52
24-7

M.R.O./1—22,400—29-11-30.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pensions DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1	Press Mis.
Dated 3-1-	18 26

Not to be folded or roughly handled

11

My dear Walker

I would
Counsel or
record the
Referee If
the family
Come for-
ward, the
matter can
be considered
as the Case

I hereby certify that I have examined Mr. Soobrayaloo Naidoo, Forcee Dy. Collector of North Arcot. He has been under medical treatment for Diabetes, for years past both at Kurnool & in this District. and I am of opinion that in consequence of long standing disease & general debility produced thereby, he is unfit for further service - not the result of his own imprudence or intemperate habits.

W. [illegible] Civil Surgeon

Chittoor
Apl 26/65

Confirmed Robt. Cole
Pl Inspector General Med. Dept.

Sce a letter from
the Collector of North
Arcot to the Civil
Paymaster dated
26th April 1865 No 6

Details

List of services
of M Soobroyalu
Naidoo Deputy
Collector of North
Arcot.

B-3

Pens/65-Dept
In No 5-43.

Pens/65-Dept
In No 5-43

List of Service of M. Subbarayalu Nayadu Deputy Collector in the District of North Arcot 5

Date of appointment	Nature of appointment	Salary	Period of Service	Remarks
From 1st Sept. 1837 to 1st Feby 1842	Purporte writer in the Clothing Board Office	20	4 5	
Ditto 2nd Feby 1842 to 8th April 1859	Deputy Interpreter in the Supreme Court	105	17 2 7	
Ditto 27/7 8th April 1859 to 26th April 1865	Deputy Collector	350	6 18	* During this period, he was 4th Class Deputy Collector for about 1 Year. There are no statistics in this Office to shew the exact period.

J. Nelson,
Collector

N. B.

The periods of leave obtained during M. Subbarayalu Naidu's Service are not traceable in this Office.

B:V
J.D.A.H:C

For tomorrow

No. 6

5939 Gen
CIVIL PAYMASTERS OFFICE
AP 28
1865

North Arcot
Collector's Office
Chittoor 26th April 1865

From
J. D. Robinson Esquire
Collector of North Arcot

To
W. Donald Esquire
Chief Assistant
Civil Paymaster in Charge
Fort St. George

Sir,

I have the honor, with reference to the Notification published at page 591 of the Fort Saint George Gazette of the 15th April 1862, to forward herewith a Register of application for pension tendered by my Deputy M. Subbarayalu Nayadu - The Services of the applicant of which a detailed list is enclosed extends as you will observe over a period of 27 years and Eight Months the whole of which time counts towards pension.

2. The Medical Certificate prescribed in a recent Proceedings of the Madras -

Dated 5th April 1865 No 136.

Madras

Government ~~[illegible]~~ is herein enclosed.

3. Since Subbarayalu Nayadu's appointment to this District, he has had Charge of the two large Zemindaris of Carvetinegger and Kalahastri and of the contermenous taluq of Chundraghery. I have much pleasure in testifying to the willing assistance he has ever afforded me in connection with the important interests committed to his care. He will retire from the Service with the respect and good wishes of all who have known him. I have no hesitation in recommending him for the highest rate of pension allowed under the rules, namely, a Moiety of the Salary drawn by him during the last 5 years of his service.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most obedt. Servant

[signature]
Collector

B.V

Pensions/865 – Despatch
No 343.
From J D Robinson Esq
Collector of N A
To the Civil Paymaster
Madras
dated 26th April/65.
Recd 13th May 1865.
No 6

Forwards Regis-
-ter of application
for pension of Deputy
Collector M Soobaroy-
-loo Naidoo –

Papers Nine in Number
B. No 1.

11

No 26

Memorandum

With reference to the Memo: from the Civil Paymaster's Office, dated 28 April 1865, No. 330, the Ag. Controller of Military Accounts has the honor to state that the services of M. Soobaroyloo Naidoo from 1st September 1837 to 1st February 1842 Cannot be verified in this Office, as the Accounts of the late Clothing Board are not Recorded in this Office. –

His services for the period in question, if proved, may be reckoned towards Pension from the Fund set apart for the Pension of Clerks of the late Army Clothing Office. –

Office of Contr. Mily Accounts
Fort St. George 6th May 1865

[signature] Major
Acting Contr. Mily Accts

To
The Civil Paymaster

Informs that the services of M. Soobaroyloo Naidoo from 1st September 1837 to 1st February 1842 cannot be verified in this Office —

Recd 15-5-65

15.

It appears by the records of this Office that M. Soobaroyloo Naidoo was entertained on the 1st

13

No. 88

CIVIL ... OFFICE MAY 12 1865

214

ARMY CLOTHING DEPARTMENT,
Madras, 11th May 1865.

