[D. D. / 42]
1,000-10-8-96.

Pension (1897) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

F. No. 512/97
E. No. 631/97

G.O., No. 459

DATED 15-6-97.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Granting an invalid pension of Rs. 22-8-0 per mensem to M.R.Ry D. Subramaniam Naidu, late Tahsildar of Badvel, Cuddapah Dt. -

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O.	1173	Pen.	10-12-96				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O.	483	Pen. ~~2-7-97~~	2-7-97				

Pen. C. No. 1275

391

APPLICATION FOR PENSION OR GRATUITY.

1. Name of Applicant. Dharapuram Subramaniam Naidu
2. Father's name. do — Allighirri sami Naidu
3. Race, Sect and Caste. Gentoo
4. Residence showing Village and Pergunnah. Dharapuram, Coimbatore District
5. Present or last employment, including name of establishment. Tahsildar of Badvel Cuddapah Collectorate
6. Date of beginning of service. 24 – 7 – 1871
7. Date of ending of service. 31 – 7 – 1896

	Y.	M.	D.
8. Length of service, including interruptions	22	6	15
of which superior	20	5	11
inferior	2	1	4
non-qualifying and interruptions	1	4	26

9. Class of pension or gratuity applied for, and cause of application.* Invalid
10. [Average] emoluments or pay. Rs: 150
11. Proposed pension. ⊕ 7 – 8 – 0
12. Proposed gratuity.
13. Date from which pension is to commence. 1 – 8 – 96
14. Place of payment. Dharapuram, Coimbatore District
15. Date of Applicant's birth by Christian era.† ~~1849~~ *1849 June the exact date is not known
16. Height. 5 ft. 7 1/4 inch
17. Marks. A scar above the left eyebrow, one mole on the left cheek, two moles on the forehead and one on the right eye brow.
18. Date. 25th September 1896.

Cuddapah Collector's Office

H. Dale
M.E.M.
Collector
SIGNATURE OF HEAD OF OFFICE.

* 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.)

Compd 26.9.96

tg 26/9/96.

N.B. * The date of birth shown in the annual list of Establishments is incorrect. The applicant now says that 1849 is the correct year of his birth.

2,000 - 9-12-93.

⊕ The amount of pension arrived at as per calculation according to rules is Rs 47-8-0

HISTORY OF THE SERVICE (SHOWING INTERRUPTION) OF M R Ry D. Subbramanium Naidu

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay.	Acting Allowance.	Date of beginning.	Date of ending.	Period reckoned as service.			Period not reckoned as service.			Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by the Audit Officer.
		RS.	RS.			Y.	M.	D.	Y.	M.	D.			
Trinnevelly,	4th writer	14-0-0	-	24-7-71	-								Received from different places when bills in this office	A does not count for pension as no pension or gratuity is admissible under Article 436 of the Civil Service Regulations B. Verified from the records of the several offices in which the applicant served and the verification confirmed by reference partly to the Audit Registers and partly to the Annual returns on record in this office.
Principal Amin's court														
Do	2d writer acting	14-0-0	7-0-0	24-7-71	20-9.71	-	1	27						
Do	Hd Gumastah.	14-0-0	6-0-0	21-9.71	31-3-72	.	6	10				He came in reduction of Establishment from 1st April 1872 & had no employment till 22d September 1874.		
North Arcot Collectorate	Attender - Dy. Tahsildar's office Arnee	7-0-0	.	23.9.74	26.10.76	A ~~2~~	~~1~~	~~4~~	2	1	4			
Chingleput Police Superintendent	Sub-Inspector Permanent	30-0-0		27-10.76	2-9-77	-	10	6						
Do	4th Class Inspector sub pro tem	30-0-0	45-0-0	3-9-77	30-9.77	-	-	28						
Total period of Superior Service ..					..									
Do	Sub Inspector	30-0-0	〃	1-10.77	14-5.79	1	7	14					Verified with reference to the establishments he served and with reference to the pay	
Privilege Leave				15.5.79	30.6.79	-	1	16						
Do	Sub Inspector	30-0-0		1.7.79	31.7.79	-	1	.						
Do	2d Class Inspector Ag.	30-0-0	30-0-0	1-8.79	5.9.79	-	1	5						
Do	Sub Inspector	30-0-0	〃	6.9.79	15.2.80	-	5	10						
Do	5th class Inspector Acting	30-0-0	10-0-0	16.2.80	6-3.80	.	.	21						
Do	Sub Inspector	30-0-0	.	7.3.80	9-4.80	-	1	3						
Taluk office Palmaner North Arcot District	Taluk Sheristadar sub pro tem	〃	60-0-0	10.4.80	31-1.81	.	9	21						
Do	Permanent	60-0-0	. .	1-2.81	11-1.82	.	11	11						
Sub Magt Vellore Town	Acting	60-0-0	7-0-0	12.1.82	10.2.82	-	-	29						
Do	Do	60-0-0	10-0-0	11-2.82	25.3.82	-	1	15						
Dy Tahsildar - Vencatagirikota	Do	60-0-0	10-0-0	26-3.82	31-5.82	-	2	5						
Do	Permanent	70-0-0	〃	1-6.82	21-4.83	-	10	21						
Deputy Tahsildar Madanapalle	Acting	70-0-0	〃	22-4.83	16.1.84	.	8	25						
Privilege Leave				17.1.84	1-4.84	.	2	15						
Do	Acting	70-0-0		2-4.84	31.8.84	.	5	-						
Do	Permanent	70-0-0		1-9-84	15.1.85	.	4	15						
Transit		70-0-0		16.1.85	23.1.85	.	-	8						
Royachoty Tahsildar Cuddapah District	Acting	70-0-0	35	24.1.85	30.6.86	1	5	7						
Do	Permanent	175-0-0	-	1-7.86	13.8.86	-	1	13						
Transit				14.8.86	19.8.86			5						
						10	6	[illegible]						

								10	6	~~24~~ a			
Badml Tahsildar Cuddapah District }	Permanent	150		u	20.8.86	25.10.87	1	2	6				
Siddhavattam Tahsildar	Do	150		-			-	-	-	-			
Do	Furlough				26.10.87	25.10.88	-	-	-	1	-	-	
Badml Tahsildar	Acting ~~Permanent~~	150		-	26.10.88	18.5.89	-	6	23	-	-	-	
Leave on loss of pay					19.5.89	16.7.89	-	-	-	-	1	28	
Do	Acting ~~Permanent~~	150		-	17.7.89	31.10.89	-	3	14	-	-	-	
+ Suspension		100			1.11.89	23.4.90		~~5~~	~~23~~	-	5	23	
Tahsildar of Siddhavattam	Do	150			24.4.90	22.7.93	3	2	29	-	-	-	× The suspension has been [illegible] and Comm Converted with 2/3 pay for Leave.
Privilege #: Leave					23.7.93	22.10.93	-	3	-	-	-	-	
Tahsildar of Badvel Taluk }	Permanent	150			23.10.93	30.6.94	-	8	8	-	-	-	#: transferred to Badvel which [illegible] became with effect from ~~(20-8-93)~~ 19.8.93
Privilege Leave					1.7.94	20.7.94	-	-	20	-	-	-	
Tahsildar of Badvel	Permanent	150			21.7.94	12.1.96	1	5	22	-	-	-	
Privilege Leave					13.1.96	22.1.96	-	-	10	-	-	-	
Do	Permanent	150			23.1.96	2.5.96	-	3	10	-	-		
Leave on Loss of pay					3.5.96	31.7.96	-	-	-	-	2	28	
					Total		18 ~~21~~	6 ~~1~~	22 ~~19~~	B 1 3	~~10~~ ~~4~~ 11	~~19~~ ~~26~~ 23	

SECY GOVT MADRAS 21 NOV 96 REV. DEPT.

REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant. Bad. Full report is now being made to the Board of Revenue (a copy of the letter to the Board is herewith sent).

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation. Copies of the orders are appended.

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

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

5. Any other remarks. "

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

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 21 NOV 1896 PENSION DEPARTMENT

SECY GOVT MADRAS 21 NOV 96 REV. DEPT.

S.K. 26.9.96

Compd by 26/9 Q 26.9.96

A.C.B. for Collector 26.9.96

SIGNATURE.

CERTIFICATE AND REPORT OF THE AUDIT OFFICER (1).

CERTIFIED that (~~subject to the remarks below recorded~~) qualifying service in ~~inferior or~~ superior grades has been duly proved for 18 years 6 months +22 days; and that an invalid pension ~~or gratuity~~) not exceeding Rs. 45 -- per mensem, equal to 18/60 average emoluments, is admissible under Articles 485 and 518 (b) of the Civil Service Regulations, 2nd Edn. The calculations have been duly verified. ~~The (pension or gratuity) is chargeable to (here specify whether to General Revenues, or to what Fund)~~.

It is observed from the remark opposite to No 1 in the 3rd page of the application that the character and past conduct of the applicant are described as "bad" and the Collector of Cuddapah recommends a pension of Rs 7-8-0 only. It rests therefore with Government to make such reductions in the amount of Pension that may be sanctioned to him as it may deem proper with reference to Article 514(b) of the Regulations.

The delay in the submission of this application is explained by the collector of Cuddapah in his letter Dis. No 2141/ __ dated 29 Sept. 96.

Fort Saint George
Accountant Genl: Office
12th November 1896

To The Under Secretary to Government,
Pension Department.

W.A.D.J. 455

J. Mason

~~Audit Officer.~~ Offg: Accountant Genl.

Ex. dsp 20.11.96

M.N.

---

(1) In the case of Civil Engineers and Telegraph Officers who are eligible for the additional pensions authorized in Article 714, the following addition should be made to the usual form of Certificate :—

He has served for three years as (Chief Engineer, Superintending Engineer, &c., as the case may be) and is eligible for a special additional pension of Rs. 1,000/2,000 if he is considered to have rendered "approved service" under Article 714 of the Civil Service Regulations.

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.

Cw 1275/96

P. 459/96

(Certificate for retirement on invalid pension or gratuity.)

No. 63.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
3-AUG.-1896
CUDDAPAH

CERTIFIED that I have carefully examined D. Subramaniyam Naid

son of D. Allagheriswamy Naidu

Tahsildar of Baduel

in the Cuddapah District

His age is by his own statement 47 years and by appearance about 47 years.

I consider D. Subramanyam Naidu to be completely and permanently incapacitated for further service of any kind or in the Department to which he belongs in consequence of Diabetes Mellitus and Incipient cataract in both eyes.

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

STATION Cuddapah
Date 31st July 1896.

Name. K. Thummon Smith
Rank.
Designation. Ag. Dist. Medl & Santy Officer. M.D.

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."]

6
2
1275

Countersigned.

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

STATEMENT OF CASE.

1. Rank. Tahasildar
2. Name. D. Subramanyam Naidu
3. Department or Office. Revenue Department
4. Marks of identification. A scar above the left eyebrow, one mole on the left cheek, two moles on the breast & one on the right eyebrow.
5. Age. 47
6. Service. 25
7. Sick leave granted during the service.
8. Disease or cause of disability. Diabetes Mellitus and Incipient cataract in both eyes.
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.

M. R. Ry. D. Subramanyam Naidu complains of having lost much weight during the past twelve months and of a dull aching pain in the loins, passes urine several times both in the day and night, the quantity is also increased, after going to bed at nights he has to rise out of bed to void urine thrice as a rule; suffers from voracious appetite and excessive thirst, complains of loss of memory, sleeplessness at nights and unfitness for work. There is numbness of the fronts of both thighs and languidity after the slightest exertion, has dry tongue and lips, skin rough dry and scaly. His urine after being passed in my presence was examined, Sp: Gravity 1024° — quantity 22 oz, contains sugar as ascertained by Pavy's Test both by myself and by the Assistant Surgeon, two mornings with the same result, he is unable to read small print. Has also suffered from Intermittent Fever and Dysentery. He is broken down in general health. He is in my opinion unfit for further service.

M. Thummon Swift M.D.
Ag: Dist: Medl & Santry Officer.

Extract from the Service Register of Mr

19 AUG 96

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
					✓	
4th Writer Additional Principal Sadar Ameen's Court Tinnevelly	Permanent	—	14	—	24-7-71 ✓	
2nd writer Do	Acting	4th writer	21	.	24-7-71 ✓	
Head Gumastah Do	Acting	Do	20		21-9-71	

Services from 24-7-71 to 31-3-72
Verified from pay bills & acquittance Rolls kept in this Court.

Tinnevelly District Court 14th August 1896 } D. Broadfoot District Judge

Cuddapah (
Dated

Extract from the Service Register of Mr Kody D. Subramaniya Naidu

CUDDAPAH TREASURY DEPUTY COLLECTOR'S OFFICE 12 AUG 96

CUDDAPAH TREASURY DEPUTY COLLECTOR'S OFFICE 21 AUG 96

Name of appointment	Nature ie 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	Signature & designation of immediate head of the office	Date of termination of appointment	Reason of termination ie transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent	Signature & designation of the immediate head of the office
Sub Inspector of Police Chingleput district.	Permanent	—	30	2	27.10.76				2.9.77	Promotion	
4th Class Inspector of Police	Sub. Protem	Sub Inspector	75	—	3.9.77				30.9.77	Return of permanent incumbent	
Do Sub Inspector	Permanent	—	30	—	1.10.77				31.7.79	Promotion	
Sub Inspector & Acting 2nd class Inspector of Police Chingleput	Acting	Sub Inspector	30	30	1.8.79		Privilege leave for 2½ months sanctioned of which availed only 1½ months from 15th May to 30th June 1879.		5.9.	Return of permanent incumbent	
Sub Inspector	Permanent	—	30	–	6.9.79				15.2. 0	Promotion	
Sub Inspector & Acting 5th Class Inspector of Police	Acting	Sub Inspector	30	10	16.2.80		Leave without allowance under G.O. No 1516 dated 4.9.1871. R.D. from 8.4.1880 and permanently transferred to Revenue Department 8.10.1880		6.3.80	Return of permanent incumbent.	
Sub Inspector	Permanent	—	30	—	7.3.80				~~8.10~~ 80 22-10	~~Transfer~~ Transferred to Revenue Deptt: as per Monthly Return for Octr./80.	

