Row late Cash Keeper of your office is being delayed for want of the information noted in the margin. Where possible your answer should be written underneath the several points to which your attention is drawn.

2. The enclosures and your reply should be returned with the least possible delay.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

68

Chief Superintendent.

67

Memorandum of Several Appointments held by Nandagiri Krishnankar Pantulu late Cash Keeper, Collector's Office Vizagapatam during the last 5 years of his Service.

Designation	Pay	Beginning from	Ending with	Nature of vacancy and how caused	Remarks	Rs. a. p.
ermanent Head clerk Principal Asst. Collector's Office Vizagapatam	85	28-10-91	30-4-92	+ In the arrangement of C. [illegible], acting Deputy Tahsildar of Revatipur on privilege leave from 3rd May to 27th July 1892.	From 28 October 1891 to 8 January 1895 at Rs 85 p.m. —	3262-14-6
Transit	85	1-5-92	2-5-92	Received acting allowance during the period.	From 9 January 1895 to 27 October 1896 at Rs 125 p.m. —	2701-9-9
g Deputy Tahsildar of atipur. Vizagapatam.	100	3-5-92	21-7-92		For 60 months	5964-8-3
manent Head clerk Principal Asst. Collector's office Vizagapatam	85	22-7-92	6-1-95		Average pay for one month —	99-6-6
Transit	85	7-1-95	8-1-95		Proposed Pension	49-11-3
manent Cash Keeper llector's Office Vizagapatam	125	9-1-95	27-10-96			

7
49
61

Vizagapatam
8th December 1896

for Collector

C.M.R.

Ref Current No. $\frac{4549}{\text{Acc.}}$ of 189
Dated 7-12-96

6436

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
29 DEC 96
MADRAS

Ref Current No. $\frac{4549}{\text{Acc.}}$ of 1896
Dated 22-12-96.

I The marks entered in the Application are [illegible] made to agree with those in the Service Bo

II. Memorandum required in 6(a) of the printed memo of instructions is enclosed.

III Copy of the letter from the Collector of Cudd. explaining the discrepancies is herein encl

Vizagapatam
Collectorate
22 December 1896

Sooria Row
For Collector

No. $\frac{2738}{\text{Acc}}$ of 96. Cuddapah Collr.
16 December 1896

From
The Collector of
Cuddapah

To
The Collector of
Vizagapatam

Sir

With reference to your foot No 4549 dated 8 December 1896 on Accountant General's letter No $\frac{\text{A.D.K}}{426}$ dated 1st December 1896, I have the honor to state that the dates of appointments of M. Krishna Row therein referred to are entered as 28-5-79 and 18.10.80 in the office copies of annual returns for 1880 and 1881 respectively maintained in this office. The date 28-5-79 tallies with that entered in the pay abstract also but the date 18-10-80 seems to be a mistake for 10-10-80 which is the correct date as is observed from the pay abstract. I have &c

(Sd) Syed Khader Pa
For Collector

True Copy

Sooria Row
For Collector

7
20
61

22 Dec 1896

for copying 1½/2
do
mined do
hed do

1897

O., No. DATED

C. N

ENNST .. .. .. A A A A A A A

GOVERNMENT.

ITH DITTO.

FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
ORIGINAL.

Copy in full.
Not to be copied.
Copy abstract only.
Copy heading only.