1. Number of pages 1 to 4
2. Date of receipt 12-7-3
3. Initials of Rec

M.R.O. 1—81,400—22-11-30

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 117 **~~Press~~**
Mis.

Dated 10 4 **18**61.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

12/7/33

Sentence of the Collector of North Arcot in an appeal preferred by Bab Row Tahsildar of Poolorr Talook from a sentence of the Sub Collector convicting him of various acts of bribery under Regulation IX of 1822, and condemning him to pay a fine of Rs 333 – 8 – ..

Para 1. The first complaint in this case was a Petition received by Tappaul by the Collector in September 1849; this Petition which charged the Tahsildar generally with incapacity, extortion on the occasion of the adungul Azmaish and oppression, was addressed at the top to Mr. Birch late Sub Collector and was dated January 1849; but there was an addition or postcript, which stated that the presentation of the Original Complaint had been delayed by the mediation of friends of the Tahsildar. This Postcript was dated August 29th 1849; and it was below this that the Signatures were affixed: they were those of twenty four of the inhabitants of Poolorr Talook, chiefly Monigars.

2. This Petition was sent by the Collector to the Sub Collector (on the 20th September 1849) with the request that he would give it the investigation which it might seem to merit; and the Sub Collector summoned the parties whose names were appended to the complaint, and took detailed depositions from all those who appeared to the number of twenty one. These deponents detailed various instances, alleged to be within their own knowledge respectively, in illustration and

support

upport of the general Charge. The Sub Collector alled up and examined the witnesses cited in support of these charges, and having completed his proceedings reported by letter to the Collector on the 18th January 1850, stating his opinion that some of the charges were proved against the Tahsildar and recommending that he should be fined the sum of Rs. 333-8-,, and removed from his Office - The Collector returned the Proceedings on the 24th January 1850 requesting the Sub Collector to pass sentence under clause first Section III. Regulation VII of 1828; and this he did accordingly on the 30th January 1850. The Tahsildar thus made an appeal to the Collector against the Sub Collectors sentence, and the Collector called up and examined the proceedings; but finding them defective, inasmuch as the accused did not appear to have had that full opportunity of making his defence, cross examining the evidence for the complaint, and producing evidence in defence which is required by the Circular letter of the Board of Revenue dated April 13th 1826 the Collector returned the Proceedings to the Sub Collector on the 23rd February 1850, requesting him to supply these omissions: he received the record again from the Sub Collector with a letter dated April 25th 1850; and he now proceeds to review the proceedings and to record his opinion on the charges.

3. The Charges before the Sub Collector, as extracted from the despositions of those whose signatures were appended to the Original Complaint amounted in Number to twenty seven; as hereinunder detailed.

1st Plaintiff Sababady Moodely, Moingar of Vilvanoya Nellore. | 1 That in Fusly 1256 the Tahsildar received 18 Rupees as a bribe at the time

of Azmaish in Vilvanoyanellore, and his son with his knowledge, 1 Rupee. -

2. That the Tahsildar received 12 Rupees and his son one Rupee in Vilva Arnee on the same occasion. -

3. That he received 6 Rupees and his son 1 Rupee in Cutcherymungalum on the same occasion. -

4. That he received 6 Rupees and his son 1 Rupee in Ambapoorum on the same occasion. -

5. That at the Adungul Azmaish of Fusly 1257, the Tahsildar received 21 Rupees in Vilvaroya nellore and his son 1 Rupee.

6. That they received respectively ~~A~~ 14 Rupees and 1 Rupee on the same occasion in Vilva Arnee.

7. That the Tahsildar received 8 Rs. for Ambapooram, on the same occasion.

8. That he received 8 Rupees for Cutcherymungahum on the same occasion.

9. That in Viasy of Fusly 1257 the Tahsildar received a muslin, value four Rupees from the Complainant -

10. That the Tahsildar received from him a muslin, value 1 Rupee, when making the Dittum of Fusly 1258.

9th Plaintiff Mooniappoodian Monigar of Sholaveram. | 11. That the Tahsildar and his eldest son made the Azmaish in Fusly 1256, and the former received seven Rupees.

12. That the Tahsildar and his younger son made the Azmaish in Fusly 1257, and the former received 10 Rupees.

13. That

13. That in Fusly 1258 the Tahsildar made the Azmaish, and received 10 Rupees.

Deposition of 14th Plaintiff Lutch=munoodian. | 14. That this deponent and his brother Monigars gave 6 Rupees to one Vencataramier, for the Tahsildar, towards building his Chuttrum.

Deposition of 16th Plaintiff Vencataramier late Monigar of Ajarum | 15. That this deponent gave 10½ Rupees to the Tahsildar out of the Collections of the Village, as a present, soon after his coming to the Talook.–

16. That in Fusly 1257 the Tahsildar's younger son Ramachundrarow Azmaished the Deponents Village, and that he then gave the Tahsildar 7 Rupees and his son 3½ Rupees.