× This Col. to be filled up written up to original pay bills.

Verified

John Edward R A Boyd
Superintendent of Police
9.8.96 Chingleput Dist

Cuddapah Collr's office }
5th August 96 }

P. Venkatanagaiah
5.8.96
Treasury Deputy Collector

5.8.96

5/8/96

The Service Register Extract of D. Subramania Naidu, prepared with reference to the pay abstracts in the North Arcot Collectarate.

TREASURY DEPUTY COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
17 AUG 96

TREASURY DEPUTY COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
26 OCT 96

Name of appointment	Nature i.e. whether substantive or acting or permanent or temporary	Substantive appointment if the new appointment be acting only	Pay	Acting allowance	Date of appointment	Character of Officer	Date of termination of appointment	Reason of termination	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10.
Attender deputy Tahsildar's office Arni	Permanent		7	..	23-9-74		8-11-1876	Resigned	
Taluq Sheristadar Palmaner	Sub pro tem ~~Acting~~			60	10-4-80		31-1-80	Confirmation ~~Promotion~~	
do	~~Sub pro tem~~		60	..	17-1880		31-1-1881	~~Confirmation~~	
do	Permanent		60	..	1-2-1881		11-1-1882	Promotion	
Sub Magistrate Vellore Town.	Acting	Taluq Sheristadar Palmaner	60	7	12-1-82	×	10-2-82	changes in the allowance	× The pay for the transit period was not drawn separately but drawn with salary bill for the months concerned.
do	do	do	60	10	11-2-82		25-3-82	Transfer.	
Deputy Tahsildar of Venkatagiri Kota.	do	do	60	10	26-3-82	×	31-5-82	Confirmation.	
do	Permanent		70	.	1-6-82		21-4-83	Transfer	
Deputy Tahsildar Maderpak	Acting	deputy Tahsildar Venkatagiri Kota.	70	..	22-4-83	×	16-1-84	Taken leave	
do	Privilege leave.		.	-	17-1-84		1-4-84	Returned from leave	
do	Acting	of Tahsildar Venkatagiri Kota	70	..	2-4-84		31-8-84	Confirmation.	
do	Permanent		70	..	1-9-84		15-1-85	Transfer to Cuddapah district.	

6
5
1275

North Arcot Collector's Office Chittoor
14th August 1896

Dy. Collector

y D. Subramaniya Naidu

Character of officer	Signature & designation of immediate head of the office	Date of termination of appointment	Reason of termination i.e. transfer promotion, return of permanent incumbent	Signature & designation of immediate ~~Superior~~ head of the office
		24.7.71	Promotion	✓
		20.9.71	Return of permanent incumbent	
		31.3.72	Abolition of the Court.	✓

P. Venkatagopal
Treasury Deputy Collector

this office }
ugust 1896 }

6/8/96

6/8/96

6
3
1275

No. 2622
5-8-96

Proceedings of the acting Collector of Cuddapah dated 3rd August 1896.

It is now two months since the jamabandy of the Rayachoty Taluk began. I entered the Taluk on the 30th ~~May~~ January and left it on the 19th June. I returned on the 1st July and was engaged in jamabandy till the 6th. I again returned on the 26th and the jamabandy is not yet on the 31st July completed. During the whole of this period the Huzur Sheristadar and 5 clerks have been employed in the examination and check of the village accounts.

The explanation of this delay is to be found in the state of the Taluk which I can only describe as utterly deplorable. The present Tahsildar has been in charge of the Taluk ~~ever~~ now since January 1885. Quite 1 1/4 years. This is

6
6
1275

quite ample time for him to have got the Taluk into order had ~~he~~ been capable of doing so. and he is to blame for the state of things existing ~~existing~~.

Everything in the Taluk wears the air of utter neglect and want of attention. The Taluk office itself is thoroughly out of hand. Every clerk is a law ~~lost~~ unto himself. They are very ignorant and clearly have never been properly supervised. The registers e.g. Subdivision of Survey fields are not written up. Demands are out ———

and nothing is known what became of them afterwards. The later years records are in a state of utter confusion unindexed and unarranged no steps have been taken to destroy the

useless

useless ones. The office shows clearly the want of a head to control and direct its working. As in the office so in the Taluk. The ~~The~~ Revenue Inspectors do just as they please. How little they pleased may be inferred from the fact that there was I may say no inspection of the Tirvajasti or Fasal jasti in the 1st class Revenue Inspector's division. The village accounts seems ~~were~~ never to have been examined. The water supply of the tanks was seldom if ever reported on and agimoish work was utterly neglected. The Revenue Inspectors were allowed to forget the orders from the Taluk with the result that the issue of Patta in B.agar-ubhevarvoo cases has not been effected in many cases for several years and that Durkhast cases few though they be drag on for an interminable time. The Birth and Death registration is excessively bad and Vaccination is much neglected.

The state of the village accounts was of course what might be expected under the above circumstances. Practically no village accounts which I may call ~~raising~~ running accounts ~~was~~ were kept except no. 10. 11 & 12, not and the Adangal. I seldom found no. 3 written up and I found it correctly so only in two cases.

The village officers are utterly out of hand so much so that the Karnams threatened a strike and of course all kinds of fraud and oppression are rampant.

We find what might naturally be expected under the above circumstances that Collections in this Taluk is the worst in the district. It must be so, for no arrangements of any kind have been made to enable Collection to be efficiently carried on. The villages have not been grouped and days for remittance fixed. The village officers have not had definite duties assigned to them when there are many in a village.

The village and Taluk accounts are hopelessly at variance. So much so that even in the two months I have been in the Taluk it has not been found possible to prepare the T.C account of arrears though

no More was required than

that to shew Asamiwar for old arrears recommended to be written off and for the outstanding arrears. The detailed examination of one village shews a state of the accounts which may be gauged from the fact that the totals of Rs 10 shewing the remittances are wrong in many cases. Notice of Collection in one village on account of another ~~village~~ was never given to the village officers with the result that many items have been twice collected. No accounts were uniformly required from the village officers. In short in the account branch everything has been systematically neglected except the Treasury

Accounts

accounts which of course are constantly and persistently checked from the Huzur.

The following shews the progress of Collections in this Taluk since January 1886.

× × × × × ×

The following is an analysis of the touring of this Tahsildar.

× × × × × ×

~~His~~ His ~~His~~ activity and attention to duty may be judged from the fact that though it was expected and asserted that there was a failure of rain in the Taluk in November and December it was only in February he started to move round his Taluk. During that month he carefully stayed where there was no want of rain and it was not till March that he arrived in any of the villages where rain was said to be wanting —

Of course he found all the tanks dry and his inspection was utterly worthless.

I don't think this man is mentally incompetent, but he is very ignorant and to say the least of it lazy and indolent. He can if he likes improve and I desire to give him a chance of doing so. I shall therefore transfer him to Badvel (promoting the Tahsildar of that Taluk here) where, if he does not exert himself I will suspend him and recommend his reduction to the post of deputy Tahsildar.

(Sd) G. Stokes

(True Copy)

[illegible] Khan [illegible]
Treasury Deputy Collector
22.9.96

22.9.96

23.9.96

Extract from the Confidential letter No. 2 dated 12th March 1891. sent to the Secretary to Commissioner Land Revenue, Shewing the Circumstances under which M.R.Ry. D. Subrahmanyam Nayadu, Tahl of Badvel. was Suspended

14/ In the Boards reference 3434 Routine, dated 14th October 1890. this report is called for and an anonymous petition is transferred to me. no report on that petition is called for. but I think it better to say briefly that in the course of a revenue appeal it appeared that the Tahsildar had recommended a man for a Village office in spite of the remark on a previous occasion by the divisional officer.

PENSIONS DEPARTMENT
b
7
1275

officer that the man was a bad character.

The remark was in writing by the Deputy Collector on one of the Tahsildar's office papers. When called on for an explanation the Tahsildar's defence was that the office papers had been called for from his office, that when they went to the Deputy Collector no such remark was to be found in them, and that it was only there when the papers came back from the Deputy Collector's office. ~~The~~ the inference being that the Deputy Collector had sent for the papers and put in the remark to support his charge previously made against the Tahsildar of having ignored it. This seemed

to

to me a serious matter and I went to Badiel & held a local enquiry in which the Tahsildar was of course and felt himself on his trial. He made the same defence.

15/ I suspended him — intending to report the matter for the orders of the Board but could not at once write the report and on reconsideration felt considerable doubt whether the matter was one that need go to the Board. The Tahsildar was evidently of opinion that the Division officer was very much against him and the Taluk Sheristadar had given to him a statement corroborating him in the belief that the remark was not on the paper when sent up to the Deputy Collector. Before me the Taluk Sheristadar withdrew this statement which he said the Tahsildar got from him by threats. I hesitated some time as to what was best to do but at ~~least~~ last came to the conclusion that as the Tahsildar was on his trial, in a manner, it would not be right to punish him too severely or recommend him for a severer punishment than I could myself inflict for statements made in his own defence if, as he once or twice said to me, the statements expressed his defence

defence merely when he was forced to explain the facts & were not made or meant as a charge against his superior officer the Deputy Collector. I therefore got him to put in writing a statement that his allegations were not a charge against the Deputy Collector but merely made in his own defence and based on the statements made to him of the Taluk Sheristadar and other Gumastahs and withdrawing any charge against the Deputy Collector.

16/. As he also promised complete subordination to the Deputy Collector I thought it sufficient that he should be suspended for five months and twenty-three days a punishment within my own competence to inflict.

(Sd). E. J. Small

(True extract)

Deputy Collector

Sd/
22.9.90

23.9.90

Dis no 2510/Ver 4/90 dated 27.5.1890

Proceedings of the Acting Collector

D Subramaniem Naidu ag Tahsildar of Badvel was suspended as he had made statements involving a charge of bad faith against his Divisional officer Mr. Rama Rao.

The matter at issue was itself of a trifling nature and would not have justified any punishment while the other charges of neglect of duty etc were not of sufficient gravity to make it worth while to remove D. Subramaniem Naidu and report the matter to the Board.

6
8
12/5

As he has now entirely withdrawn his charges against the Deputy Collector I see no reason for making any reference to the Board on the other matters and resolve to deal with them myself.

The order of suspension is therefore cancelled.

But as it will not be well that D. Subramaniam Naidu should return to Baduel and as there are other reasons making it desirable to effect a change at Sidhout, D. Subramaniam Naidu will take charge of his permanent appointment as Tahsildar of Sidhout, and V. Seshayya will revert to his permanent appointment as Tahsildar of Baduel. He should join at once.

(sd) E. J. Sewell
A/Collector

(True Copy)

Ks $\frac{288}{}$ $\frac{81}{896}$

Gea Khas Gardud
23.9.96
Treasury Dy Collector

Dis No $\frac{816}{\text{Ver}}$ 91 dated 20.3.1891

Proceedings of the Acting Collector of Cuddapah.

Read:

Treasury Deputy Collector's office note Reference on C No $\frac{2904}{\text{an}}$ d/ 28.5.1890 requesting instructions to pass the pay due to D. Subramaniam Naidu, Tahsildar.

Read also. D. Subramaniam Naidu's arzies Nos $\frac{5465}{16.7.90}$, $\frac{2693}{6.8.90}$, $\frac{2994}{30.8.90}$, $\frac{3737}{1.11.90}$ requesting to order the Treasury Deputy Collector to pass his arrear pay.

Read also. Treasury Deputy Collector's note on the Accountant General's objection Memo.

6
9
1275

Read also Order No $\frac{2510}{27.5.90}$ cancelling the suspension order and directing Subramaniam Naidu to ~~re~~join at Sidhout.

P.T.O.

Order

The suspension which was terminated by my Proceedings dated 15-4-90 was a punishment inflicted by me as I determined to deal with the matter myself instead of reporting it to the Board as I at first intended. Subramaniam Naidu is certainly not honourably acquitted and cannot therefore draw his full pay.

Under Section 215 note (b) of the Civil Service Regulations clause ii the revising authority can grant to the officer suspended such portion of his salary as may seem expedient. The acting Collector therefore grants to Subramaniam Naidu Rs 100 a month or 2/3rds of his pay during the period of his suspension.

(Sd) E. J. Sewell
Ag Collector.
12/3/91.

(True Copy)

Treasury deputy collector
23 9 96

-8.8.96

23.9.96

24 Cuddapah COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,

REFERENCE / DISPOSAL No ~~Disposal No.~~ 24th September 1896.

ENCLOSURES. ~~DATED~~

(1) Medical certificate
(2) Three verified extracts of the applicant's services in other districts
(3) Last pay certificate
(4) Service Register
(5) Copies regarding suspension & degradation orders

FROM A. C. Tate. Esquire,

COLLECTOR OF Cuddapah.

4927

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
30 SEP 96
MADRAS

TO

THE Accountant-General,
Madras.

SIR,

In submitting herewith the Pension application of M.R.Ry D. Subramaniyam Naidu, Tahsildar of Badvel, with the enclosures noted in the margin for transmission to Government, I have the honour to state that the delay beyond a month in its submission, was due to getting the necessary information regarding his services in

other

1/10

PENSION DEPARTMENT.
6
No. 14
1275

other districts. Requisitions were sent to the officers concerned on 5th August 1896 and the final reply from the Treasury Deputy Collector North Arcot was received only on 19th Instant.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obdt Servt

Ag Collector

25.9.96

25/9

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

FROM

THE — COLLECTOR OF

Cuddapah

TO

THE Acctt Gl

Madras

Dated 24
Despatched } September 1896.
Received

REFERENCE / DISPOSAL No. ______

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

Submitting the Pension application of M.R.Ry D. Subramaniyam Naidu Tahsildar of Badvel and explaining delay in its submission

---

Disposal No. 5017 476/

DATED Rev 25. 9. 96

Cuddapah Collector's Office, Dated 25th Sep. 1896

From:

A. C. Tate Esqr

Collector of

Cuddapah

To

The Secretary to the Commissioner of Land Revenue

Madras

Sir.