To

The Chief Assistant
Civil Paymaster in charge
Fort Saint George

SIR,

With reference to your letter No. 11, dated 6th May 1865, I have the honor to state, that this department has not the means of verifying the services, in the late Clothing Board Office, of M. Soobaroyloo Naidoo — between September 1837 and February 1842; the Earliest Pay list on Record, being for the month of March 1845. —

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

W. C. Woods Lieut-Col.,
Acting Supt. and Agent for Army Clothing.

From

Army Clothing Department,

Madras

Dated 11th } May 1865.
Received }

No. 88

Vide the reverse
of Mr. Soobaroyloo Naidoo
cannot be verified

Pens/65 Dept.
5th Feb 1842.

15.

It appears by the records of this Office that Mr. Soobaroyloo Naidoo was entertained on the 1st of September 1837 & resigned his Situation on the 4th Feby 1842 his actual Service is therefore 4 Years and 5 Months during which period the above Individual was employed as a Purport Writer.-

Clothing Board Office,
Fort St. George,
5th February 1842.-

Signed/ J.H. Cramer
Secy Clothing Board.-

I hereby Certify that Mr. Soobbaroyloo Naidoo was Deputy Interpreter of the Supreme Court of Judicature at Madras from 2d Febuary 1842 to 8th April 1859.-

Dated this 22d day of September 1859

Signed/ William A. Serle
Registrar.-

/True Copies/

J. Bouard
Chief Asstt
Civil Paymr
in Charge

E.J.R.

Pen/65-Dept.
Sn Bd-44.

143

CIVIL PAYMASTERS OFFICE
MY 9
1865

High Court Madras
Registrars office
8th May 1865.

Official Memo

With reference to the official Memo of the Chief Assistant Civil Paymaster in charge, dated 29th April last, the Registrar of the High Court Original side begs to state that M. Soobbaroyloo Naidoo late Deputy Interpreter of the late Supreme Court of Judicature at Madras, was never on leave during ~~his~~ such employment from 3rd February 1842 to 8th April 1859.

[signature]
Dy. Registrar.

To
The Chief Assistant
Civil Paymaster
in charge.

[initials]

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
31*st May* 1865.

No. 551. Read the following letter from J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Chittoor, 27th May 1865, No. 25 :—

SIR,

1. In submitting, for the information of Government, enclosed copy of a letter addressed by me to the Acting Head Assistant Collector, I have the honor to request that they will be pleased to defer passing final orders on Deputy Collector Subarayalu Naidu's application for pension, until the transactions, indirectly brought to light, have been fully sifted and reported on.

2. The papers have only been in my hands for a few hours, but the documentary evidence is so strong, particularly when read by the light of some highly suspicious proceedings in the Deputy Collector's office, that I have not hesitated to accept the responsibility of the situation, and to withdraw, by an order of suspension, the authority, which under a previous arrangement, the Deputy Collector was to have voluntarily resigned on the 31st instant.

3. The papers I may observe in conclusion prove the existence of pecuniary dealings between the Deputy Collector and a Tahsildar in the Zemindary, who is about to be committed to the Session Court on a very flagrant charge of forgery. They further indicate, in almost unmistakable terms, the existence of an outside dictation and influence which is absolutely incompatible with the pure and independent administration of justice.

No. 552.

Miscellaneous.

ORDER THEREON, 31st May 1865, No. 1,161.

1. Communicated to the Public Department, with reference to the Deputy Collector's application for pension.

2. The Government will await the Collector's further report which they trust to receive at an early date.

3. Meanwhile his Excellency will be pleased to observe, from which he will perceive that he is not competent to suspend a Deputy Collector. His removal of Subarayulu Naidu from the Zemindary charge is approved as a temporary measure.

(True Extract.)

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Public Department.
,, the Collector of North Arcot.
,, the Board of Revenue.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

4 Copies sent

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd June 1865.

No. 521.

Dated 23rd June 1865, *No.* 1,424.

Miscellaneous.

1. His Excellency the Governor in Council resolves that the appointment of Deputy Collector, North Arcot, lately held by M. Subrayaloo Naidoo, shall be dealt with as vacant from and after 31st May 1865, from which date Subrayaloo Naidoo has tendered his resignation of the service and acceptance of pension.

2. Orders will hereafter be passed on the subject of his pension.

(True Extract.)

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Collector of North Arcot.
,, the Civil Paymaster.
,, the Board of Revenue.
,, the Public Department.
To M. Subrayaloo Naidoo, for information.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 8th September 1865.

No. 188. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st August 1865, No. 5,078.

Read the following letter from J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to R. A. DALYELL, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chittoor, 7th August 1865, No. 139 :—

SIR,

1. I have the honor, with reference to the Proceedings of the Board, dated 28th ultimo, to transmit, for the consideration of the Board, and for eventual submission to Government, the results of my inquiry into the official conduct of Subbarayalu Naidu, late Deputy Collector in charge of the Zemindaries of Karvetinugger and Kalashtri in this District.