Deposition of 17th Plaintiff Marcasah=yen. | 17. That this Deponents Uncle the Monigar of Cadalady gave 30 Rs. to the Tahsildar and 5 Rupees to his son at the Azmaish of his Village for Fusly 1256.

18. That the same person gave the Tahsildar 30 Rupees and his son 3½ Rupees at the Azmaish of Fusly 1257.

Depn. of 18th Plaintiff Ettiawody Monigar Eswerigen. | 19. That this Deponent gave the Tahsildar four Rupees at Azmaish of his Village for Fusly 1256.

Deposition of 19th Plaintiff Mamput Monigar Parasaramien. | 20. That the Tahsildar obtained from this Deponent 6 pair of waist=cloth, value 11¼ Rupees at Navarattry feast in Fusly 1256.

21. That in Margaly of the same year the Tahsildar obtained from him 15 Rs.

22. That at Navarattry feast of Fusly 1257, he obtained from the deponent 6 pairs of waistcloths

waistcloths value 11¼ Rupees–

Deposition of 20th Plaintiff Soobroyen monigar of Periaggrum. | 23. That during the Azmaish of Potteray, made by this Deponent by the Tahsildar's Order, the Tahsildar obtained 12 Rupees from the Monigar KistnaReddy before he would allow him to sign the accounts–

24. That the Tahsildar also received 25 Rs. from Columda Coonden Monigar of Coonnatoor, on the same occasion: the Azmaish of that Village also having been made by this deponent, by the Tahsildar's Order.–

25. That the Monigars of Keelapoloor agreed to give the Tahsildar 40 Rupees on the threat that he would report concealed Cultivation in their Village; and that of this sum they then paid him 20 Rupees and Gooroosamy Iyen Monigar of Muttavaid paid the remaining 20 Rupees.

26. That the Monigar of Nundimungalum in like manner paid the Tahsildar 25 Rupees at the Azmaish of the Village in Fusly 1257, as a bribe to hush up their fraudulent concealment of some Cultivation and some Tamarind Trees.

27. That in Margaly of Fusly 1256 this deponent and the other Monigars of his Village were required by the Tahsildar to give him a present and tha they did accordingly pay him 10 Rupees.

There are also a few more allegations, which are not stated here as charges, because they are made on hearsay, or are indefinite.–

4. The first ten charges are stated by t 1st Plaintiff and have reference either to his ow Village, or to three others with whose Monigars he i connected through family influence.

The first four refer to the Azmaish of these four Villages for Fusly 1256. This complai=ant Sababady Moodely states tha in that year these Villages were Azmaished

Note. All these Villages are entered in the Talook returns as Azmaished by the Tahsildar him=self, both in Fusly 1256 and Fusly 1257.

Azmaished by the Tahsildar's eldest son Appanjee Row, but that the Tahsildar came to the village when the work was completed, that a present being required for the Tahsildar, he and his brother monigar gave 18 Rupees to the Tahsildar and 1 Rupee to his son for their village Valoorroya nellore; and that the other Villages, Vilva arnee, Cutchirrimmigalum and Ambapoornum, gave respectively 13 Rupees, 7 Rupees and 7 Rupees; and that he the deponent received these sums and paid them to Appanjee Row for his father the Tahsildar, and then told the Tahsildar that he had done so.

5 The evidence to support these charges is that of the monigars of the several Villages. The 2nd Plaintiff (Co-monigar of Vilvarroya nellore) states that he gave 7 Rupees to 1st Plaintiff to be given to the Tahsildar. The statements bearing on the sum said to have been given in this fusly from Vilva arnee, are those of 3d, 4th and 6th Plaintiffs: of these the 3rd deposes to having given money, but he states the Amount differently from the 1st Plaintiff; and varies from him also in some matters of detail; the other two only state what they have heard from the 3rd Plaintiff.

The evidence in support of the payment from Cutcherrimmugalum is that of the monigar (15th Plaintiff), and respecting Ambapoornum it is that of the two Monigars (7th and 8th Plaintiffs) all these deponents say that they gave to the 1st Plaintiff Sababady Moodily for the Tahsildar the sum specified by him in his charge, and that they saw him enter the house of Anna Goorookul in which Appanjee Row was.