With reference to para 2 of Board's Proceedings No. 1064 (Routine) dated 16th April 96 I have the honor to submit herewith a copy of my proceedings Reference on Current No. 1485/Rev of 1896 dated 28th July 1896. Containing a precis of the misdeeds of M.R.Ry D. Subramanhiyam Nai

6

15

1275

Tahsildar of Badvel, which came to my notice, since I joined the District. As I have summarised in para 23 of the above Proceedings he has shown himself to be careless, unreliable, untruthful, disobedient inefficient and generally untrustworthy. Subramanyam Naidu's explanation on the points noticed in the Proceedings is submitted herewith in original with marginal remarks. The first point noticed in the Proceedings relates to unconscionable delays that he allowed to occur in replying to the remarks made by the Collector in the Jamabandi of fasli 1303. Subramanyam Naidu says he considers that "this work is an additional

one to the legitimate and daily work of the already overburdened Taluq Gumastas and that it was through his own perseverance that this work was gone through personally and that he was able to finish the memos in March last. It is evident that he does not understand his work if he really holds such views. The Jamabandi memos merely point out the defects in the ordinary work of a Taluq Establishment and there is nothing "additional" or "illegitimate". It was found that owing to carelessness in checking the various accounts and bringing them up to date, Government was losing revenue to which it was entitled and it was the Tahsildar's principal duty to find this out himself and rectify matters without the necessity of its being pointed out by the Collector. A Tahsildar who expects the Collector to teach him to do his duty must be a useless officer. It is also clear that from the various defects in his reports pointed out in paras 1 and 2 of the Proceedings that there was no 'perseverance' on the part of Subramaniyam Naidu in getting through the work until pressure was put upon him by prescribing progress reports. Until I made him understand that serious results would follow further delay, he took no trouble to send his replies defective as they were. The delays and defects were noticed not in a '*few*' cases as the Tahsildar ventures to state, but in almost every report.

2. About the misleading and inaccurate reports made by him, he makes vague and general statements which are not to the point in some cases he disclaims his responsibility for some of the inaccuracies stating that he was not Tahsildar at the period or that the inaccuracies were due to Gumastahs or other

Subordinates. As pointed out in my marginal notes, these remarks are again misleading. For instance, with reference to the transfer of certain lands in Kavalakuntla village, Subramanyam Naidu says that the matter relates to fusli 1297, and that he joined the Taluq in October 1893, but he must be well aware that he was in charge of the Taluq for one year in 1886-87 and again for another year in 1888-89, while he makes it appear in his explanation that he came to the Taluq for the first time in 1893 and

offers no explanation for the period during which he was in charge of the Taluq between 1886 and 1889.

3. The explanation regarding the remarks in matters relating to loans are also vague and do not meet the specific observations made in the Proceedings some of which show that he grossly neglected his duties. As an instance of his carelessness and ignorance of rules I pointed out that he had granted a loan of Rs 200 on an unenfranchised inam in Sidhout Taluq without taking collateral security and that difficulty actually arose

in Collecting the instalments of the loan owing to his disregard of the rules. In explanation of this, Subramaniyam Naidu states "Borrowers are well to do people. Government will lose nothing. I am responsible for it". This is mere impertinence.

4. In Connection with the remarks about his bad work under the Income tax act his explanation is irrelevant and not to the point and savours of insubordination as he makes unwarranted insinuations against his Divisional Officer

5.

5. His explanation regarding the other points noticed in the Proceedings, viz. Land Revenue Collections. Minor Irrigation works Treasury, Payments of Salaries to Village Establishment, Touring, preparation of Famine Analysis accounts and Firka Books, noting Changes in Permanent registers, Magisterial work, Maintenance of Subjail Register, Dharkhast work are all unsatisfactory as my marginal remarks will show. He is a Tahsildar of 4 years standing and yet he fails to realize his responsibility regarding

Treasury work. The serious errors pointed out in the Proceedings are treated by him as of minor importance, which betrays, in my opinion, his unfitness for a responsible position.

6. The expla~~ti~~nation for allowing a gumasta to write the Judgments in 2 Magisterial Cases, is futile and the way in which Subjail registers were neglected is characteristic of his extreme Carelessness and indifference. In short there is no branch of work to which this Tahsildar can claim credit to have discharged with proper attention and the Taluk has been mismanaged

by him.

7. That his previous history is bad is already within the knowledge of the Board. In 1886 Mr. G. Stocks found that his general work was very bad and degraded him from the post of the Tahsildar of Rayachoti on Rs 175 to that of Tahsildar of Badvel on Rs 150. His Concluding remarks in his Proceedings No 2622 dated 5. 8. 86 were as follows:—

"I do not think that this man is mentally incompetent, but he is very ignorant, and to say the least of it, lazy and indolent. He can, if he likes, improve, and I desire to give him a chance of doing so. I shall therefore transfer him to Badvel, where if he does not exert himself, I will suspend him and recommend his reduction to the post of Deputy Tahsildar."

8. In October 1886 he was reported to the Board for bad Income tax work done while he was Tahsildar of Rayachoti and after obtaining his Explanation the Board passed the following remarks — in its Proceedings No. 115 (Mis) dated 11th January 1887:—

"The Board are of opinion that the explanation submitted by the Tahsildar shows that he has done his work so badly as to deserve" severe punishment. The only question is whether the punishment he has already suffered by reduction is sufficient. Considering that the Tahsildar had to deal with the neglected state of affairs that prevailed in Cuddapah; that he had a bad Taluk Establishment to work with and that during this year his

Staff of Revenue Inspectors was exceptionally weak, the Board do not consider that further punishment is called for". Subsequently he was transferred from Badvel to Sidhout on the same pay. On 15th February 1888, Mr Stokes again reported to Board on the conduct of Subramanyam Naidu as Tahsildar of that Taluq in his letter No 1156 dated 15th February 1888 in which his concluding remarks were:– "I express my opinion of this officer after an experience of 18 months during which I have carefully watched

his work in all branches that he is utterly unfit by his character and conduct to be entrusted with any independent charge". On further correspondence Mr E. J. Sewe reported to the Board on 12th March 1891 that he resolved not to report against the Tahsildar except after personally warning him, to give him another trial. In the same letter he added that in connection with the allegations which the Tahsildar made against his Divisional Officer of tampering with certain records, he suspended him for 5 months and 23 days as a sufficient punishment, as the Tahsildar withdrew charge against his Divisional Officer and promised complete subordination to him. Upon this the Board in its Proceedings 1985 (Mis) dated 25th March 1891, accepted the Collector's disposal of the matter as sufficient and observed that the reports of the Dy Collector and Mr Stokes, will be considered in disposing of the question of punishment should the Tahsildar ever be found guilty of neglect of work or insubordination

or corruption again.

9. In June 1893 Mr Mounsey reported to the Board on the conduct of Subramanyam Naidu as Taluk Magistrate of Sidhout towards the Police in 2 cases and upon the Board's report, Government ordered, in its order No 1445 dated 7th July 1893 communicated in BP No 4446 (Mis) dated 1st August 1893 that "D. Subramanyam Naidu has, to say the least, shown great indiscretion in both cases and he should be severely reprimanded and transferred as proposed by the Board" D Badull.

Judicial

10. Thus, his Career in this District has been throughout one of misdeeds and the repeated Warnings by the Collectors, Board and Government, have had no salutary effect on him. He has continued to show an utter disregard of orders and supreme indifference to the interests of Government.

11. I enclose for the information of the Board a Copy of the statement of lands possessed and acquired by M.R.Ry. D. Subramanyam Naidu upto 31st December 1895. This will shew that

35.78 acres of dry land assessed at Rs 17-15-0, 26.14 acres of wet land assessed at Rs 34/-"-0 & a house, all in Coimbatore District, were ~~purp~~ purchased out of his self acquired property for Rs 17,225. But no mention is made in the statement of another house which Subramanyam Naidu admitted to have purchased in his deposition before the Sub Magistrate of Kangayam, Coimbatore District on 10th May 1895. He stated that he had purchased two houses for Rs 2475. The value of one of the houses shown in the Statement is put down as Rs 2300/, and the value of the other house would seem to be Rs 195/- In the same deposition Subramaniyam Naidu admitted that he had lent Rs 11,000/ to eleven individuals, that he paid Rs 15 on account of the tax on his income from money lending, that he had invested Rs 400 in a Savings bank, that he had bought Jewels worth Rs 2000, & that all this represented the savings out of his earnings in the public Service after meeting the expenditure required for three establishments maintained by him, one at Basul, the 2nd at Dharapuram, in Coimbatore, and the 3rd at Madras, not to say anything about the 4th Establishment, viz, dancing girls, admitted to have been kept by him in his younger days at a cost of Rs 15 or 20 a month. In addition to this he has been paying a quarterly premium of Rs 86 on a Life Policy. The Sources of his large savings, as stated by Subramaniyam Naidu were as follows:-

(1.) He was drawing 60 Rs per mensum for 3 yrs = Rs 2160

(2) do do 70 Rs for 3 or 4 yrs = 3360

(3) do do 175 Rs do for 2 yrs = 4200

(4) do do 150 Rs do for 10 or 11 yrs = 18,000

(5) He was Police Inspector for 4 years on an average Salary Rs 50 per mensum } 2400

30,120

Bu

But his total nett savings amount to Rs 30,800 as shown below:

Lands and houses.	Rs 17,400
Money lent . .	Rs 11.000
Jewels . .	Rs 2.000
In Savings Bank	Rs 400
Total	Rs 30,800

These facts seem sufficient to prove that Subramanyam Naidu has not been honest as a public servant.

12. In connection with some of the lands shown in the above statement as having been purchased in the names of others, Subramanya Naidu has involved himself in a Criminal Charge. On 8"

8" August 1895 the Sub Magistrate of Kangayam issued a notice to Subramanya Naidu calling upon him to show cause why sanction should not be given to prosecute him under sections 211 & 182 I. P. Code for having brought charges under S.S 379 and 145 I.P.C against Kondappa Chetti and others. He had to take leave to answer this charge & I understand that sanction was given and was confirmed on appeal but that a prosecution has not yet been started. The Collector of Coimbatore can, if desired, give information on the point.

13. Subsequent to my furnishing him with a Copy of my Proceedings he put in an application requesting me to send him to the Medical Officer for examination as to further fitness for duty, as he wished to retire from the Service. The District Medical Officer has Certified him to be unfit for further Service and I enclose a Copy of his Certificate for the Board's information. The pension papers are submitted to Government through the Accountant General. Had it not been for his application for pension, I should now on the points whereon I took his explanations have recommended his reduction to the Post of Taluq Head Accountant on Rs 50, and I am of opinion, that on account of his proud & persistent bad Conduct as a public Servant, he should either be removed now without pension or that his pension should be largely reduced. (I did not question him about his possessions as I got the information subsequently)

The information which

I have given above as to his private transactions are gleaned from his own sworn deposition before the Kangayam Sub Magistrate when he was severely cross examined in order apparently to show that he could not own the property he was claiming and where it was distinctly to his interest to make his possession as small as he could. I enclose a copy of his deposition and I request that the Board will peruse it, as it very clearly indicates the nature of the man. Considering that he admits the possession of self acquired property worth Rs 30,800, and that he is notorious in this District for his dishonesty, I don't think he deserves much pension.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obdt Servant
(Signed) A. C. Tate
Collector

(True Copy)

For Collector.
28.9.96

Compd
41
29.9.96

by
29/9/96

4864
av
10 10 96

P. 600—9-5-96.

(TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.)

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

No. A.D.K./361.

Fort St. George,
Accountant-General's Office,
7th October 1896.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
8-OCT-1896
CUDDAPAH

From
THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To
THE Collector of
Cuddapah

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

It is stated that Rs 47-8-0 is the amount of pension arrived at as per calculation according to rules. A memo showing how it is arrived at should be appended.

2. In the Service book the date of birth was originally entered as 1850 or 1851, but now altered to 1849. It should be stated whether the permission of Government was obtained to make the alteration.

3. In the annual returns for 1882, 1883 and 1894, the date of appointment is entered as 27-3-82, 10-1-82, and 19-8-93 respectively. But no such dates are traceable in the application. The discrepancy should be explained.

4. In the extract from the applicant's service register verified by the Deputy Collector North Arcot; it is stated that the applicant resigned the appointment of attender on 8-11-76, but in the Service register the reason of termination is entered as transfer and the date is entered as 27-10-76. The discrepancy should be explained.

5. The leave without pay enjoyed by the applicant from 3-5-96 to 31-7-96 has not been entered in the service book. The omission should be supplied.

SIR,

I have the honour to inform you that the application for pension/~~gratuity~~ of M.R.Ry. D. Subramaniyam Nayudu, late Tahsildar of Badvel 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,

Chief Superintendent
~~Assistant Accountant-General.~~

6
13
1275

WR 5/

Cuddapah COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,

10th October 1896.

MC

~~REFERENCE~~ / ~~DISPOSAL~~ No 4864 / an 796

ENCLOSURES. 2.

FROM M.R.Ry. P. Venkatarangalu Naidu Garu B.A.

Deputy COLLECTOR ~~of~~ in charge of the Treasury

To

THE Treasury Deputy Collector
North Arcot

SIR,

In forwarding herewith an extract from the Accountant General's objections on the pension application of M.R.Ry. D. Subramaniyam Naidu late Tahsildar of Badvel, I have the honour to request you to inform me how the variations pointed out in objection 3 may be reconciled.