2. The papers* herewith transmitted relate to four separate sets† of transactions.

* As per accompanying list.
† *Vide* Cases Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The first of these relates to the acceptance, by the Deputy Collector, of a sum of Rupees 1,800 from the Pulicherla Poligar, as a gratification in a charge of mis-appropriating certain valuable securities then pending against his son before Subbarayalu Naidu.

The second, to four distinct acts of corrupt patronage in his own office.

The third, to an attempt, by the Deputy Collector, to obtain a gratification in the matter of the appointment of the Munsiff of Puthur in Narranavanam division.

The fourth, to the acceptance, by the Deputy Collector, of a gratification of Rupees 5,000 from the Zemindar of Karvetinugger in a case under inquiry before him, touching certain complaints of exaction and oppression against the said Zemindar's officials.

1st Case.—Receiving a gratification from Pulicherla Poligar.

3. Leaving the papers to speak to details, I beg to offer some general remarks on the evidence in these several cases. A grave contradiction will be observed in the statements of the Poligar and his ex-Dewan Subba Rao, the former deposing that the money was paid to the Deputy Collector in two instalments, whilst the latter says it was paid in three instalments. The aggregate amount said to have been paid, viz., Rupees 1,800 is, it will be observed, the same in both depositions.

4. I am disposed to think that the Poligar's is the more accurate version of the affair, as it is supported by the statements of B. Rangaia, a direct agent in the negotiation, and of Nayana Chary, the Poligar's Vakil in charge of the case at the Deputy Collector's Cutcherry. By the Poligar's admission, the Deputy Collector's Head Clerk, Rungasami Mudali, tried hard, on the occasion of his visit to the Polliem, to get something more out of him, and coming as this Clerk did in all state as his master's plenipotentiary to take the deposition which was to spare the Poligar the much dreaded humiliation of a compulsory attendance in the Deputy's Office, (an indulgence which it will be observed had been already dearly purchased,) the supposition might naturally enough have arisen in Subba Rao's mind that Rungasami Mudali did not go away empty handed. And here I may fairly ask what honest motive can be attributed to a visit made under such circumstances, and to an out-of-the-way locality some forty miles distant from the official Head Quarters? Remembering the confidential relations which are shewn to have subsisted between this Clerk and the Head of the Office, the only possible conclusion is that the mission was undertaken in connection with the corrupt negotiations which the evidence describes as having preceded it. That part of the transaction, which concerns the conversion of a bar of gold into money subsequently paid to the Deputy Collector, has about it a certain particularity and impress of truth from which it is difficult to withhold credence. The remainder of the evidence, if considered in connection with the delay of six months in the disposal of the case as

verified from the public records, and its eventual dismissal, leads irresistibly to the hypothesis that the Deputy Collector was influenced by corrupt motives in his disposal of the case.

5. This very same case, thus suspiciously starved into annihilation, was subsequently, when tried on appeal at the Session Court, considered so dangerous by the Poligar's party, who had bought it off in the Deputy Collector's Office, that it needed all the legal ability and skill of Mr. Norton, aided by Mr. O. Sullivan and Ranga Charlu of the High Court (procured as the Poligar himself admitted to me at a cost of some Rupees 4,000) to pull his son through.

6. This case has its more recent parallel in the two great forgery trials, one of which resulted in the conviction, at the April Sessions, of four of the tools and accomplices of Chengama Naidu, the Deputy Collector's ally and confidant, and the other has just terminated after eight days' hearing, in a sentence of seven years transportation against the principal culprit himself, Chengama Naidu.

7. The original case out of which these convictions have been effected, is the same as that spoken of in Srinivassa Chary's statement marked No. 31 in the accompaniments to this letter, and which the Board will, I think, agree with me indicates in tolerably plain terms that the case did not receive fair play in its passage through the Deputy's and his subordinate's offices.

This Sub-Magistrate, I think it but fair to mention, is an officer of great promise, but in this instance, he was led away by youth and inexperience to lend himself too easily to his superior's irregular behests.

8. The proceedings connected with these two forgery trials are so voluminous that I have abstained from sending them until required to do so, but throughout the whole record from first to last, there is the most ample evidence that Chengama Naidu, then a Zemindary Tahsildar, was on terms of the closest intimacy and confidential intercourse with the Deputy Collector; that the latter was under numberless personal pecuniary obligations to him; that in his (Chengama Naidu's) capacity of Zemindary Tahsildar and Treasurer, he was the medium of several corrupt transactions between the Zemindar and the Deputy Collector; and that he exercised an influence in all matters coming under the Deputy Collector's official cognisance which he (Chengama Naidu) not only felt himself but made others feel.