---

6. The next four charges contain the details
of presents alleged to have been given from the same
Villages at the Azmaish of Fusly 1257, which sums
are as follows; 22 Rupees from Vilvanoya nellore, 15
Rupees from Vilva arnee, 8 Rupees from Ambapoorna
and 8 Rupees from Cutcherrimmugalum; tota
53 Rupees. The 1st Plaintiff states that after
the azmaish was completed the Tahsildar sent f
him to Eachumpoody where he had put up in
the house of Anna Goorookul; and that he wen
there accordingly, and being required to give a presen
gave 22 Rupees to Ramachendra Row Vizt. 21 Rup
for the Tahsildar and 1 Rupee for himself and h
having signed the accounts told the Tahsildar wh
he had given and came away. This story is support
by the other monigar, the 2nd Plaintiff, who depos
that he went with the 1st Plaintiff and paid the 22 Rs
to Ramachindra Row.

On the 6th charge the evidence offered is tha
of the Village monigars, the 3rd 4th and 5th Plaintiffs.
The story of the 3rd differs from that of the 1st, and th
5th appears irreconcilable with either; the statement
the 4th is only what he heard from the 3rd.

On the 7th charge the evidence is that of one
the monigars, the 8th Plaintiff, who states that he a
the other monigar gave the 8 Rupees to Ellatoor
Vencatarmier for the Tahsildar; the other Monig
however (7th Plaintiff) says nothing of this.

On the 8th charge the evidence is that of
monigar (15th Plaintiff) as in the preceding year;
states that Ellatoor Vencatarmier asked him for a
present for the Tahsildar for the Azmaish, and th
he gave him 7 Rupees for the Tahsildar and 1 R
for his son Ramachendra Row and then signed
Azmaish accounts and came away.

On

On reviewing the evidence in these eight
rges, it is clear that all must be dismissed as un=
roved except the 5th. On the 1st, 3d, 4th, 7th, and 8th
arges, the evidence at the most proves no more than
at the money stated was paid to a third party for
Tahsildar; there is nothing to trace it further.
the 2nd and 6th charges the statements though some
them more direct vary so much, that the evidence
nnot be admitted as sufficient proof. On the 5th
arge there is more evidence, but as the Sub Collector has
quitted upon it, it is not necessary that the Collector
hould go into detail.

The 9th and 10th charges are equally unproved;
ese allege that the Tahsildar obtained two muslins
om the complainant Sababady Moodely at
fferent times worth respectively 5 and 1/2 Rupees.
The 2nd witness deposes that he saw both these
loths given, one by Sababady himself and the other
y 3rd Witness Periatumby Pilly Curnum of Vilvaroya=
nellore; and the latter part of the statement is confirmed
the Curnum, who says that the Tahsildar told him
ask the 1st Plaintiff for a Muslin, and that he went
d asked him accordingly, and he gave him one which
(deponent) delivered to the Tahsildar. There is how=
ver nothing whatever to show positively for what
ason or with what object these Cloths were given, even
dmitting the evidence of the fact; and the Curnum
tates distinctly that he does not know whether the
uslin which he delivered was given freely or sold.

The next three charges, Nos. 11, 12, and 13,
late to presents alleged to have been given to the
ahsildar by the monigars of Sholavaram, on occasion
the Aymaish of that Village in Fuslies 1256,
257. & 1258 The evidence is that of the three Monigars

themselves; one of them only (9th Plaintiff) deposes to having actually paid the money to the Tahsildar, the other two say that they gave money to him for the Tahsildar, or that he said he had given the money to the Tahsildar. The 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th charges are in like manner unsupported by evidence; in the 14th the money (six Rupees) is alleged to have been given not to the Tahsildar but to Vencataramien; in the 15th, 16th, and 19th, the deponents 16th and 18th Plaintiffs say distinctly that there were no witnesses in the 17th and 18th charges, the deponent 17th Plaintiff states that his uncle Kistnien Monigar of the Village paid the Tahsildar 30 Rupees on two Occasions and his son 5 Rupees: he cites no witnesses but it does not appear why his uncle was not called and examined.

10 On all the foregoing charges the Sub Collector has acquitted the Tahsildar unless the conviction in the matter of Rs 2-4-0 received from Sababady moodely, is connected with the muslin in charge 9 or 10. On most of the remaining charges the Sub Collector convicts.

11. Charges 20, 21, and 22, are brought forward by the 19th Plaintiff Parasaramien Monigar of Mampuut. It is to be remarked that this man was not originally disposed to complain against the Tahsildar; he was one of the three persons who are stated by the Plaintiff and apparently with truth to have come to him and dissuaded him from presenting his complaint.

subsequently however he himself affixed his signature to it; and in his examination before the Sub Collector he states three instances in which he himself gave presents to the Tahsildar on requisition from him.

12. In charge 20 this deponent states that immediately before the feast of Navarathy in Fusly 1256, the Tahsildar sent for him and required him to bring him six pair of Waistcloths as a present, those articles being manufactured in Mamput. And he states that he accordingly went to the Village, and brought the cloths required from the weavers, and brought them and gave them to the Tahsildar. In proof of this Statement he cites three witneſses, Vencatarayen late Monigar of the village 6th Witneſs Cundapachery the Village Shroff 7th witneſs and Vilum, Taliary, 8th witneſs, these witneſses depose to the same effect.