THE PENSION DEPARTMENT
6
11
1275

As regards objection 4. I have to say that in the extract received from the Police department D. Subramaniyam Naidu is

Shewn to have been confirmed as Sub Inspector with effect from 27.10.76 and consequently his appointment as attender Deputy Tahsildar's office should have ceased on that date. In submitting the application from this office, it was considered that the variation now pointed out by the Accountant General was due to delay in sending or accepting the resignation. At any rate the attender's post must have fallen permanently vacant from 27.10.76 from which date ~~the~~ D. Subramaniyam Naidu's service began in the Public Department. Please let me know if my surmise is correct and if not, how the period from 27.10.76 to 8.11.76 was treated in your establishment bills

bills.

The verified extract of service forwarded by you is herewith sent for reference and return.

An early reply is solicited.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient
(Sd) P. Theenathulpalai
Deputy Collector
in charge

(True copy)

P. Meenakshiayyar
for
Deputy Collector

26/9.96

Compared
26/10

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

FROM

THE COLLECTOR OF

TO

THE

Dated
Despatched
Received
189 .

REFERENCE/DISPOSAL No.

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

REFERENCE/DISPOSAL No.

Chittoor 21st October 1890.

ENCLOSURES.

FROM

M.R.Ry. T.H. Ramachandra Iyer
Deputy Collector in charge of Treasury
North Arcot

THE

Deputy Collector
in charge of Treasury
Cuddapah

SIR,

With reference to your letter Ref on C.No. 4864/ac dated the 10th instant, I have the honour to state as follows: ~~[illegible]~~

2. Accountant General's objection item No 3.

The date of appointment entered in the detailed lists of establishment of this district for 1882 & 1883 appears to be a mistake for 26.3.82, which is the correct date on which Subramaniyam

6
12
1275

Naidu

[illegible] of the [illegible].

cannot be ascertained now how the dates referred to by the Accountant General came to be entered.

Accountant General's Objection Item No. 4

From the remarks entered in the service division of Tahsildar's Establishment pay bill for November 1876, it would appear that S. Subramaniyam Naidu's resignation reached the Dy. Tahsildar's office on the 8th November 76. He was on leave on loss of pay from March 76 until the date on which his resignation reached the Dy. Tahsildar, so that the period from 27.6.76 (the date of his entering the Police Department) to 8-11-76 was treated as leave on loss of pay in the establishment bill

4. The service register extract received with your letter is herein returned.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obdt Servt
(Sd) T. N. Ramachandra Iyer
Deputy Collector

(True Copy)

P. Venkataraya
26/10
Deputy Collector

26:10

Compd
26/10

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

FROM
THE COLLECTOR OF

TO
THE

Dated
Despatched } 189
Received

REFERENCE/DISPOSAL No.

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

REFERENCE/DISPOSAL No. 20th October

ENCLOSURES.

5283

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
27 OCT 96
MADRAS

FROM
A. G. Forbes Esquire
Ag Sub COLLECTOR ~~of~~ in charge of
Cuddapah.

TO
THE Accountant-General
Madras.

Superior Service . y. m. d. 20 – 5 – 11
deduct non qualifying and interruptions 1 – 4 – 26
Net Superior Service 19 – 0 – 15
The average emoluments per month . Rs 150 × 60 / 60 = Rs 150
The actual amount of pension per mensem as per rules $\Big\}$ Rs $\frac{150 \times 19}{60}$ = Rs 47 – 8 – 0

SIR,

In returning herewith your letter No $\frac{A. D. K}{361}$ dated 7th instant, I have the honour to state as follows.

Objection No. I

The memo showing the process how the pension of Rs 47-8-0 was arrived at is given in the margin.

Objection No. 2.

The date of birth given in the annual lists of North Arcot where the applicant had been employed before he came to this district

27/10 6
PENSION DEPARTMENT.
10
1275

was

[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] the entries [illegible] the Service Register, the applicant was asked to explain the difference and he explained that the exact date of his birth is not known and that the contemporaneous facts make him state that the ~~may~~ year 1849 is probably correct. As the date of birth first recorded in North Arcot District should have been adopted in this District also and as the applicant reports that it is correct, it was considered not necessary to obtain the Government sanction for alteration of the entry in the Service Register, in view to make it agree with the date originally recorded in North Arcot. If under the circumstances explained the sanction of Government be considered necessary, I request that it may be obtained.

Objections Nos 3 & 4

As regards the variations pointed out [illegible] I have nothing to say but to submit copies of correspondence between this and the Treasury Deputy Collr North Arcot.

As regards the variation relating to this District, I find that the date 20.8.93 is a clerical error for 19.8.93. The necessary corrections have now been made both in the Service Register and in the Pension application.

Objection No. 5

The leave without allowances has already been noted in the last page, but two, of the applicant's Service Register.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obdt servt

P. Veerarayalu
26.10.03

For Asst Sub Collector in Charge

Compd
26/10

26.10.06

FROM

THE Asst COLLECTOR ~~OF~~
in charge of
Cuddapah

TO

THE Acctt Genl
Madras

Dated 26 } Octr 1896.
Despatched
Received

REFERENCE/DISPOSAL No. 2339 / Acc 0796

ENCLOSURES. (Bundle)

SUBJECT.

Retransmitting the pension application of M.R.Ry D. Subramanyam Naidu with the necessary information called for.

[A]

C. No. 1275.

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

List

No. 87 d/25-11 96

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The Board of Rev. (L.R.) is requested to forward, for the information of Govt., a copy of its Proceedings on the letter from the Collector of Cuddapah No. 5017 d/25-9-96, regarding M.R.Ry. D. Subrahmanyam Naidu, late Tahsildar of Badvel.

K.S.
23.11.96

T.D.
24.11.96

To the Bd. of Rev. L.R. }

Note

Please see the Collr's letter to the Board of Rev flagged A in the file. He is of opinion "that on account of the applicant's proved & persistent bad conduct as a public servant, he should either be removed without pension or that his pension sd. be largely reduced". In the pension application the Collr has proposed a pension of only Rs 7-8-0 p.m., the pension admissible to the applicant being Rs 45 p.m. for his qualifying supr service of 18 yrs & odd. The Board's orders on the Collr's letter haven't yet been comd. to us. Hence this O.M. to the Bd. for approval.

K.S.
23.11.96.

~~Financial~~ Pension (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 1302

From

Board of Revenue
Land Revenue.

Order

No. 3218

Dated 27th Novr. 96.

Received

SECY. GOVT. MADRAS
30 NOV 96
REV. DEPT.

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Furnishing Govt. (Pension Deptt.) with a copy of B.P. 4676 mis / 14-10-96, confl re: M.R.Ry D. Subramanyam Naidu, late Tahr. Badvel, Cuddapah Dt.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

(2,000—27-11-95.)

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 14th October 1896,

No. 4676

Confl. No. 135.

READ — letter from the Collector of Cuddapah to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras, Dis No. 5017/Rev of '96, dated 25th September 1896.

Resolution

The Collector of Cuddapah submits for the orders of the Board the case of M.R.Ry D. Subramaniam Naidu, Tahsildar of Badvel. Mr. Tate, in a proceedings of unnecessary length, has reviewed in detail the numerous short-comings of this officer as evidenced by his work in every branch of the Service during the last two years. This so-called "lengthy precis of M R Ry D. Subramanian Naidu's misdeeds" is submitted to the Board together with a detailed explanation prepared by the Tahsildar in answer thereto, but no proper abstract of the above papers has been prepared to indicate the main charges made against the Officer in question.

2. M R Ry Subramanian Naidu has since been declared by the District Medical Officer to be unfit for further Service of any kind, and the Board understands that he has been relieved of his former charge, but the Collector is silent on this point. It is reported

that

that the pension papers have been submitted in the ordinary course for the orders of Government. Mr. Tate now recommends that the Tahsildar should either be removed from service without pension or that the Government should be moved to effect a substantial reduction in the amount of any pension granted to him.

3. There is nothing in the papers before the Board to justify the acceptance of either of these recommendations. The detailed enquiry instituted by the Collector elicited nothing that can be considered as of such a serious nature as to call for condign punishment and the faults proved

merely

True Copy of B.P.
4676
Confl. No. 135
& 14 — 10 — 96

(2,000—27-11-95.)

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 27th November 1896,

No. 3218 R.

No. 81 READ — Official Memorandum from the Under Secretary to Govt., Pension Dept., C. No. 1275, dated 25th November 96.

Resolution

Ordered accordingly

(True extract).

L D Swamikannu

27 NOV 1896

for Secretary

To
The Under Secretary to Govt.,
Pension Deptt
with copy of B.P. 4676 mis
14-10-96. confl. no 135
in a sealed cover

[R. E. / 43]
1,000—10-8-96.

Pension (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 1305

Order

From

B. Subbramania Naidu
late Tahsildar of
Budvail.

No.

Dated 30" Novr./96.

Received 2/12.

Registered do

Enclosures Nil.

Spare copies. do.

SUBJECT.

Stating that he has applied to the Collector of Cuddapah & the Bd. of Rev. for certain documents and requesting that orders on the Collector's letter recommending a reduction of his pension may be deferred pending receipt of his explanation in regard to the charges framed by the Collr. against him.

BACK PAPERS,

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Pension Report

From

V. Subba Ramanayudu
Tahsildar of Budvail

SECY. GOVT. MADRAS
4 DEC 96
REV. DEPT.

To

L. Davidson Esquire
Under Secretary to Govt.
Revenue Department.

Most Honored Sir,

In obedience to your honor's order No. $\frac{1113}{18\text{-}11\text{-}96}$ I most humbly and respectfully beg to submit that I have applied to the Board of Revenue and the Collector to furnish me with a copy of the charges in which the Collector found me to be dishonest &c. and to request that the passing of orders on the Collector's report recommending a reduction of my pension may be postponed till I get the said charges & submit my explanation thereon.

K.S.
19.2

I beg to remain
Honored Sir,
Your honor's most humble servant
V. Subba Ramanayudu
Tahr.

Dharapuram
30-11-96

Pension
~~Public~~ (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 151

CNo 114 + 151

~~Order~~ Sec

To lie over pending receipt of report from the Hd. Astt: Magte. Coimbatore.

KS
19.2.97.

From

The Collector of Cuddapah

Ref. on C: No. 19/Confidential

Dated 18th February 1897

Received 19th do.

Registered 19th do.

Enclosures Nil

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Reporting that M.R.Ry. D. Subramaniam Naidu has been charged with perjury before the Head Asst. Magistrate Coimbatore and promising further report on receipt of a copy of judgment.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Cuddapah COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Dated 18th February 1897.
Despd 18. 2. 97

~~REFERENCE~~ / ~~DISPOSAL~~ ON CURRENT No. 19
ENCLOSURES. nil Confidential

FROM
A. C. Tate, Esquire,
COLLECTOR OF Cuddapah

TO
THE Chief Secretary to Government,
Pension Department,
Madras.

SIR,

In Continuation of my lette Disposal No 82/Tour of 1897 dated 8th February 1897, I have the honour to report for the information of Government that since writing it I have come to know that M. R. Ry — D. Subramhanyam Naidu late Tahsild of Badvel has been Charged under Section 193 Indian Penal Code with perjury before the Head assistant Majistrate of Coimbatore - I have - asked the Head Assistant Majistrat to furnish me with a copy of the

judgment

pursuant after the case is disposed of if not disposed of already.

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

18-2-97
Collector

Copy by Cl. 18/2/97

Ws
18.2.97

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
19 FEB 97
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Pension
~~Revenue~~ (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 114

Please see C no 151

From The Collector of Cuddapah

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
12 … 1897
PENSION DEPARTMENT

Order

Dis No. $\frac{82}{Tour}$ of 97

Dated 8th February 1897
Received 12 — do —
Registered 12th do —
Enclosures 2 (sent separately)
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting a repor
as directed by the
Board in regard to the
refusal or reductio
of pension in the cas
of M.R.Ry D. Subrama
nyam Nayadu Tah
sildar of Badvel

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Cuddapah COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
8th February 1897.
Camp Surabhi
Despd 10.2.97

Reference/Disposal No. 82/Tour of 97

ENCLOSURES. 2

FROM

A. C. Tate Esquire

COLLECTOR OF

Cuddapah

TO

THE Secretary to Government
Pension Department
Fort St George
Madras

SIR,

I have the honor to submit the following for the orders of Government.

2/ In his arzi No 867 of 96 dated 3rd March / 96 M.R.Ry D. Subrahmanyam Nayadu applied for leave on forfeiture of pay for 2 months, to enable him to arrange for the conduct of a criminal case brought against him in connection with a land dispute in Dharapuram Taluk of Coimbatore District.

3/ I was unable to recommend the leave immediately on account of the exceedingly unsatisfactory state of the Minor Irrigation, Collection and other work in the Taluk, and on the 12th April /96, when submitting the leave application for the orders of the Board, I stated as above and added that as I considered that Subrahmanyam Nayadu was not fit to be a Tahsildar, the leave might be granted and that before the expiry of the leave, a report about him would be submitted. The Board, while granting the leave, observed that it awaited my report - vide Boards' Proceedings No 1064 Routine dated 16th April /96 (Land Revenue).

4 I gave notice to Subrahmanyam Nayadu on the 26th May /96, that he should appear before me at least a week before the

the expiry of his leave and render an explanation of his bad work in Badvel Taluk. Without complying with this order, Subramaniam Naidu applied on 16th June 1896, for an extension of two months' leave. As the business relating to the Criminal case in Coimbatore District was stated to be still unsettled I recommended the Board to sanction an extension of leave for one month and intimated the fact to Subramanyam Naidu, calling upon him to appear before me prior to the expiry of that period to furnish his explanation. The extension of leave was sanctioned by the Board in its Proceedings No. 3176 Mis d/ 11th July 1896.