2nd Case.—Corrupt exercise of patronage in his office. Cases of Tirmal Row, Narrain Row, Ramasami Mudali, and Naranaya.

9. The evidence in these cases is complete enough to my mind to satisfy every legal requirement. In Tirmal Rao's case, the official records shew that such a transfer and re-transfer did take place.

The overtures, intermediate negotiation, and circumstances attending the final arrangement and payment of the douceur, are described in all their natural sequence, by the several parties* concerned.

* Tirmal Row, Subbaia, and Naina Chari.

10. The principal contradiction occurs in the earlier part of Tirmal Rao's deposition where he attempts to color over his personal participation in this negotiation. This he sets right in the latter part of his statement, and after the production by Y. Subbaya of the rough draft which he (Tirmal Rao) gave in as the model of the letter which Subbaya was to write for him arranging for the payment through Chengama Naidu of the Rupees 200 which were to purchase his (Tirmal Rao's) re-transfer.

11. This discrepancy does not affect the general credibility of his evidence, and originates in Tirmal Rao's natural desire to escape direct complicity in a transaction which might be mischievous to his own interests. This, in fact, he himself admits.

12. Before leaving this part of my case, I would ask the Board's attention to the docket on Petition* with Board's endorsement and to Mr. Banbury's letter† thereon. That letter has not been answered up to this date.

* No. 2,287 of 1864.

† Dated 15th November 1864, No. 176, Enclosure No. 33.

13. This sale of official patronage is followed up by three similar transactions in connection with the appointments of Narrayana* Rao, Ramasami Mudali first, and Naranaya second Clerks in Deputy Collector's Office.

* Head Gumastah of Maderpak Division.

14. Letting the depositions of these three men speak for themselves, I would merely remark that the secret of the Sub-Magistrate Arunachellia's self-sacrifice, for the first of these three men, is explained by the fact that he (Arunachellia) was absolutely dependent on his Gumastah for the conduct of his most ordinary official duties. Arunachellia is dead now; but among the ranks of the old school, he was conspicuous for indolence and incapacity. The evidence of all three may be safely accepted. It was reluctantly given; but the parties felt that these inquiries had reached a point at which it would no longer be for their interests to withhold facts.

3rd Case.—Attempt of Deputy Collector to obtain a gratification in the matter of the appointment of the Munsiff of Puthur.

15. The case of Subba Reddi is a minor transaction of similar complexion. The consideration did not actually pass into the Deputy Collector's hands, but the preliminary negotiation is described in terms which have the impress of truth.

The ultimate failure of these overtures was not, it will be observed, occasioned by awakening scruples of conscience on the part of the Deputy Collector, but by the insufficiency of the bait offered to his cupidity.

16. The history of these cases as traced in the evidence will, I think, satisfy the Board that the universal report, that all official patronage in and out of the Deputy Collector's Office was made matter of private bargain and traffic, rests upon some foundation.

4th Case.—Acceptance by Deputy Collector of a gratification from Zemindar of Carvetnagar, in Tyoor Ryot's case.

17. The evidence in this transaction does not pretend to be complete, but there is enough to constitute a very strong *primâ facie* case against the Deputy Collector, and to justify my submitting it without entering further for the present into the difficult and probably fruitless inquiry which it would entail.

18. Besides Ragupathi Naidu's deposition which accompanies this, three or four others of the parties concerned in the case were verbally examined by me, and all confirmed the main facts as therein described.

19. On examining the records of the case submitted at the time by the Deputy Collector, there are unmistakeable indications that the whole inquiry was conducted in the most miserably slip-shod and informal manner.

20. Among the records of the case are several papers containing numerous signatures, and purporting to be the complainant's acquittances in full of all former grievances.

In one of these which I submit marked No. 34, Deputy Collector's foot-note and signature have evidently been attached to it whilst it was yet a blank sheet, and the whole appearance of the record goes greatly to support the allegation of all whom I examined that no formal inquiry was instituted by the Deputy Collector during the eleven weary months the case was under his manipulation, and that it was ultimately bought off, as stated by Nayana Chary and Subbaya, for Rupees 5,000.

21. Nayana Chary has, the Board will observe, spoken in detail to the circumstances attending the payment of the gratification of Rupees 5,000 taken in this case, and has produced a rough memorandum taken at the time, of the particulars of the notes which then passed into the Deputy's hands.

22. On reference to the Secretary Madras Bank for information as to the names of the parties who might have presented any of these notes for payment, Mr. McIver has sent me an extract from the Bank books giving particulars of five out of the thirteen. I have not thought it desirable to delay this report until I can make a further reference respecting the eight yet untraced notes, or ascertain more fully who the parties are whose names figure in the Bank extract, but these researches, so far as they go, lend great additional weight to this part of Nayana Chary's statement, as entries five* and two† in the extract relate, one to the cashing of a note for Rupees 500, on account of Venkatasami Naidu who is the Deputy Collector's brother, and the other of a Rupees 50 note on account of Soobbarayaloo Naidu himself.