The 22nd Charge is to a similar purport, Vizt. that at the Navarathy feast of Fusly 1257, the Tahsildar extorted a similar present: and this is supported by the statements of the same Cundapachery, Govinda Chitty /9th witneſs/ from whom the cloths were purchased, and Armooga Pillay /10th witneſs/ the village Curnum.

13 The Tahsildar acknowledges receiving the cloths in both instances, but pleads that he paid for them; he produces two witneſses who depose that they saw him give the complaint Parasaramien ten Rupees as advance for cloths a few days before the Navarathy feast; of these witneſses one is the Talook

Duffadar,

Duffadar, and the other is a clothmerchant of Poloor. Their testimony does not appear of much value, and in particular it appears singular that they should remember so accurately a trivial occasion of which they were Casual Spectators, and in which they had no concern or interest.

The Collector is constrained to declare however that he considers these charges unproved. There are many weavers in Mamput: if the Tahsildar had brought and paid for the cloths through the Monigar, it is not probable that there would have been any direct evidence, written or other, to prove the payment of the price; the allegation that the price was not paid depends on the aſsertion of Parasarmien only. or at most on that of himself and his co-monigar, who was afterwards dismiſsed on the recommendation of the Tahsildar; and this evidence is inadequate to bring conviction.—

14 The 21st Charge, also brought forward by Parasaramien is that in the month of Margaly of Fusly 1256, /December 1840/ the Tahsildar asked him for 20 Rupees saying he was in want of cash; whereupon he /Deponent/ fetched 15 Rupees from his village and gave it to the Tahsildar. The witneſses cited to prove this are Soobroyen /20th Plaintiff/ and Vencatarmien /14th Witneſs/ monigars of Periaggrum, and the above said Vencatarayen and Cundapacharry, late Monigar and Shroff of Mamput. The last two depose that they accompanied Parasaramien from the Village to give the money; the first two that they were then

accidentally

cidentally at the Tahsildars house and saw it
iven.—

The 27th charge is brought by one of
hese witneſses Soobroyen, /20th Plantiff/, who
tates that in Margaly Month of Fusly 1256 —
December 1846/ he and his brother Monigar went
o see the Tahsildar, who then asked for a —
present; whereupon they went home and fetch=
ed ten Rupees and paid to him. This pay=
ment is Stated to have taken place at the
ame times with that of the 15 Rupees in charge
2; the witneſs to this charge are the other Moni=
gars of Periagrum, Vencataroyen /14th Witneſs/
nd the witneſs to the 22nd charge; they all sup=
port it in general terms, but both in this —
harge and in the former, all those details —
nd particulars are wanting, which are neceſs=
y to give credibility to such evidence and especi=
ally under such circumstances and again, in —
neither case is a sufficient motive for giving the
money apparent. The Collector does not consider
ither of these charges to be proved.

6. There remains four charges to be —
onsidered, the 23rd, 24th 25th and 26th all of which,
like the 27th already disposed of were brought
orward by Soobroyen Monigar of Periaggrum the
0th Plaintiff. This deponent states that by the
Tahsildars orders he made the ×admingul —
Aymaish of the villages of Potteray and
Coonnattoor for Fusly 1257; that —

Note In the Talook
turns both these —
illages are entered as
aving been Aymaished
the Tahsildars in
Fusly 1257.

the Tahsildar came, and that he /the Tahsildar/ asked and obtained presents from the monigars in both Villages, Vizt. 12 Rupees from Potteray and 25 Rupees from — Coonnattoor.—

17. In the case of Potteray the only evidence offered is that of the Monigar Kistna Reddy /16th Witneſs/ who deposeses to giving 7 Rupees to the Tahsildar in the Village, and 5 Rupees somedays afterwards at Poloor by the hands of Soobroyen, who paid it to the Tahsildar immediately in his presence; on this charge the Sub Collector acquits, probably because there was only one witneſs.—

18. In the case of Coonnatoor /charge 24/ the evidence adduced is that of the three Monigars and the Curnum of the Village, Colmudars Counden /5th/ Vencata Reddy /17th/ Putchana minor /18th/, and — Permal Pillay /19th Witneſs/. Their testimony is to the effect that 21 Rupees /not 25 as stated by Soobroyen/ was given by the three Monigars to the Tahsildar on the occasion of the Aymaish of the Village in Fusly 1257; the statements of the three — monigars is direct and concurrent, but it is uncorroborated by any other evidence, and it was not delivered in presence of the accused, or subjected to the test of croſs examination. Considering how easy it is for three or four persons to make out a consistent story where their statements are not thus tried, the Collector finds it impoſsible to pronounce a conviction on this evidence.