5. This time, Subramaniam Nayadu having appeared before me as ordered, I furnished him on the 28th July 1896 with a copy of my Proceedings, Ref. on. c. No. $\frac{1485}{Rev}$ of /96 d/

dated 28th July 1896, in which most of the instances of his bad work as Tahsildar were set out in detail and invited him to render any general or special explanations he might wish to render, and also called upon him to show cause why a recommendation should not be made to the Board to degrade him to a post the duties of which he might be expected to perform with ordinary efficiency.

6. On the same day, i.e, the 28th July 1896, Subramaniam Nayadu presented to me a petition in which he stated that his health 'has been broken on account of 'my stay for more than 10 years 'in this District, that I intend 'retiring from the service,' and therefore asked that he might be sent

sent to the medical officer for examination. He also asked me verbally to drop the charges on which he was required to furnish explanation, as he was prepared to retire on pension.

7. I declined to comply with his latter request as I distrusted his bonâ fides in applying for medical examination and said that he must furnish his explanation, but, I, of course, gave him also a letter to the District Medical and Sanitary Officer asking for a certificate as to Subramaniam Naidu's fitness for further service.

Thurmon Singh

8. The medical officer certified that Subramaniam Nayadu was unfit for further service on account of Diabetes mellitus and incipient cataract in both eyes and the pension papers were duly prepared and submitted

to

Government through the Accountant General and they are probably now before Government for disposal.

9. The explanation called for was also furnished by Subramaniam Naidu and in obedience to the Board's call, mentioned in para 3 supra, I submitted to it a report dated 25th September 1896, accompanied by copies of my Proceedings and of Subramaniam Naidu's explanation with my marginal remarks.

10. The Board has, with its Proceedings No. $\frac{4676\ \text{Mis}}{\text{Confl No. 135}}$ dated 14th October 1896 (Land Revenue) returned these papers to me observing, Hay B.

(1) that no proper abstract of the above papers has been prepared to indicate the main charges made against Subramaniam Naidu.

(2) that the detailed enquiries instituted by me elicited nothing that can be considered as of such a serious nature as to call for condign punishment.

(3) that the faults proved merely shew that the Tahsildar discharged his duties in a perfunctory and indifferent manner and that the papers merely indicate that he may be made to retire from active service.

(4) that there is nothing in the papers before the Board to justify the acceptance of my recommendations viz, either to remove Subramaniam Naidu from service without pension or that Government should be moved to effect a substantial reduction in the amount of any pension granted to him: and that if I feel justified in moving Government to reduce or refuse the Tahsildar's pension, I may address

Government in the Pension Department for that purpose;

and (5) that there is apparently nothing in my report to support the suggestion that Subramaniam Naidu has been dishonest and that there is no evidence of corruption.

11. As I believe, the pension papers of Subramaniam Naidu are before Government, I feel that I will not be justified in letting the matter drop without placing the whole correspondence before Government and in forwarding the marginally noted papers, I beg leave to refer to the Board's remarks in the following paragraphs:-

1. Letter this No. 5017/Rev offg d/ 25.9.96
2 (a) 1 file containing Collr's Procgs Ref. on c. No. 1485/Rev offg d/ 28.7.96
(b) Subramaniam Naidu's explanation with marginal remarks
(c) his deposition before 2nd class magte of Kangyam
(d) copy of medical certificate and landed property statement.

12. With reference to the Board's first observation that the papers do not indicate the main charges against Subramaniam Naidu, I

Flag

I beg to state that my Proceedings dated 28th July 1896 deals with the following items:-

(1) Para 1 deals with chronic delays in the disposal of memos on which orders were passed by Mr. Hewetson at the Jamabandi conducted by him in Fasli 1303. The Jamabandi memos, as they are called, were issued one for each village, between March and July 1894. Each memo dealt with irregularities in the Inam cases and other subjects, such as, dark lists, resale of lands purchased by Government for arrears of revenue &c noticed while scrutinizing the village accounts: and the Tahsildar had to send up reports on the points noticed by Mr. Hewetson. In several cases, the Inam Fair Registers maintained in the Huzur

office and the village B registers and Vernacular Quitrent registers did not agree with each other in regard to changes that took place subsequent to Inam Settlement. In some cases, lands were allowed to be enjoyed as Inams without being brought under settlement by the Inam Commissioner. In some cases, where full assessments were ordered to be levied by the Inam Commissioner, the lands were allowed to be enjoyed free of any assessment and the order of the Inam Commissioner remained a dead letter so that opportunity was given, as in the case of Jaddathiru Inams for bringing resumed cases again under settlement and thereby causing serious loss to Government. Lands

Lands purchased by Government at Revenue Sales were not shown in the prescribed registers, nor were they resold, so that Government lost the revenue to which it was entitled. When such omissions, errors and irregularities were pointed out after considerable difficulty, it was the Tahsildar's duty to rectify them all before the next year's jamabandi commenced and to submit the necessary reports to the Collector: but Subramaniam Naidu paid very little attention to them. Sub Para (a) to (j) of para 1 of my Proceedings give typical instances of cases in which the delay in reporting ranged from one year to 21 months. The Tahsildar's explanation is that this work is additional to the legitimate and daily work of already overworked gumastahs, that through his own perseverence, this work was gone through personally and finished before the end of March 1896. The Jamabandi memor~ merely point out as stated above the defects noticed in the ordinary work of a Taluk establishment and there is nothing additional or extra ordinary. Owing to carelessness in keeping the various accounts properly and up to date and scrutinizing them from time to time, Government was losing revenue to which it was legitimately entitled and it was the duty of the Tahsildar to find out such mistakes himself and rectify them without the necessity of their being pointed out by the Collector. Until pressure was put upon the Tahsildar by prescribing a progress report and

until

until I made him understand that severe results would follow any further delay, he did not take the least trouble to send his replies.

(ii) The second point noticed in the Proceedings was that the reports sent by the Tahsildar contained gross misstatements which were due to great want of care and indifference on his part in verifying his reports with the records in his own office or to some worse reasons. This often necessitated lengthy and unnecessarily worrying correspondence between my office and the Divisional office and the Tahsildar in order to find out the real state of things. Instances of such reports are detailed in Sub. paras (a) to (m) of para 2 of the Proceedings. In sending such inaccurate reports to Superior officers, Subramaniam Naidu failed to show that he exercised the ordinary care or diligence which an officer in his position is expected to do and showed himself utterly unworthy of credit. The Tahsildar's explanation is contained in Pages 11 to 22 of his report in which he makes vague and general statements which are not to the point in some cases. He disclaims his responsibility for some of the inaccurate ~ statements stating that he was not Tahsildar at the period or that the inaccuracies were due to gumastahs or other subordinates. These remarks have been noticed again by means of marginal remarks in the Tahsildar's explanation: and I may state that the explanation is again misleading in some respects as shown in the marginal remarks For instance with reference to the transfer of certain lands in Kavalakuntla village, Subramaniam Naidu states that the matter related to Fasli 1297 and that he joined the Taluk in December 1893 but the facts are that he was in charge of the Taluk for one year in 1886-87 and again for another year in 1888-89 while he implies in his explanation that he came to the Taluk for the first time in 1893 and offers no explanation for the period during which he was in charge of the Taluk between 1886 and 1889.

(iii) Paras 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 of my proceedings deal with the irregularities noticed in regard to the work connected with loans granted under the Land Improvement Loans Act. The various registers prescribed by the Board have not been properly maintained. There were inordinate delays in the inspections of wells and in recommending the recovery of the loans and consequent loss of revenue to Government. Processes were not promptly issued for the recovery of balances in cases in which orders of summary recoveries were passed by the Collector, nor were such processes, when issued, promptly executed. In short, the Tahsildar did not realize the fact that prompt action was necessary in cases in which Government money was lent or at any rate entirely neglected Government interests. In one case, he ignored the orders which prohibited the

grant

grant of loan on the security of unenfranchised inams. When recommending balances of loans outstanding to be written off as irrecoverable, he did not base such recommendations on proper enquiry as to the possession of property by the defaulters and he thus utterly disregarded the interests of Government. The Tahsildar's explanation is contained in pages 23 to 38 of his report. It is vague and does not meet the specific observations made in the proceedings. As an instance of his carelessness and ignorance of rules, I pointed out that he had granted a loan of Rs 200 on an unenfranchised Inam without taking collateral security and that difficulty actually arose in collecting the instalments of the loans owing to his disregard of the rules. In reply, he furnishes an impertinent explanation viz "Borrowers are well to-do people. Government will lose nothing. I am responsible for it."

(iv) The fourth point noticed in my Proceedings relates to the Income tax work of Subramaniam Naidu - Vide paras 8 & 9: and his explanation contained in page 39 and 40 is irrelevant and not to the point and savours of insubordination, as he makes unwarranted insinuations against the Divisional officer.

(v) In regard to his bad work in connection with the collection of Land Revenue, referred to in paras 10(a) & (b) of my Proceedings, Subramaniam Naidu makes a few passing remarks in pages 41 to 45 of his explanation. The

remarks

remarks in the review for July '95 extracted in the Proceedings show that the information furnished in the D.C.B. Statement was imperfect. The remarks in the review for August 1895 show that the Tahsildar did not take steps to adopt the settled demand. The remarks in November review show that he delayed the submission of the irrecoverable statement. No explanation has been offered regarding these irregularities.

(vi) The remarks regarding his minor Irrigation work noticed in para 11 of my Proceedings are passed over by Subramaniam Naidu with a statement that the works were all completed and the estimated amount was fully paid and completion report submitted before the end of the official year. This explanation is misleading. He makes no attempt to explain the irregularities and defects in the progress reports submitted by him and the misleading statements in them which were all pointed out in the reviews, extracts of which have been quoted in the Proceedings.

(vii) The numerous irregularities in regard to the Treasury work pointed out in detail in para 12 of my Proceedings are summarily disposed of by Subramaniam Naidu ~~in~~ in a few lines in page 46 of his explanation wherein he states that he remembers to have examined the Treasury at the end of every month 'that 'the Sheristadar writes the certi'ficate "Examined and found 'correct" every day and I after 'my personal examination

sign

sign or initial it." and he further 'respectfully' submits that the "Sheristadar should explain" the "minor details" and that there appears to be nothing for which "I am personally responsible to explain". It is hardly necessary to comment on this but I may point out that he has not obeyed the Board's standing orders which require him to examine the balance in the Treasury not less than twice a month. To say that the Sheristadar alone should explain what he calls "minor" details and that there is nothing for which he is personally responsible is preposterous. If only he had examined the Treasury with ordinary care he could not have failed to notice the various amounts unauthorizedly kept in amanath and the long delays that were allowed in the adjustment of such amounts. His omission to sign the cash chitta on the days on which he was at Head Quarters and the neglect with regard to contingent charges incurred from the Permanent advance fund are very serious. He states that he considers that he has no responsibility in all these matters which are treated by him as of minor importance.

(viii) In paras 13 to 18 of my Proceedings, I have noticed his bad work under other branches of Revenue work, viz, (a) payments of salaries ~~of~~ to village establishments (b) Touring (c) Preparation of Famine Analysis accounts (village Registers) and Firka books and (d) noting changes in the Permanent Registers &c and the explanation furnished by Subramaniam Nayadu in pages 47 to 52 is vague and not to the point as the marginal remarks will show

Para 20 & 22 of my proceedings give instances of carelessness under other items of his revenue work, viz. preparation of the statement of minerals and the verification of births and deaths. Para 20 describes the supreme indifference displayed by this Tahsildar in regard to the most important branch of Revenue work, viz, darkhasts. I regard his explanations as utterly unsatisfactory as my marginal remarks will bear out.

IX Para 19 of my proceedings discloses Subramanyam Naidu's bad work as a magistrate, and my marginal remarks in pages 53 to 55 of his explanation will show that his excuse for allowing a gumasta to write up the judgments in 2 magisterial cases is futile, and that the way in which subjail registers were neglected is characteristic of his extreme carelessness & indifference.

13. I have shown at sufficient length in the previous para what the main charges against Subramanyam Nayadu are with brief remarks as to the nature of the

explanation furnished by him and how far they are relevant & answer the charges

14. As regards the Board's remarks that the detailed enquiry instituted by me elicited nothing of such a nature as to call for condign punishment and that he may be merely allowed to retire from active service, they most respectfully submit for the consideration of Government how far this opinion is justified by the facts of the case. Considering that this officer has been doing

bad

bad work for a very long time, considering that he had been several times found fault with since 1886 and punished once by reduction & afterwards by transfer & warnings, considering that he made no attempt to improve in spite of the severe warning conveyed to him in unmistakable terms by the Board and Government in 1893, viz, that his previous history will be considered in disposing of the question of punishment, should he be ever again ~~be~~ found guilty of neglect of work or insubordination or corruption again, Considering the very futile & useless explanations furnished by him on the various items noticed in my proceedings, & considering also that he offered to retire from service as soon as a copy of the proceedings was put into his hands, I do not think that he should be allowed to get off easily on the usual pension, and without suffering for his persistent and continued misconduct

throughout his career. It is a most ungracious task to recommend the curtailment of a subordinate's pension and were it not perfectly manifest from what follows that he has laid up an ample provision for his old age by dishonest means I should not think it necessary to move further in the matter.