* Note No. 3,852.
† ,, ,, 7,525.

23. Both Nayana Chary and Y. Soobbaya were personal friends and confidants of the Deputy Collector, as is shown by all the evidence, and must have been, by virtue of their official relations to the Zemindar, most fully informed of all that passed in connection with a case which made much stir at the time.

24. They could both doubtless say more if they chose; but as it is, they have been more explicit than I had dared to expect.

25. Whilst speaking of these men, I would ask the Board's attention to another part of Nayana Chary's statement, where he mentions that another sum of Rupees 5,000 was paid to the Deputy Collector by the Zemindar in compensation for property robbed from him whilst residing in the Zemindar's bungalow at Nagari. The records show that such a robbery did take place, and that the property lost was, in the original report, valued at some Rupees 231. I believe this, as I do every other part of Nayana Chary's deposition. He has not, as already observed, volunteered information, and could probably make further disclosures, but he never showed any desire to evade the questions put to him whilst under examination, and gave his evidence, as far as it goes, in a frank straightforward way.

26. I have already alluded to the Zemindar's refusal to produce a certain account which Soobbaya, his ex-Dewan, most distinctly informed me does, or at any rate did exist. Had I been able, with due regard to my other duties, to make the requisition in person, and before counter-action had been taken by certain other native officials in high place, whom the account would have gravely compromised, I should probably have been in a position to lay this part of my case before the Board in a very complete form.

27. I believe implicitly the universal rumour that in this Tyoor case, and in all the principal railway compensation claims, large sums of money found their way into the hands of the Deputy Collector and others in my office. This may possibly not admit of legal proof; and in any case, I question the propriety of devoting more time and labour to the prosecution of researches in a direction where Zemindary influence and Cutcherry intrigue have already anticipated me. An inquiry conducted under such adverse conditions could not but be long and of doubtful issue, and would absorb an amount of my time and attention, which I could not bestow on it without serious obstruction to my general duties. The letters and extracts marked, as shown in the margin, are all free translations of papers seized under search warrant in Chengama Naidu's house. The discovery of those numbered as above in such a place is an additional proof, if that were needed, of the close relations, public and private, which subsisted between the Deputy Collector and Chengama Naidu.

A., B., C., Nos. 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20.

28. These all tell the same tale of the Deputy's obligation and subjection to the influence of a man who raised himself to power and wealth by acts of rapacity and servile unscrupulousness, which have at length brought down on him that retribution which would probably have overtaken him long ere this had his lot been cast in any other than in Zemindary tracts.

29. I need hardly call the Board's attention to facts so fully supported by evidence, oral and documentary, as that the Deputy Collector occupied rent-free buildings, the property of the Zemindar; that a palanquin and bearers were kept for him free of charge; that all his every day wants were either supplied through the Agency of the then Zemindar's Tahsildar Chengama Naidu, or by the Peon attached to his household by the Zemindar.

30. Reading by the light of these facts the two khats, translations of which are enclosed marked 22 and 23, one no longer marvels at their nauseous obsequiousness and servility, nor is it difficult to picture to one's mind how little those who might be inclined to assert their rights had to expect from the officer to whom they should have looked for protection and even-handed justice.

31. In conclusion, I would solicit the Board's perusal of the letter marked No. 32, and ask them whether a man, who, in palming off his antiquated and mischievous notions, could pen such pitiable fustian, is one who could be safely entrusted with the large powers of a Deputy Collector in any charge, far less amid the dangerous temptation and servile toleration of wrong, which surround him in Zemindary estate.

32. With these remarks, I beg to leave the matter in the hands of the Board, confident at least that no one can arise from a perusal of these papers with other than a moral conviction that independent official action was, under such a condition of things, simply impossible.

33. Soobaroyulu Naidu appears to have made several appeals "ad miseri cordiam" on the score of ill-health and outraged innocence. I think he should have thought himself before assuming this attitude how far such bodily infirmity is due to natural causes, or to his own imprudence and intemperance. I have good reasons for believing that general report does not greatly err, when it jocularly affirms that in lieu of the customary lime, suitors found that a bottle of strong waters was the more acceptable offering.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Pulicherla Poligar's Case.

A.