19. The 25 charge also brought forward by Soobroyen, is that the Tahsildar finding some concealed cultivation of the Aymaish of —

Keelapoloor

Note. Entered in the Talook return as aymaished by the Tahsildar in Fusly 1257.

Keelapoloor× Village in Fusly 1257, obliged the monigars; by threats of reporting the concealment to the Sub Collector, to agree to pay him a bribe of forty rupees; of which 20 Rupees was actually paid to him, and 20 on his account to one Goorosamy Iyen Monigar of Muttavaid for paddy delivered to the Tahsildar – In this charge the witnesses are the three monigars and the two Curnums of the Village. It is clear that supposing the charge to be true these witnesses would not state the facts clearly and fully, because in so doing they must deeply criminate themselves. There is much appearance, accordingly, of concealment in their evidence; but there appears good reason to believe the charge to be true, not so much on the ground of their direct statements, as of their indirect admissions, especially in the case of the Curnum Appoo Pillay (24th Witness). There is not sufficient proof however to convict the Tahsildar.–

20. The 26th charge is to a similar purport as the last Vizt. that the Tahsildar having detected some concealed, cultivation, and the Teerwah of some Tamarind trees concealed, in the Aymaish of Fusly 1257, in the Village of Nundimungalum×, took a bribe of 25 Rupees from the Monigars, to refrain from reporting the matter – The remarks on charge 25 apply to this also there is grounds for strong suspicion, but there is not conclusive

× Entered in the Talook returns as aymaished by the Tahsildar in Fusly 1257.

proof

proof of the bribe.

21. In addition to the foregoing, the Sub Collector convicts the Tahsildar of Corruptly receiving 20 Rupees from the monigars of Canaolapandy, and 30 Rupees from the monigars of Veerammudel, under circumstances somewhat similar to those of Keelapodoor and Nundimungalum. These charges are not mentioned in the statements of any of the complainants, but are stated in the deposition of Canrapunt Ramien one of the Witnesses. The Collector cannot think that these charges were properly before the Sub Collector for enquiry and he therefore makes no remarks upon them.

22. The Sub Collector has also convicted the Tahsildar of receiving 2 Rupees from the Monigar of Arnee (3rd plaintiff): the said two rupees having been paid as bandy hire for the conveyance of some paddy for the Tahsildar. But though it is alleged that this two rupees was paid on the Tahsildar's account, and it may probably have been so, yet there is nothing whatever to show that the Tahsildar was cognizant of the transaction, either at the time or afterwards.

23. The Collector has thus felt obliged to reverse the sentences of the Sub Collector in every instance. This has been in part owing to the nature of the evidence obtainable, and to the circumstances of the case making it

necessary

neceſsary to receive all evidence with caution. But it has been owing in part also to the method in which the investigation was conducted by the Sub Collector and to the number of seperate charges accumulated before him, and investigated as one case, in such a manner as to be indistinct and confused. Had a few of the charges most capable of proof been selected for investigation, and had due care been taken to keep such cases distinct from each other to obtain all the evidence procurable on each, and to sift and examine it thoroughly; had this been done it is not improbable that some of the charges might have been fully established. It appears also to have escaped the Sub Collector that under clause third, Section II of Regulation IX of 1822, the sons of the Tahsildar Appanjee Row and Ramachundra Row, and Ellatoor Vencataramier, all of whom were charged with receiving money for themselves or for the Tahsildar, might have here been tried under the Regulation.

24. Though none of the Specific charges brought against the Tahsildar are supported by full proof, it is impoſsible to go carefully over the depositions, without feeling that the Tahsildar's conduct and integrity are very seriously compromised by the evidence here collected. It is to be remembered that in the nature of things eye witneſses are not

procurable

procurable to acts such as those alleged against the Tahsildar; Where money is corruptly received, it will generally be either in strict secresy, or by the hands of a third party; and the Collector cannot but consider that there is very much probability in many of the Charges that have been considered above, especially the earlier ones. The Tahsildar's reply to all the charges and evidence is that the complainants and witneſses are his enemies,[x] tha his activity in enforcing th Collection of balances from them, and his having got a numb of them fined, some dismiſsed from the Office of Monigar, led them to conspire for his ruin; and in proof of this statement he files a list of fines imposed at his recommendation on these deponents, and some papers showing the 1st Plaintiff Lababady Moodely as a Revenu defaulter. He also produces a number of witneſses to prove that the complainants entere into a formal league against him and bound themselves by an oath or solemn engagement in a Pagoda. As respects the three witneſse who speak directly to the latter fact, the Collector has no hesitation in rejecting th testimony as manifestly false, the rest sp only to having heard a report of such combinatio