15. The Board remarks that there is apparently nothing in my report to support the suggestion that Subramaniyam Nayadu has been dishonest

as

and that there is no evidence of corruption. I would respectfully solicit a perusal of para 11 of my letter to Board Dis No. $\frac{5017}{Rev}$ of 96 dated 25th September 1896, the facts wherein mentioned are based on Subramanyam Nayadu's own sworn* deposition. I respectfully consider that ordinary arithmetical calculations conclusively prove the charge. Subramanyam Nayadu admits that he inherited no ancestral property

*Enclosed

and

and his present possessions amounting to Rs 30,800 — which by the way must be considerably under the mark — have been according to his own admission, acquired out of his own earnings from the figures furnished which are undisputed, it will be found that the legitimate sources of his income have failed to account for such large possessions, and the irresistible conclusion is that he has been very dishonest public servant as he was on all hands reported. I submit that proof of his dishonesty is a mere matter of arithmetical calculation from the figures given

16. For the reasons stated in the foregoing paras, I respectfully request that Government will be pleased to consider my proposal to refuse altogether to pension Subramanyam Nayadu or to reduce it to a ~~normal~~ nominal sum of Rs 7-8-0 proposed by me already.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

10.2.97

~~Judicial~~ Pension (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~2133~~ 445

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 27 [illegible] PENSION DEPARTMENT

CHIEF SECRETARY 22 MAY. 1897 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From

The District Magistrate
of Coimbatore

Ref C.No. 703/mag of 97.

Order

Dated 17th May 1897

Received 22nd } May 1896

Registered 22nd }

Enclosures - a Service Register.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting the letter from the joint Magistrate Coimbatore informing that the accused in C.C. No 12 of 97 on the file of his Court was discharged and also sending the Service Regr. of Subbramania Naidu.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CURRENT No. 2133

No.

COIMBATORE ~~DISTRICT~~ Joint MAGISTRATE'S OFFICE,

Dated 17 May 1897.
Camp. Karur.

FROM

L. G. Moore ESQUIRE,
Ag Joint ~~DISTRICT~~ MAGISTRATE OF
COIMBATORE,

TO

The Chief Secretary to Government Madras
Through The District Magistrate
Coimbatore

SIR,

In reply to para 2 of Government order No 1173 dated 10th December 1896, I have the honor to report that the accused in C C No 12 of 1897 on the file of this court, who was charged with an offence under Section 193 Indian Penal code, was discharged under Section 253 criminal Procedure code.

2. The Service book is returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. Servant

L G Moore

Ag Joint Magistrate

Cho 703

~~(189) Department.~~ Magte 98)

FROM

THE ~~District~~ Joint MAGISTRATE OF

COIMBATORE,

TO

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Madras
Thr The District Magte
Coimbatore

C.C. No. 12/Magte. of 1897.

Dated 17th
Despd. Do. } May 1897.

ENCLOSURES. 1.

SUBJECT.

Informing that the accused in C.C. No. 12 of 97 on the file of this court was discharged & also sending the service register of Subramania Naidu the accd.

Submitted

Hubert [illegible]

Coimbatore Distt Magte Office 19-5-97 Camp: Tiruppur } Distt Magte

563

17/5/97

21/5/97

28/5/97

Confidential

~~Public~~ Pension (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 461

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
2 JUN 1897
PENSION DEPARTMENT.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
31 MAY 97

Order

From

The Collector of
Cuddapah

Reference: No. 19/Confdl 1897

Dated 27th May 1897

Received

Registered

Enclosures 1

Spare copies "

SUBJECT.

Submitting a Copy of the judgment of the Joint Magistrate, Coimbatore in C.C. 12 of 1897.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
19 MAY 1897
CUDDAPAH

Judgment in calendar case No. 12 of 1897 on the file of the Joint Magistrate of [illegible].

Complainant. Queen Empress of India on the complaint of the Police Inspector of Dharapuram.

Accused Subramania Naidu.

Offence. Perjury under sec 193 IPC.

Finding — Not proved

Sentence — Discharged under Sec 253 CPC.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
18 MAY.-1897
CUDDAPAH

1 The accused in this case formerly Tahsildar of Kudaval in the Cuddappah district is charged with an offence under Section 193 I P C.

2 The Prosecution was conducted by the Public Prosecutor and Mr Srinivasa Aiyangar 1st Grade Pleader. The accused was defended by Mr Narasiah Varahdoo and Mr Padmanabhachari

3 The accused in this case was examined as a Court witness in C C No 92 of 1895 on the file of the Kongayam Sub Magistrate in which a complaint of theft was brought by one Narasimha Naikan. The accused in that case was discharged, and the Sub Magistrate of Kongayam Sanctioned the Prosecution of the 1st Court witness (the accused in the present case) for an offence under Section 193 I P C. E.G. with intentionally giving false evidence in a Judicial Proceeding

4 The Statements made by the

accused in the above case which are alleged to be false are as follows. "My deceased brother Gopalasami Nayudu purchased "Puttasi" land from one Jeer Nayudu my brother-in-law in the name of R. Krishnasami Chetty." "He borrowed money from Krishnasami Chetty and purchased the land." "The debt was paid off by me to Krishnasami Chetty the following year." "That land was in the possession of the Chetty till the end of 1893 on the understanding that it should be handed to me on demand." "It would be about 7 or 8 years since I paid off the debt of Rs 2000 incurred by my brother," I sent the money through a certain person. I do not know whom." "The Chetties told me in 1893 that they would deliver the land after the harvest season." The statement in question was made on May 10th 1895. Briefly it may be said that the alleged false statements consist in the witness having deposed that he paid the purchase money for the land 7 or 8 years before. Eg in 1887 or 88.

5 Before dealing with the evidence in the case, I propose to mention briefly certain facts which throw considerable light on the present case. The accused in C.C. No 92 of 1895 were charged before the Kongayam Sub Magistrate with having entered upon "Puttasi" land and carried away the crops. At the same time proceedings were taken under Chapter XII of the Criminal Procedure Code as it was ~~statis~~ anticipated that a dispute likely to cause a breach of the peace would take place in respect of the land in question. The matter was enquired into by Mr Harding Joint Magistrate who allowed proceedings to be stayed as a Razinama was put in by both parties in which it was stated that there was no likelihood of any disturbance taking place since the matter had been settled. The

case of theft was referred as false by the Police, Mr Hardinge, however, directed the Kongayam Submagistrate to inquire into the case.

6. The evidence against the accused consists (1) of documentary evidence consisting of letters &c written by the accused in which ~~to~~ references are made to the purchase of the land in question (2) Oral evidence of witnesses as to the terms under which the settlement of the "Possession case" was effected in January 1895. A number of letters Exhibits F. F_1 F_2 F_3 F_4 F_5 have been filed on behalf of the Prosecution. With the exception of Exhibits F_2 F_3 these letters are addressed by the accused to Rangayya Chettiar. ~~(4)~~ 4th Prosecution witness in the present case. These letters were written towards the end of 1890 by the accused and their genuineness has not been questioned.

The case for the Prosecution is that it is clear from these letters that the accused's statement that he had paid Rs 2000 for the land about 1888 must be untrue.

7. In these letters the accused refers to certain money due to him from the 4th Prosecution witness' brother Venkatarama Chetty. He writes that he is in urgent need of the money as he wants to purchase Puthadi land for Rs 2000. In Exhibit F_4 dated 21.8.1890. the following sentence occurs "I will write to Khandappa Chettiar to execute the sale deed for the land in my name and to take the cost Rs 2000 from you." Again In Exhibit F_3 (dated 23.8.90) the writer (the accused) says "Puthadi land which is in the enjoyment of Khandappa Chettiar should be purchased according

to the previous agreement. It costs Rs 2000. A similar reference is made in Exht F_3 dated 23.8.90. In Exhibit F_4 the writer speaks of getting a sale deed executed after the months of Tai and Masi." The accused in Exhibit F_2 addressed to Venkatarama Chetty & 4th Prosecution witness' brother says he was obliged to trouble him for the money as he wanted to purchase Puttadi land from Khandappa Chettiar. It is to be noticed that in the letter Exhibit F_5 dated 18.7.90 to the 3rd Prosecution witness, the accused writes "I request that you will let me know what you have to say about Puttadi land". No mention is made in the letter of executing a sale deed ~~or~~ paying money.

8 The manner in which these letters came into the 3rd Prosecution witness possession is somewhat remarkable. The 4th Prosecution witness deposes in cross examination that the 3rd Prosecution witness' son took away the letters during his absence, and explains that he was in the habit of opening letters addressed to the 3rd Prosecution witness and that the latter opened letters addressed to him. The defence version regarding the letters is that the writer was extremely anxious to get the money owed to him by the 4th Prosecution witness' brother and that he made the purchase of the land an excuse for pressing for payment. It is also asserted that the letters were written with the object of getting the money and that the purchase of the land is only mentioned incidentally.

9. I next proceed to deal with the evidence regarding the terms of the settlement effected in January 1895 regarding the possession of the land.

It appears that at the hearing of the Possession case before Mr Katbinge the Chettiars (2nd and 3rd Prosecution witnesses) were represented by Mr Narasiah and that Mr Narayana Sastri BA BL represented the accused in the present case. Exhibit G is the draft of the terms of the Settlement drawn up by Mr Narasiah. It appears that this draft was sent to the accused's Vakil who objected to certain phrases which were erased. The phrases which were struck out were that Subramania Nayudu should "from this day" be in possession and that he further should perform what he has promised." The Case for the Prosecution is that the terms of the Settlement were that the accused should pay Rs 2000 to the Chetties and be put in possession of the land. The defence case is that no money ~~is~~ was to be paid at all. It is noticeable that no mention is made in the Settlement as finally drawn up or in the draft of the payment of any money. The two phrases in the draft which would support the Prosecution case are, it is to be noticed, the very phrases which were objected to and ~~struck~~ struck out.

10. A number of witnesses have been called for the Prosecution and they assert that the accused promised to pay Rs 2000 and raised no objection to the terms of the Settlement. Oral evidence as to a point of this kind is under the circumstances almost valueless. Most of the Prosecution witnesses ~~were~~ are related to one another, the 2nd and 3rd Prosecution witnesses are deeply interested in the case. Little or no importance can, I think, be attached to the Prosecution witnesses evidence on this point.

11. The only witnesses as to this point who can be regarded as in any way independent are the 7th 8th and 9th

Prosecution witnesses. The 7th Prosecution witness Mr Kuppa Rao is a Vakil who was engaged in the case. His recollection as to what happened is very faint. He believes that the accused agreed to pay the money. The 8th Prosecution witness Mr Natesan is unable to state what the terms of the settlement were, and states that the accused refused to pay any money. The 9th Prosecution witness Mr Narayan Sastri has no recollection of what happened.

12. For the Prosecution it is contended that the sum of Rs 2000 has never been paid, on the other hand it is very significant that as a result of the agreement or settlement the accused was at once put in possession of the land and he has remained in possession since. It is admitted by the 2nd Prosecution witness that no steps have been taken to recover the amount from the accused. No pronote was taken from him and no single letter has been produced addressed to the 2nd and 3rd Prosecution witness in which the accused promises or undertakes to pay the amount. It is incredible in my opinion that the Chetties would have parted with the land for no consideration. The suggestion that they were induced to agree to the settlement under fear of Criminal Prosecution is absolutely untenable, although Mr Harding had no doubt impressed a strong opinion that the 2nd and 3rd Prosecution witnesses had perjured themselves.

13. The principal witnesses in the case the 2nd and 3rd Prosecution witnesses are in my opinion absolutely unworthy of credit. Their ~~demeanours~~ demeanour as witnesses was most unsatisfactory and they shuffled and fenced with the questions put to them in a way which left no doubt in my mind that they were ready to perjure themselves

rather than damage their case in any way. In the first place these witnesses state that they had no money dealings with the accused. This I believe to be absolutely untrue and it is contradicted by Exhibit III the signature of which is admitted by the 3rd Prosecution witness. This is a letter from the 3rd Prosecution witness to the accused in which he speaks of sending accounts herewith as desired and of another business transaction. Again these witnesses although they trade jointly state that they do not know one another's handwriting. Exhibit V is admitted by the 3rd Prosecution witness to be signed by him. The language of the letter is far from clear. In the letter, the writer says, as regards the execution of the sale deed although it is against my wish I consider that it should be done". and again "I do not like to go "against your wish as you insist upon executing the sale deed."

14. These sentences in a letter written in 1890 appear to me to be perfectly consistent with the defence version that the amount had been previously paid. No mention is whatever is made in the letter of payment of any amount. The signature to Exhibit VI exactly resembles that of Exhibit V. There is no reason to suppose the letter is not genuine and the 3rd Prosecution witness says that it is like his signature and cannot swear that it is not his. In this letter the 3rd Prosecution witness says that he is willing to give up the land next season, "but my brother Krishna Chetty (2nd Prosecution witness) is not willing to pay any interest for your amount which is with us, not to account for

to before. In any case, however reprehensible the omission to enter the purchase in the return may be, it does not appear to me to have much bearing on the present case.

17. The main question to be determined in the case is whether the statement that the accused paid Rs 2000. for the land about 1888 is true or not. As to the statement that the accused's brother Gopalasami Nayudu purchased the land benami in the name of the 2nd Prosecution witness; the accused expressly stated that he heard this from his brother. It appears to me to be irrelevant to the present enquiry.

18. On the whole I am of opinion that the Prosecution has failed to prove affirmatively that the accused's statement was false. I have given in the previous paragraphs my reasons for considering that it has not been shown that the accused did not pay the money in 1888. The balance of the evidence is, I think in favor of the supposition that he did pay the amount before 1890. Unless it can be proved beyond all reasonable doubt that the accused's statement was false, he is entitled to be acquitted. No case has I think been made out of an offence under Section 193 I.P.C. The accused is discharged under Section 253 C.P.C.

(Sd) L.G. Moore
Ag Joint Magistrate.
10-5-97

(True Copy)

L.G. Moore
Ag Joint Magistrate.

REFERENCE
~~DISPOSAL~~ ON CURRENT No. 19/Confdl 97

ENCLOSURES. 1

Cuddapah COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Dated 27th May 1897

FROM

A. C. Tate, Esquire,
COLLECTOR OF Cuddapah

TO

THE Chief Secretary to Government,
Pension Department,
Madras.