Subba Row sworn.—I was Dewan to the Poligar of Pulcicherla for thirteen months from 1863 to March 1864. During that time a complaint was preferred by Venkat Reddi against the son of the Poligar named Narasima Naidu. The charge was that he had misappropriated certain valuable securities belonging to Venkat Reddi and others. Both parties consented to a settlement by arbitration. They could not come to terms in this way. Venkat Reddi and his party went away saying they would lodge a regular complaint. On that the Poligar wrote to the Huzur recommending the *removal* of Venkat Reddi and

True by records.

their post as Monigars. When those parties heard this they lodged their complaint concerning the misappropriation of the securities in the Deputy Magistrate's Office. On hearing this Narasimha Naidu gave me a Vakalutnama, ordered me to attend at the Deputy Magistrate's Office on his behalf. I went, I presented my credentials. At that time there was a *second charge* filed by

Verified by records.

Do. do.

Poligar had caused to be felled in his Inám land. The Deputy Collector said here are three charges against the Poligar; in that of Venkat Reddi I will issue a warrant for the Poligar, and have his Polliem confiscated. He also said that in the Toty's matter, the Sub-Magistrate's decision in favor of Poligar was in appeal before him, that he would take it up and punish severely. I took.

2nd complainant, Chengal Reddi's father, from some Inámdar about his Katubadi lands, which the Poligar had given to some others for cultivation, and *a third* by Toty whose name I don't remember regarding a Neradi tree, which the

B

leave and set out to tell the Poligar that a warrant was to be issued for him. I told this to the Poligar and to his son. They answered that this would be a great disgrace, and that I as Vakeel must arrange to get them out of the scrape. Narasima Naidu then called me into his room, and giving me a bar of gold weighing Rupees 103 odd, as long as a finger, and about the thickness of two fingers, told me to get it changed into money, and take it to the Deputy Collector for the purpose of stopping the warrant with which he was threatened. I took it by train to Madras to exchange. My man Venkatroyadu accompanied me. Narasimha Naidu told me I should get Rupees 500 odd on the bar of gold; that I was to give Rupees 500 to the Deputy Collector, and pay my expenses out of balances. *I went to Madras and sold the bar* at Triplicane to the brother-in-law of goldsmith Hemadri. I got some Rupees 500 on it. I was acquainted with the goldsmith. I returned to Nagari with the money, and went to the Deputy Magistrate. He again repeated that he had the warrant ready, and would send it off the following day. Nothing more passed there, but that evening the Deputy Collector sent for me. He again repeated that the warrant was ready, that it would bring great disgrace, and asked me what the Poligar was saying to the matter. I represented that the Poligar had bid me say that they were in a high position, and that the issue of a warrant should be stopped. The Deputy Magistrate answered that verbal messages were no good, and asked me whether I had brought any thing. I answered that I had brought money, and handed him Rupees 500. It was in cash. I counted it over to him. He then said I will neither issue warrant or summons, but do you take with you the Ryots and make terms. He then called up Venkat Reddi and Chengal Reddi, and pointing to me said, here is your Polliem Vakil go with him, and I will make arrangements with the Poligar. We all went to Madras having severally business there. I returned after a day's absence to Polliem. I told the Poligar what had occurred, that I had paid the Rupees 500, and that the Deputy Magistrate had said we were to make it up between us. The Poligar was very angry and accused me of having sided with his opponents, adding that he would not make terms, and that I must return to the Deputy Magistrate with Vakalut, and have a regula enquiry made. I declined absolutely saying there was no justiceto be got there. So the Poligar appointed *Nayana Chary* as Vakeel. Nayana Chary remains always at the Deputy Collector's Cutcherry, so the Poligar appointed one *Bynani Rangia* to report progress between himself and the Vakeel. Summons came for the Poligar himself, who is an old man, as witness, and for his son as Defendant. Narasima Naidu then sent for me and asked me how it was that after all a summons had come for him, and ordered me to go to the Deputy Collector. I declined and said I would lodge an *Arzi with the Magistrate* instead. Narasima Naidu consented, and I did so. I returned to the Polliem in ten days. A notice came to me from Nagari requiring my attendance in connection with the Arzi presented to Magistrate; was in Gramespett when the notice reached me, and returned at once to the Polliem. Meanwhile *the Vakil Nayana Chary* had written to the Poli- saying that the Deputy Magistrate was in a great rage, about the Arzi presented to Magistrate, that the case would fall through, and that care must be taken to send Bynani Rangia at once to Nagari. I read the letter; the Poligar was angry with me, so I started for Nagari to see what was to be done. The Deputy Magistrate was very angry with me, and threatened with imprisonment, asking me how I dared to present an Arzi to Magistrate. He showed me the Arzi to Magistrate's address, and asked me if I had written it. I said I had. He asked me whether I had presented it *propriomotu* or by direction of Narasima Naidu. I answered by his direction. I signed my deposition, went away to Polliem. On the night of my arrival, there, Narasima Naidu came to Cutcherry where I was, and asked me how matters at Nagari progressed. I answered badly, that

Extract of a letter from SUBBA ROW to Poligar, dated 12th September 1863 :—

"I arrived here from Naggari this day. In the matter of the complaint preferred at Nagari by the Reddi, you have been cited as a principal witness. A summons, was thereupon issued for you. I have stopped the summons, and have come here considering the time, and the present state of my health."