25. These

[x] Note. On the same ground also he declines to have the witneſses examined before him, or to croſs examine them; this the Collector learns from the Sub Collr. letter of April 25th; it does not appear in any deposition from the Tahsildar

25. There is no doubt that the complaint was laid against the Tahsildar by concert or combination, it is shown also that many of those who appeared against the Tahsildar had been fined several times during the three years that the Tahsildar has been in the Talook, some heavily for misconduct in Police matters, the rest in various small sums for slackneſs or unpunctuality in bringing their Village Kists, or for backwardneſs in Maramut work; two or three had also been removed from the Office of Monigar for keeping heavy balances. The question is whether these considerations are of sufficient weight totally to invalidate their testimony; the Collector is of opinion that they are not. There are several of the witneſses indeed on whose statements he looks with much distrust on account of their manifest bias against the Tahsildar, but there are a number of others who display no vindictiveneſs or ill-will, and who profeſs that they have no complaint about the money they paid, that they paid it willingly, and only gave their evidence because called upon to do so.

26. On the whole the Collector is of opinion that there is very strong reason to believe from these Proceedings, 1st that the Tahsildar committed the serious irregularity of employing his sons & others not in the public ~~the~~ service to make the Azmaish of Villages which he profeſsed to have azmaished himself; 2nd that he also extorted presents from the Villages thus Azmaished, and in several instances employed his sons or another person to receive the money for him

and

and lastly that he took larger bribes to suppreſs discoveries of fraud in the admurgul accounts brought to light in the Azmaish. Having come to this conclusion after a very careful examination and consideration of all the evidence and circumstances of the case, the Collector thinks it neceſsary to remove Bob Row from the Office of Tahsildar; and he accordingly resolves to submit a copy of this sentence to the Board of Revenue and to solicit their sanction for that measure.-

18th May 1850-

(Signed) J. D. Bourdillon
Collector.

(True Copy)

Acting Collector.

Compd G. Stacey
Dy Clerk

From Mr Bourdillon the Collector of North Arcot

To Sundarum Pillay the Tahasildar of Kavaripaukum

As Baboo Row the late Tahasildar of Poloor has been appointed to the vacant Post of Sheristadar of your Talug, you are required to enter his name in the Baravurd from the date of his assuming the charge of the said duty & put him in charge of the Stamp papers kept for sale in the Talug, as also to act according to rules.

(Signed) J D Bourdillon
Collector

Dated 26th Decem 1850

True copy
(Signed) J D Robinson
Ag Collector

In a Official
Memo from the
Acting Collector
of North Arcot
to the Chief Secretary
to Government Ld/
19th March 1861.

Copy of the decision
of the Collector d/
18th May 1850.

Revenue Department

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 30th May 1850.

Read the following letter from the Collector of North Arcot, dated 18th May 1850.

(Here enter No. 58)

Under the circumstances stated in the paper which accompanies the above letter, the Board of Revenue authorize the dismissal from the Public Service of Bob Row, Tahsildar of Poloor.

(A true Extract)
(Signed) W. H. Bayley
Secretary

(True Copy)

Ag Collector

E. A.

In a Official
Memo from the
Acting Collector of
North Arcot to the
Chief Secretary to
Government dated
19th March 1861

Copy of an Extract
from the Proceed
ings of the Board
of Revenue dated
30th May 1850

25

No. 2

North Arcot
Collector's Circuit Office
Ranipet 3d January 1861

From
J. D. Robinson Esqre
Acting Collector of North Arcot

To
T. Pycroft Esqre
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort Saint George

Sir,

With reference to the orders of Government dated 15th May 1851 regarding the grant of superannuation pensions to Uncovenanted servants, I have the honor to forward for submission to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the accompanying Register of an application for pension tendered by Bábu Rau, Shirastedar of the late Tiruvalam taluq

2. Bábu Rau's services extend over a period of 35 years – 10 m. – 5 ds of which 2 yrs – 10 m. – 28 dys were spent in a situation which would not count for pension the net period of his services is therefore 32 years, 11 months, and 7 days –

3. Bábu Rau was it appears dismissed from the service by Mr. Bourdillon with the sanction of the Board of Revenue on the 1st February 1850

1850 on the ground that his conduct and integrity were indirectly compromised by the evidence adduced in several cases of extortion and Bribery, altho' the charges themselves were never legally brought home to him. He seems however speedily to have been readmitted to the benefit of the doubt, as he was re-employed by Mr. Bourdillon on the 28th December of the same year.

4. Considering the length of Bábu Rau's services, I beg to recommend that a pension equivalent to the moiety of the average salary drawn by him during the last 5 years or Rupees 18 be granted to him for life.

5. As Bábu Rau was thrown out of employment on the recent reduction of establishments, he has not under the orders of Government dated 26th October 1860 No. 532 been called upon to produce a Medical Certificate of physical unfitness.