SIR,

In Continuation of my letter Reference on Current 19/Confdl dated 18th February 1897, I have the honor to forward herewith a Copy of Judgment in Calendar Case 12 of 1897 on the file of the Joint Magistrate Conumkampam wherein M.R. [illegible] late Tahsildar of Badvel was tried for perjury.

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

J. G. Roberts
For Collector
28.8.97

CS
28.5.97

18.5.97

[A./1]
500—7-8-96.

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

H. M. [illegible] ~~Secy~~

C. No.s 1275 & 1302 & 1329/13/114, 151

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

The Tahsildar of Badvel -

READ the following papers :—

From the Collector of Cuddapah —— dated 24th Sepr — 1896, No. 2141.

Certificate and report from the Accountant-General, dated 12th Novr 1896, No. A.D.J./455.

O.M. to the Board of Rev. d/25-11-96 No. 81.
Pros. of the Bd. of Rev. (L.R) d/27-11-96 No. 3218. R.
From the Collr. of Cuddapah d/8.2.97. No. 52 of 1897
— do — d/18.2.97. No. 19. Confdl.
— do — Dt. Magistrate of Coimbatore d/ ~~17-5-97~~ No. 703

Character . . . . Bad.

Reduced in 1886 from Royachoti Tahsil on Rs 175 to Badvel Tahsil on Rs. 150. for very bad work.

Transferred in 1887 from Badvel Tahsil to Sidhout Tahsil on the same pay and subsequently reported to the Board as utterly unfit by his character and conduct to be entrusted with any independent charge.

Suspended in 1891 for 5 months & 23 days for making allegations against his Divisional officer of tampering with certain records. The suspension was cancelled, 2/3 pay being allowed.

Severely reprimanded and transferred from Sidhout Tahsil to Badvel Tahsil in 1893 for showing great indiscretion in 2 magisterial cases. — Please see G.O. 1445/17.7.93 Jdl.

—

Please see the Collector's letter to the Board of Rev. - flagged A. in the file. The Collector enumerates the applicant's 'misdeeds' as Tahsildar, and says that, had it not been for the man's application for pension, he should have recommended his reduction to the post of Taluq Head Accountant on Rs 50, and is of opinion that "on account of his proved and persistent bad conduct as a public servant he should either be removed ~~from~~ without pension or that his pension should be largely reduced". The Board has not accepted either of these recommendations - vide B.P. 4676/Confl. No. 135 d/14 Octr. 1896 - flag B. The Board's remarks run as follows:-

flag B.

"There is nothing in the papers before the Board to

ORDER THEREON, 15th June 1897 No. 459

Under articles 485 & 518 (b) of the Civil Service Regulations (2nd Edition), His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to grant to M.R.Ry. Dharapuram Subramaniam Naidu, late Tahsildar of Badvel, Cuddapah Dt.; an Invalid pension of Rupees (22-8-0) twenty two, and annas eight only per mensem payable at Dharapuram from 1st August 1896 in consideration of his qualifying Superior service of 18 years, 6 months and 22. days.

2. The full pension admissible under the rules has not been granted as the applicant's character and conduct have not been thoroughly satisfactory.

11.6.97

To the Accountant-General, with Register.
" Collector of Cuddapah.

2/12

C4/6/97

to justify the acceptance of either of these recommendations. The detailed enquiry instituted by the Collr. elicited nothing that can be considered as of such a serious nature as to call for condign punishment and the faults proved merely show that the Tahsildar discharged his duties in a perfunctory and inefficient manner. The proceedings may be taken as showing that the man should be made to retire from active service, and this is being done. If the Collr. is of opinion that he would be justified in moving Govt. to reduce the man's pension or to refuse it altogether, he is at liberty to make a recommendation to that effect, and for this purpose he may address Govt. in the Pension Dept. In his covering letter the Collr. hints that the Tahsildar has been dishonest, but there is apparently nothing in support of his accusation beyond his alleged possession of large amounts of property. The fact even if proved is in itself insufficient as evidence of corruption".

In submitting the Tahsildar's pension papers to Govt. with the above letter to the Board, the Collr. has proposed a pension of only Rs 7-8-0 p.m. in the pension application in view of the applicant's unsatisfactory character and conduct, the pension admissible being Rs 45/- p.m. for his qualifying superior service of 18 years & odd.

The applicant asked for a copy of the charges brought against him by the Collector, but he was given para 2 of the Petition Rules. He now states that he has applied to the Collector & to the Board for copies and requests that orders on his pension papers may be deferred pending receipt of his explanation in reply to the charges made by the Collector against him.

+ G.O. 1113/13.11.96 Pen.

✻ C. No 1305 - flag C

The Collr's charges are contained

in a 'proceeding' of which no copy has been forwarded to Govt. Another current has since ~~been received~~ (C 4329) from the Acct. Genl. from which it appears that the applicant is now being tried (on a charge of giving false evidence) by the Head Asst. Magte of Coimbatore. The [illegible] asks that the applicant's service register may be sent him. Submit that this should be done at once & that the question of granting a pension should be over until the trial is concluded & the applicant finally acquitted [illegible] orders passed [illegible] of the Collr's charges [illegible].

Now flag G

flag. F. G.O. 1173/Pen. 3.12.96

C.P.C.

8/12/96

Sect

[illegible] 8/12/96

[illegible] 8/12/96

[illegible] 8/12/96

Yes
[illegible]
5/6/97

I have known this man and it was I who reduced him in 1886. He was the most dishonest and inefficient Tsr. I have come across. When I left Cuddapah I left him under report to the B.O. for reduction but I believe the papers were sent back to S. J. Sewell who kept them in a box for 12 months & then warned him!! naturally

8/12/96.

P.T.O.

~~R. C. No. [illegible] 131 1440/97~~

The Collector of Cuddapah has also submitted a report direct to Govt. (with connected papers) on the applicant's case as directed by the Board in regard to the refusal or reduction of pension. The report shows at length what the main charges against the applicant are with Collr's brief remarks as to the nature of the explanations furnished by him and how far they are relevant and answer the charges. The Collector also shows in his letter how far the Board's remarks are justified by the facts of the case.

* flag D

The H^d Asst. Collector of Coimbatore now reports that the applicant – the accused in C.C. No. 12 of 1897, of the file of his Court – who was charged with ~~the~~ an offence under Sec. 173 of the I.P.C., was discharged + under Sec. 253 C.P.C. This matter may therefore be left out of sight.

* flag E

+ The judgment is in the Coimbatore cover [illegible] 2.6.97

For orders.

KS 31.5.97.

Collr's letters A & D give the case agst the applicant in full.

B.P. Flag B gives the most favorable view of the Tahsildar's conduct.

It is submitted that even if the plea of Diabetes be taken to excuse inefficient work it does not explain the continued bad record of the applicant in the past & the fortune he has amassed. Please see para. 11 of A.

The question for decision appears to be ~~whether~~ Govt will refuse pension or grant a reduced one – & if the latter how much. The full pension admissible is 45 Rs. p.m.

[illegible] 2.6.97

I submit that Mr. Tate's report does show him dishonest. In 88 I left him ~~[illegible]~~ under report for fraud in connection with famine inspection work.

[illegible] 3/6/97.

I w^d submit that this is a case in which the applicant's pension sh^d be largely reduced. Every Collr of Cuddapah has had occasion to reduce report him – and let the B^d say what it likes.

D/4 1,000—20-2-96.

REVENUE DEPARTME

Show Secy & Mem

Issue G.O. [illegible] 11.6.97

No.

From

Recirc to

Mem Hon Mr Grose C.I.E.

Dated 189 .

FOR ORDERS.

Marked in red chalk

No, I had not seen page 4. I have read it now & gone through the papers.

It is certain that the man has had a continuous bad record, & Mr. Tate's proceedings show that there was no improvement till the last. He was unfit to be a Tahsildar & Mr. Tate's opinion that if he had not retired he sh^d have been reduced to the post of Head Accountant on R 50 is fully justified. It is clear, also, that the man has enough to live on even if he is left without a pension altogether as the B^d say; the fact that he is in possession of a large property does not prove that he was dishonest. He did not disburse the whole amount at w^h his property is valued at one time. He may have got a great profit from previous investments before

R.C. 7/6.97.

R. 10/6/97

With reference to Hon. Mem's note D/5.6.97 on page 3 of the next paper below I beg to submit that Hon. Mem. apparently has not seen page 4. The Head Asst Magistrate has reported the result of the case & the matter now comes up for final orders.

[illegible] 7.6.97

[illegible] 8/6/97.

vested again. At all events he has [been] called upon to explain this point. He probably was dishonest, but we cannot act on ~~probable~~ mere probabilities.

Think it will be sufficient to reduce his pension by one-half so to R 22½. // Orders so.

JG
11/6/97

12/6/97.

FOR ORDERS.

---

or copying
ed
189

No. DATED

D. No.

ERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

NT.

M DITTO.

ED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
GINAL.

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

English and Telugu.

SERVICE BOOK

సెర్విసు పుస్తకము.

OF

Name
పేరు Dharapuram Subbramaniam Naidu

Caste or Race
జాతి లేక కులము Gentoo

Residence
వాసస్థలము Dharapuram

FATHER'S
తండ్రియొక్క

Name
పేరు Dharapuram Alligherysawmy Naidu

Residence
వాసస్థలము Dharapuram

Date of birth
పుట్టినతేది About 1849 ~~1850 or 1851~~

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

ఈ కలములలో వ్రాసేవుండేవాటిని అయిదుసంవత్సరములకు ఒకపర్యాయము చేవ్రాలుచేసి యథార్థపరచవలసినది ; చేవ్రాలుచేసి యథార్థపరచిన తేది స్పష్టముగా కనపరచబడేలాగున జాగ్రతగా రూలుకర్రతో అడ్డగీతలు వేయవలసినది.

Name of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని పేరు.	Caste or Race. జాతి, లేక కులము.	Residence. వాస్తవ్యము.	FATHER'S తండ్రియొక్క — Name. పేరు.	FATHER'S తండ్రియొక్క — Residence. వాస్తవ్యము.	Date of birth. పుట్టిన తేది.	Age. వయస్సు. — Years. సంవత్సరములు.	Age. వయస్సు. — Months. నెలలు.	Age. వయస్సు. — Days. దినములు.	Exact height. సరిఅయిన పొడుగు. — Feet. అడుగులు.	Exact height. సరిఅయిన పొడుగు. — Inches. అంగుళములు.	Personal marks for identification. ఆనవాళ్ళవల్ల పోల్చుకొనుటకు శరీరగుర్తులు.	Date of Entry. వ్రాసిన తేది.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office. ఆఫీసు పెద్దదొర యొక్క చేవ్రాలున్ను ఉద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
Dharapuram Subbramaniem Naidu	Gentoo	Dharapuram	Dharapuram Mighenysawmy Naidu	Dharapuram		23			5	7 1/4	A Scar above the left eyebrow, one mole on the left cheek, two moles on the breast & one on the right eye brow.	19. 3. 85.	D. Subbramaniem Naidu	

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

ఈ కలములలో వ్రాసియుండేవాటిని అయిదుసంవత్సరములకు వకపర్యాయము చేవ్రాలుచేసి యథార్థపరచవలసినది; చేవ్రాలుచేసి యథార్థపరచిన తేది స్పష్టముగా కనపరచబడేలాగున జాగ్రతగా రూలుకర్రతో అడ్డగీతలు వేయవలసినది.

Name of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని పేరు.	Caste or Race. జాతి, లేక కులము.	Residence. వాసస్థలము.	FATHER'S తండ్రియొక్క		Date of birth. పుట్టిన తేది.	Age. వయస్సు.			Exact height. సరిఅయిన పొడుగు.		Personal marks for identification. ఆనవాళ్లవల్ల పోల్చడమునకు శరీరగుర్తులు.	Date of Entry. వ్రాసిన తేది.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office. ఆఫీసు పెద్దదొర యొక్క చేవ్రాలున్ను ఉద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
			Name. పేరు.	Residence. వాసస్థలము.		Years. సంవత్సరములు.	Months. నెలలు.	Days. దినములు.	Feet. అడుగులు.	Inches. అంగుళములు.				

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

ఈ కలములలో వ్రాసియుండేవాటిని అయిదుసంవత్సరములకు ఒకపర్యాయము చేవ్రాలుచేసి యథార్థపరచవలసినది; చేవ్రాలుచేసి యథార్థపరచిన తేది స్పష్టముగా కనపరచబడేలాగున జాగ్రతగా రూలుకర్రతో అడ్డగీతలు కోయవలసినది.

Name of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని పేరు.	Caste or Race. జాతి, లేక కులము.	Residence. వాసస్థలము.	Father's తండ్రియొక్క		Date of birth. పుట్టిన తేది.	Age. వయస్సు.			Exact height. సరిఅయిన పొడుగు.		Personal marks for identification. ఆనవాళ్ళకెల్ల పోల్చడమునకు శరీరగుర్తులు.	Date of Entry. వ్రాసిన తేది.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office. ఆఫీసు పెద్దదొర యొక్క చేవ్రాలున్ను ఉద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
			Name. పేరు.	Residence. వాసస్థలము.		Years. సంవత్సరములు.	Months. నెలలు.	Days. దినములు.	Feet. అడుగులు.	Inches. అంగుళములు.				

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

ఈ కలములలో వ్రాసివుండేవాటిని అయిదుసంవత్సరములకు వకపర్యాయము చేవ్రాలుచేసి యథార్థపరచవలసినది; చేవ్రాలుచేసి యథార్థపరచిన తేదీ స్పష్టముగా కనపరచబడేలాగున జాగ్రతగా రూలుకర్రతో అడ్డగీతలు వేయవలసినది.