The said letter was produced by Poligar from his records.

To same effect.

Do.

Verified by record: the Arzi forwarded to Deputy Magistrate with letter, dated 19th February 1861, No. 26.

Admits.

Police Deputy Inspector General Captain HEARN's Memorandum, dated 20th July.

I had great difficulty in getting anything out of Venkata Ramanuah. He was unwilling to speak, and when brought before me said there were so many Subba Rows that he could not possibly tell. Your note gave no particulars, but I ascertained from other quarters that one "Sepoy" Soobba Row (so called) a servant of the Pulicherla Poligar Venkatakistnama Naick (Venkatachendrama Naick) did bring a bar of gold some time ago. Accordingly I sent for my friend and refreshed his memory. Whereupon he admitted reluctantly that this Subba Row from Penmari Talook did bring a bar of gold, and that he went accompanied by a Sudra caste man, age 30, short, dark, whose name he does not know, he did not buy the bar himself, but introduced him to another goldsmith, who, he believes, bought it for between 300 or 400 Rupees. I have no doubt that Venkata Ramannah did buy it himself, but is unwilling to own it.

Note by Collector.

The Polliem is an old Penmari Talook, and the Soobba Row who deposes is very generally known under the soubriquet of Sepoy S. R.

the Deputy Magistrate was very angry. Narasima Naidu then gave to *Bynani Rangia* Rupees 800 with a note to Vakil Nayana Chary at Nagari. I read the note; it was to the effect that money was sent by bearer, and that he was to make all right with the Deputy.

B. Rangia confirms.

I do not know who wrote the note. *Duffadar Kassim accompanied* B. Rangia to Nagari. Some fifteen days after this *Rangasami Mudalliar* came and halted at Kothapeta near palace. He came in a palki, the Deputy Collector's I heard. He sent his own man Guruvapa to the Poligar. I was by at the time he came to Narasima Naidu. Narasima Naidu ordered me to go and bring Rangasami Mudalliar. I did so. The three, old Poligar his son Narasima Naidu and Rangasami Mudalliar, went to speak apart. They told me to leave. After a little Narasima Naidu called me in, told some one to bring his cash box, and counted out before me to Rangasami Mudalliar Rupees 500. Rangasami Mudalliar left the following evening. I went to Chittoor. The case was shortly after thrown out in the Deputy Magistrate's Office.

Spoken to by Poligar, B. Rangia, and Nayana Chary.

P. Venkata Chendrapa Naidu, Poligar of Palicherla.

I am Poligar of Palecherla. I am about sixty-two years of age. My age and infirmity affects sometimes my memory. I remember, however, that a complaint was filed against my son Narasima Naidu. I was entered as a witness in that case. It came on for hearing before Deputy Collector Soobbaroyalu Naidu. It was pending in his Court for four or five months. I appointed first Subba Row, Vakil. He informed me that a summons would be sent for me, or if I did not attend on that, a warrant would issue. Dreading the great disgrace which such a process would bring on me, and not having at the time the requisite cash, I gave Subba Row a bar of gold about a finger long, and the thickness of two round, and told him to get it changed for its worth about Rupees 500, and pass the money over to the Deputy Collector. Subba Row afterwards informed me that he had exchanged the bar, and paid Rupees 500 into the Deputy's hand When Subba Row returned to the Polliem, he also told me that the Deputy Collector had ordered us to arrange amicably over matters. I was displeased with this arrangement, and found fault with Subba Row. greatly fearing the disgrace of such a proceeding, I sent for one Bynani Rangia Naik of Kattubadies, and giving him Rupees 1,300, told him to hand the money over to the Deputy Collector. Duffadar Kassim accompanied him with some other Kattubadies. Some little time after Bynani Rangia returned and told me he had paid the money over to Deputy Collector. *Bynani Rangia** has from his position, very full confidence.

* Is a relative of the family.

I remember Rungasawmy Mudali coming to the Polliem. He was Head Munshi in Deputy Collector's Office. He came in a palki with bearers. He put up at Kottapeta. He had an interview with me, and took my deposition. He asked for some thing, but I declined as I had already paid so much. He went away in a huff. After that neither summons nor warrant, and the case dropped for the time, and remained so until it was renewed before the Session Court. How it came to be renewed may be gathered from the Court records. I do not recollect what papers or accounts relating to these transactions are in my records, but I will have search made, and send anything that may be found.

Cloths or Jewels.

Subba Row's letter sent by the Poligar, extract of which entered in Subba Row's deposition.