North Arcot
Collector's Circuit Office
Ranipeta 3rd January 1861

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servt.

Acting Collector.

To
T. Pycroft Esqr.
Chief Secretary to Government

29

7,

Public - Separate
1861 Department

From No 10

L D Robinson Esqr
Ag Collector
of North Arcot

To T Pycroft Esqre
Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St George

Dated 3d January 1861
Recd 7th " "

Letter No 2-

Enclosure 1-

Submits an appli:
:cation for pension
from Bailu Rau
Sheristadar of late
Teruvalam Taluq
With an order

Referred to the Civil Auditor for the usual verification.

Fort Saint George, 7 January 1861. } L. Forbes
Depy. Secy. to Government.

To

The Civil Auditor. Dis/7/1/61

Register of an application for a Superannuation pension from the Establishment of the Collector of North Arcot preferred under the Rules passed by Government under date the 15th May 1851.—

11 [illegible] Order

Name of the person applying for pension with the name of his father	Number on the Establishment	Identification of applicant's person	Size		Age of the applicant at the time of application			Religion, Caste and Sect	Where Residing			Present employment	Total period of Service			Applicant's service continuous or not	How long unemployed and under what circumstances	Date of application	Average salary or emoluments of office or allowance from the five years preceding the date of application	Salary or authorized official allowance at the time of application	Abstract of the grounds of application	Remarks by the Head of Office	Proposed amount of Pension for Service	Treasury at which party if pensioned wishes to draw his pension	Date from which Pension is commenced	Orders of Government
			Feet	Inches	Years	Months	Days		Province	Pergana	Village		Years	Months	Days											
Móró Bábu Rau son of Ráma Rau	4	Bamboo Colour a Mole on the right side of the Nose	5	2	55	6	"	Nizamshai Bramin Siva Sect	Chittoor	Pallikonda	Vellore	Shirastedar of the late Tiruvalam Taluq	35	10	5	Not continuous	Ys Ms Ds " – 10 – 27 under removal	17 June 1860	Rs as ps 36 – " – "	Rs as ps 36 – " – "	Infirmities & old age	Vide accompanying letter to the Chief Secy to Govt dated 3 Jany 1861	Rs 18	North Arcot	17 June 1860	

		Ys	Ms	Ds
Gumasta of the Pólür taluq from 23d September 1823 to 31st October 1830 on a salary of	Rupees 10 – 8 – "	7	1	8
Do Do from 1st November 1830 to 22d July 1832 on a salary of	" 9 – 8 – "	1	8	22
Do in the Sub Division Huzur from 23d July 1832 to 31st January 1833 on a salary of	" 15 – 12 – "	"	6	9
Do in the Pólür taluq from 1st February 1833 to 6 April 1834 on a salary of	" 9 – 8 – "	1	2	6
Do in the Sub Division Huzur from 7 April to 11 August 1834 on a salary of	" 15 – 12 – "	"	4	5
Do Do Do from 12 August 1834 to 27 Decr 1838 on a salary of	" 19 – " – "	4	4	17
Peshkar in the Tiruvattür Táluq from 28 Decr 1838 to 13 Decr 1840 on a salary of	" 27 – " – "	1	11	18
Shirastedar in the Pólür Táluq from 14 December 1840 to 21st June 1842 on a salary of	" 31 – 8 – "	1	6	9
Do in the Tiruvattür táluq from 22d June 1842 to 27 May 1846 on a salary of	" 36 – " – "	3	11	6
Tahsildar of Pólür táluq from 28 May 1846 to 31 January 1850 on a salary of break [illegible] & 27 days	" 72 – " – "	3	8	4
Shirastedar of the Kaveripakam now Walaja taluq from 28 Decr 1850 to 20 June 59 on Do	36 – " – "	8	5	25
Do of the late Tiruvalam taluq from 21st June 59 to 16 June 1860 on a salary of	Rs 36 – " – "	"	11	26
		35	10	5
Deduct the period of service for which the applicant draw a salary of	Rs 9 – 8 – "	2	10	28
	Net period of Service	32	11	7

North Arcot
Collr's Cutcherri
Ranipett 3d Jany 1861

18th April 1857

Acting Collector

In a letter from
the Acting Collector
of North Arcot to
the Chief Secretary
to Government
d/ 3d January 1861

Register of an
application for
pension.

My dear Foster

I can add nothing in the way of opinion on Bal Row's case to what is said in my review of it. For the rest, he has served many years, & I believe is no worse than many of his class. I think the Rule which cancels claims to pension for a single breach in the service, is a very hard one; but that is a general question, not affecting this case only –

Yours very truly

March 22/61.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(Signed) J. D. B.
Collr.

[illegible]

(True Copy)

Ag Collector.