Name of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని పేరు.	Caste or Race. జాతి, లేక కులము.	Residence. వాసస్థలము.	Father's తండ్రియొక్క		Date of birth. పుట్టిన తేదీ.	Age. వయస్సు.			Exact height. సరిఅయిన పొడుగు.		Personal marks for identification. ఆనవాళ్లవల్ల పోల్చడమునకు శరీరగుర్తులు.	Date of Entry. వ్రాసిన తేదీ.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office. ఆఫీసు పెద్దదొర యొక్క చేవ్రాలున్ను ఉద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
			Name. పేరు.	Residence. వాసస్థలము.		Years. సంవత్సరములు.	Months. నెలలు.	Days. దినములు.	Feet. అడుగులు.	Inches. అంగుళములు.				

1 ౧ Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, i.e., whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తవుద్యోగముబదలీగామాత్రమువున్నయెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting allowance బదలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములోనుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, e.g., *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
4th Writer Additional Principal Sader Ameen's Court of Tinnevelly	Permanent	— " —	14	"	24.7.71		Has given me satisfaction	(Signed) T. V. Ponnusawmy Additional Principal Sader Ameen	24.7.71	Promotion	
2nd Writer — Do.	Acting	4th Writer	~~21~~ 14	7	24.7.71				20.9.71	Return of permanent incumbent	
Head Gumastah Do.	Acting	4th Writer	~~20~~ 14	6.	21.9.71				31.3.72	Abolition of the Court	

1 ౧ Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగము బదిలీగామాత్రముపున్న యెడల, తనదయిన పుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting Allowance బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినాపుంటే నేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, పుద్యోగములో నుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు పుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద పుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను పుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer*, *promotion*, *return of permanent incumbent*. అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన పుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద పుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను పుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
Attender Dy. Tahsildar's office at Arnee	Permanent	— " —	7	"	23.9.74	D Subbarow			26.10.76	Transfer	
Sub Inspector of Police Chenglepet Dt.	Permanent	— " —	30	"	27.10.76	D Subbarow			2.9.77	Promotion	
4th Class Inspector of Police Do.	Sub pro tem	Sub Inspector	KW 30 ~~75~~	45	3.9.77	MS			30.9.77	Return of permanent incumbent	
Sub Inspector	Permanent		30		1-10-77	MS	Privilege leave for 2½ months sanctioned of which availed only 1½ months from 15th May to 30th June 1879		31-7-79	Promotion	
~~Sub Inspector &~~ Ag. 2nd Class Inspector of Police Do.	~~Acting~~ ~~Do.~~ Acting	~~Sub Inspector~~ ~~Acting~~ Sub Inspector	30 150	30 ~~30~~	1-8-79 ~~1-8-79~~	MS			5.9.79	Return of permanent incumbent	

1 ౧ Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగము బదిలీగా మాత్రముపున్న యెడల, తనదయిన పుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting Allowance బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, పుద్యోగములోనుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు పుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్దపుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను పుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన పుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్దపుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను పుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
Sub Inspector Do 5th Class Inspector of Police	Permanent	.	~~[illegible]~~ 30-	-	6-9-79	M.S			15-2-80	~~Promotion~~	
Do	~~Acting~~ Acting	~~Sub Inspector~~ Sub Inspector	~~50~~ 30	10	16.2.80	M.S			~~6-3-80~~	return of P. incumbent	
Sub Inspector	Permanent	—	30	.	7-3-80	M.S	Leave without allowances under G.O. No. 1516 of 4th Septr 1871 R.D. from 10th April 1880 & Permanently transferred to Revenue Depart 8th October 1880.		~~16-3-80~~ ~~6-4-80~~ 6-3-80 21-10-80 9-4-80.	~~Transferred to~~ Rev. Depart ~~Transfer~~	
Taluq Sheristadar Palmanair	Sub pro tem	Sub Inspector	60	60	10.4.80				1-1-81	Confirmation	
— Do —	Permanent	— —	60		1-2-81				11-1-82	Promotion	
~~English 3rd accountant Collector's office North Arcot~~	Permanent	— " —	~~35~~		~~13.10.80~~						
Taluq Sheristadar Palmanair	Permanent	" —	60		31.1.81						

1 ౧ Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగము బదిలీగామాత్రము వున్నయెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting Allowance బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములో నుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతిము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
Sub Magistrate of Vellore Town	Acting	Taluq Sheristadar	~~60~~ 60 ~~70~~	7 ~~10~~	12-1-82 ~~7-1-82~~				10-2-82 ~~27-3-82~~	Change in acting [illegible] ~~Return of permanent incumbent~~	
— Do —	— Do —	— Do —	60	10	11-2-82				25-2-82	Return of permanent incumbent	
~~Sub Magistrate~~ Dy. Tahr of Venkatagiricota (H.A)	Acting	Taluq Sheristadar	60 ~~70~~	10	26-3-82 ~~27-3-82~~				31-5-82		
Deputy Tahsildar & Sub Magistrate Venkatagiricotah	Permanent	"	70	"	1-6-82 ~~12-6-82~~				21-4-83 ~~20-4-83~~	Transfer	
Dy: Tahsildar & Sub Magistrate Maderpauk (H.A)	Acting	Dy: Tahsildar Sub Magistrate Vancatagiri-Cottah	70		22-4-83 ~~20-4-83~~		Three months privelege leave was granted from 17th Jan: 1884 of which 2 1/2 months was availed of & the rest cancelled. 16 Sept 1884 Ranipet (Sd) J. Andrew A. G. Hd Asst Collr		31-8-84	Confirmation	

1 ౧ Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, i.e., whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగము బదిలీగామాత్రముపున్న యెడల, తనదయిన పుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting Allowance బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడానికనకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనే తప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, పుద్యోగములో నుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు పుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వ వహిత పెద్ద పుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను పుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, e.g., *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతముకావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన పుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వ వహిత పెద్ద పుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను పుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
Deputy Tahsildar & Sub magistrate Madanpalle	~~Substantive~~ Permanent	"	70	"	1-9-84 ~~12.9.84~~				15.1.85 ~~23.1.85~~ 23.1.85	Promotion & transfer	
		Days in transit			16.1.85	Pay drawn					
Tahsildar of Royachoti Taluk Cuddapah Dt.	~~Substantive~~ Sub pro tem	Deputy Tahsildar & Sub Magistrate Madanpalle	70	35	24-1-85 ~~23.1.85~~				30.6.86 ~~23.1.85~~	Confirmed retrospectively ~~Confirmation~~	
Do Do —	Substantive permanent	"	175 ~~175~~	"	1-7-86 ~~23.1.85~~				~~14-8-86~~ 13-8-86	Reverted to 5th class Tahsildari	
		Days in transit			14.8.86	Pay allowed at the rate of Rs 150					
Tahsildar of Budvel.	Temporary	-	150		20.8.86 ~~14.8.86~~				19.8.86 25 ~~24~~ October 1887	Transfer	

6 Furlough for 1 year from 28th October 1887

Leave without allowance from 1st May 89 to 16th July 89 both days inclusive

Privilege leave from 1st to 22nd January 90.

Leave on Loss of Pay from 23rd January to ... July

1 ౧ Name of Appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగముబదిలీగా మాత్రముపున్న యెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting allowance. బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములోనుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer*, *promotion*, *return of permanent incumbent*. అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగముపొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
Tasildar of Siddhout	Permanent	—	150·0·0	-	26 ~~25~~ October 1888		Suspended by the Collector until further orders from 7th November 1889. The above Suspension Cancelled vide Collector's Proceedings No 0/15-4-90	Tahsildar	25-10-88		Tahsildar
Do of Badvel	Acting	Tahsildar of Siddhout	150-0-0		26-10-88				23-4-90	Return of permanent incumbent	
Do of Siddhout	Permanent	"	150-0-0	"	24-4-90		Under suspension from 1st November 89 to 23rd April 90. 2/3 of 150 = 100-0-0 has been allowed during the period of suspension vide Collector's Proceedings Dispatch No 816/Ver dated 20.3.91 and Collector's [illegible] Dispatch No 2870/27.5.91		18·8·93 ~~19·8·93~~	[illegible] on Transfer.	

Privilege leave for 3 months from 23rd July/93 to 22nd October 1893.

Privilege leave for 30 days from 1-7-94.

Verified upto ~~31-12-92~~ 31st March/93

Dy Collector

6/2/93

Verified upto 31-12-91

Dy Collr

Verified and found correct upto 31-12-89.

Narainaswamy

Ag. Dy Collector

Verified & found correct up to 31-3-9[illegible]

1897
Judicial Dept.
Enclos. No Service Register
C.M. 2133

1 ౧	2 ౨	3 ౩	4 ౪	5 ౫	6 ౬	7 ౭	8 ౮	9 ౯	10 ౧౦	11 ౧౧	12 ౧౨
Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తవుద్యోగము బదిలీగా మాత్రము వున్నయెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	Pay. జీతము.	Acting allowance. బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	Signature Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థ చేవ్రాలు	Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనే తప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములో నుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరవుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.
Tahsildar of Badul	Permanent	~	150	~	19-8-93		Verified upto 30-11-95. Dy Collr 22-1-96 by 25/6/96 Ospr. No extracts for the service in other dists. Copies of order of suspension were wanting. L. Pro. statement sent first upo. by 2/1/6	by 22/9/96	31-7-96	Retired. Verified up to 30th November 93 Dy Collector ~~Verified upto 31-8-94~~ Verified upto 30-11-94 Ramachandra Dy Collector Verified up to 31-2-96. Dy Collr 22/9/96	

1 ౧	2 ౨	3 ౩	4 ౪	5 ౫	6 ౬	7 ౭	8 ౮	9 ౯	10 ౧౦	11 ౧౧	12 ౧౨
Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తవుద్యోగము బదిలీగా మాత్రమువున్న యెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	Pay. జీతము.	Acting allowance. బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములోనుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరవుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	Reason of termination, *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగముపొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహితపెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.

1 ౧ Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, it the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తవుద్యోగముబదిలీగా మాత్రమువున్న యెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting allowance. బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములో నుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరవుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer*, *promotion*, *return of permanent incumbent*. అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగముపొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.

1 ౧ Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, it the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగము బదిలీగా మాత్రమున్న యెడల, తనదయిన పుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting allowance. బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *No entry need be made in this column except when there is anything either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినా వుంటేనే తప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీ కాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యము లేదు, వుద్యోగములో నుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరవుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer*, *promotion*, *return of permanent incumbent.* అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
౧	౨	౩	౪	౫	౬	౭	౮	౯	౧౦	౧౧	౧౨
Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	Substantive appointment, it the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగము బదిలీగా మాత్రమువున్న యెడల, తనదయిన పుద్యోగము.	Pay. జీతము.	Acting allowance. బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *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.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మఱియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములోనుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	Reason of termination, *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.

1 ౧	2 ౨	3 ౩	4 ౪	5 ౫	6 ౬	7 ౭	8 ౮	9 ౯	10 ౧౦	11 ౧౧	12 ౧౨
Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగపు పరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. క్రొత్తవుద్యోగము బదిలీగా మాత్రమువున్న యెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	Pay. జీతము.	Acting allowance. బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *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.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటే నేతప్ప, మః యేదిన్ని యీ కాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములో నుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer*, *promotion*, *return of permanent incumbent*. అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పొడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్వహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.

1 ౧	2 ౨	3 ౩	4 ౪	5 ౫	6 ౬	7 ౭	8 ౮	9 ౯	10 ౧౦	11 ౧౧	12 ౧౨
Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగపు తరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగము బదలీగా మాత్రము వున్నయెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	Pay. జీతము.	Acting allowance. బదలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *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.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనే తప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యము లేదు, వుద్యోగములో నుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్దవుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	Reason of termination, *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతము కావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగము పెడగడము, కాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్దవుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
౧	౨	౩	౪	౫	౬	౭	౮	౯	౧౦	౧౧	౧౨
Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తవుద్యోగము బదిలీగామాత్రమువున్నయెడల, తనదయిన వుద్యోగము.	Pay. జీతము.	Acting allowance బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *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.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, వుద్యోగములోనుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు వుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	Reason of termination, *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.* అంతముకావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగముపొడగడము, ఖాయమయిన వుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్ద వుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను వుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.

1 ౧ Name of appointment. ఉద్యోగపు పేరు.	2 ౨ Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary. ఉద్యోగవివరము, అనగా, తనదయినది, లేక బదిలీ, ఖాయము, లేక హంగామీ.	3 ౩ Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only. కొత్తపుద్యోగముబదిలీగామాత్రమువున్నయెడల, తనదయిన పుద్యోగము.	4 ౪ Pay. జీతము.	5 ౫ Acting allowance బదిలీ పనికి వచ్చే వర్తన.	6 ౬ Date of appointment. ఉద్యోగము పొందిన తేది.	7 ౭ Signature of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలు.	8 ౮ Character of Officer. ఉద్యోగస్థుని నడవడి. *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.* వ్రాయడమునకు మంచిదిగాగాని చెడ్డదిగాగాని యేదయినావుంటేనేతప్ప, మరియేదిన్ని యీకాలములో వ్రాయవలసిన అవశ్యములేదు, పుద్యోగములోనుంచి నిలిపేటట్టు పుత్తరువుచేసేటప్పుడు దాన్ని యిక్కడ వ్రాయవలసినది.	9 ౯ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్దపుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను పుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.	10 ౧౦ Date of termination of appointment. ఉద్యోగము అంతమయిన తేది.	11 ౧౧ Reason of termination, *e.g.*, *transfer*, *promotion*, *return of permanent incumbent*. అంతముకావడమునకు కారణము, అనగా, బదలాయించడము, ఉద్యోగముపొడగడము, కాయమయిన పుద్యోగస్థుడు మళ్లీ రావడము.	12 ౧౨ Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office. ఆఫీసు అవ్యవహిత పెద్దపుద్యోగస్థుని చేవ్రాలున్ను పుద్యోగపు పేరున్ను.

ENGLISH AND TELUGU.

40

SERVICE BOOK

of

D. Subbramaniam. Naidu