In a Official
Memo from
the Acting Collector
of North Arcot
to the Chief Secretary
to Government
dated 19th March 1861

Copy of a Takeed

~~The Act. Collr. is requested~~

The Undersigned has the honor to request that the Act. Collr. with, with reference to his letter of ———, to be good enough to submit copy of the decision of the Coll. of the Pres. of the Bd in connection with the dismissal of Bábu Rám in 1850: also copy of Mr. Baird's order reappointing him.

L. S.

Written

4 - 3 - 61

No 12

Official Memorandum

Agreeably to the request contained in Mr. Deputy Secretary Forbes Memo of the 4th Instant, the Acting Collector of North Arcot has the honor to forward copy of the decision of the Collector and of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue in connection with the dismissal of Bábu Rau in 1850 - The Collector's order reappointing Bábu Rau is not forthcoming on the records of this office, but copy of the takid to the Tasildar of the Káveripak taluq, informing him of Bábu Rau's reappointment as Shirastedar, is enclosed -

dated 30 August 1850

North Arcot
Collector's Kacheri
Chittoor 19 March 1861

Acting Collector

To T. Pycroft Esqre
Chief Secretary to Govt.
Fort St George

Entd H. B. Raye
D. C.

Public Separate
1861 Department

From No 144

L. D. Robinson Esqre
Acting Collector
of North Arcot

To
T. Pycroft Esqre
Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St George

Dated 19th March 1861
Recd 21st " "
No 12

Enclosures 3-

Forwards copy of the Decision of the Collector and of the Boards Proceedings in connection with the dismissal of Babu Rao in 1850 as requested in an Official Memo from the Dy Secy to Govt dd 14th Instant

---

No 92. General Dep.

Report of the Offg. Civil Auditor

The Offg. Civil Auditor has the honor to report that the Authorized Official allowance drawn by Babu Rao, late Serishtadar of the Tiruvalum Taluq on the Establishment of the Collector of North Arcot, has been, for the last five years of his service, Rs. 36 — per mensem; and his service qualifying for pension extends over a period of 9 years 5 months & 20 days, viz. from 28th December 1850 to 16th June 1860.

His previous service of 26 years 4 months & 10 days from 23d Sept. 1823 has been excluded owing to his dismissal on 1st February 1850. This took place with the sanction of the Board. But as the Collector says that the charges "were never legally brought home to him" & that he was soon re-employed, it rests with the Govt. to decide whether he is entitled to any Special Consideration.

If this service be not allowed to count,

he

He may receive a gratuity of 3 Months Salary.

Civil Audit Office,
Fort Saint George,
26th Feby 1861.

J Mutrfield
Offg. Civil Auditor

Ex. FHM.

To.

The Chief Secretary to Govt.
Civil Pension Depart.

Separate
Public } 1861 Department

From No 113
The Offg Civil Auditor

To
The Chief Secy to Govt.
Civil Pension Dept

Dated 26 } February 1861
Received 1st } March 1861

No 92
No

Reports on the Service of Bambo Row late Sheristadar on the Establisht of the Collector of North Arcot.

No 117

Separate — Proceedings of the Madras Government — Pub. Department

45

Read the following
From the Acting Collector of North Arcot — (Here enter 8th January 1861.)
From the Officiating Civil Auditor — " — 26 February "
From the Acting Collector of North Arcot — " — 19 March "

Order thereon dated 10th April 1861. No. 117

The average salary of the applicant for the last five years is the Govt. learn from the Civil Auditor's report No. 36 -

That officer however reports the period of applicant's service qualifying for pension as only 9 years & 5 months - his previous service of 26 years & 4 months being excluded owing to his dismissal on the 1st of February 1850 -

The Government have referred to the decision in question & are of opinion that it would be a ~~harsh~~ strained interpretation of the rule to consider this dismissal as one barring the right to reckon previous service; it was, it is observed confessedly on suspicion only & not on proof of guilt - so much so that the applicant + was within the same

+ who had, it sd. be noted, been acquitted judicially of all the charges brought against him

47x

year by the Collector who dismissed him
to the ^reappointed responsible though subordinate
post of Talook Sheristadar.

They resolve therefore to allow the
+ No 25-76 applicant Baboo Row, the full pension+
of half his salary viz Rs. 18. to which
his service of 36 years would otherwise
entitle him.

Dy Secy to Govt

To
The Acting Collector of North Arcot. Sent 11/4/61 with original
& copy certificate.
The Civil Auditor. Sent 11/4/61 with copy certificate.

Entered & Returned
13 April /61.

Ind.
O.C.A.

Separate

Public 1801 Sept

No. 117

Pro: of Govt

Dated 10 April 1801.

Granting Bamboo Row
Talook Sheristadar on the
Establishment of the Collector
of North Arcot a Supperan-
-nuation Pension of Rs. 18