C. *Bynani Rangia* sworn.—I am Katubadi Monigar. I am employed by the Palecherla Poligar on any confidential business. I am his connection, and can intermarry with his family. I remember the Reddi's complaint against the Poligar's son Narasima Naidu. It was pending inquiry in the Deputy Collector's Office some five or six months. I was employed for a time in the matter by the Poligar. My mission was to come and go and report progress between the Deputy's Office and the Polliem. I remember on one occasion being entrusted with money to carry to the Deputy Collector. It was contained in three bags, two containing Rupees 500 each, and one Rupees 300. It was counted out before me, and then filled into bags and sealed. I was told to pay the money over to the Deputy in presence of his Munshi; Rangasami Mudali, Duffadar Kassim Mullaya, and other Kattubadies accompanied me. We went by train; Kassim and I, the Kattubadies returning home. We reached Nagari in the evening. We had supper on our way to the Deputy's house; we inquired at Rangasami Mudali's house where he was. They told us with the Deputy. We asked if we might go, and were told we might. I found both sitting together inside. I knew Rangasami Mudali, though not the Deputy Collector until then. I laid the bags down before them,

and asked whether I should count out. Deputy Collector replied no matter, they are sealed, in the morning if it not right, I will speak to you. On the following day went to Rangasami's house. He told me it was all right, and on my asking for the empty bags, he returned the one that had contained the Rupees 300. I wanted the empty bags in proof of my having fulfilled my mission.

I asked if I might go; Rangasami Mudali said I might, and that I was to tell my master that no summons or warrant would be issued against him, that money had reached the Deputy Collector, and the other two empty bags could not be returned. I remember Rangasami Mudali coming after this to Polliem. I heard of his arrival only on following morning, and found him just starting when I reached the Polliem. He was travelling in a palki; the bearers I recognized as the Deputy Collector's.

(Signed) J. D. ROBINSON, *Collector.*

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Tirmal Row's, case No. 2.
Tyoor do. ,, 4.
Narrain Row's ,, 2.

D.

English year about 1856.

English year 1859.
Do. 1861 and 1862.
Do. 1863.

Yenambakam Soobbaya sworn.—I was formerly manager in the Karvetnugger Zemindary. It is the chief post. Was first appointed Dewan Peishkar in the year *Nallah*. Held that post for three years; was appointed manager in year *Sidharti*. Held it for two years; was without employ during the years *Durmatti* and *Dundupi*. In the year *Rudrobagari* became manager for some eight or nine months. I had not then the full powers of the post. Tirmal Row, Head Gumastah in Narranavanam Cutcherry is a friend of mine.

Vide District Gazette, 31st October 1863, page 395.

He was *transferred* from that office to the Maderpak Cutcherry by Deputy Collector Subbarayaloo Naidu. He was much annoyed at the transfer. He represented this to me, but I told him he had better bear on for a little and join. He did so. Some time after whilst in office as manager, I went to Nagari. *Tirumal Row was there,*

27th February 1864, on one month's leave.
26th March 1864, three do.

and asked me to intercede with the Deputy Collector for his re-transfer. I promised to do so, and there the matter ended for the time. Subsequently went to Narranavanam. Tirumal Row came to me, said that notwithstanding all his solicitation to the Deputy Collector he had not ordered his transfer. He added that *Vakil Nayana Chary* and Chengama Naidu had given him to understand that the transfer would not be ordered unless the Deputy Soobbarayaloo Naidu got Rupees 200, and begged me, therefore, to intercede for him *or give him* Rupees 200 out of what I owed him. I owed him then some money. I wrote accordingly to Chengama Naidu, then Tahsildar, asking him to pay Tirumal Row Rupees 200 out of what he (Chengama Naidu) owed me. Chengama Naidu owed me money then, and still owes me. I am not quite sure whether I mentioned in my letter to Chengama Naidu for what purpose money was to be paid to Tirumal Row, but I can produce the *rough draft of letter*, and believe it will be found that the purpose is mentioned. I was not present when money was paid, but in less than ten days after the transfer was ordered, I conclude that the bargain had been duly concluded. At that time the Deputy Collector was endeavouring to secure himself a place in the Zemindary when he retires on pension, and was visiting Nagaram every ten days or fortnight. On one of these occasions he said to me that he had been told that in Tirumal Row's matter I had got Rupees 500 from him, but had only sent Rupees 200 through Chengama Naidu to him. I answered that I had neither got Rupees 500 nor Rupees 200 from Tirumal Row, but that being given to understand that arrangements had been made to that effect, I had authorized Chengama Naidu to pay that amount out of what he (Chengama Naida) owed me. Nayana Chary is the Zemindar's Vakil. I know himwell. He is in that part of the country. He will *tell* his own story.

Who verifies.

Having dealings.

Subsequently produced.

Translation of a draft of a letter in TIRUMAL ROW's handwriting.

We had a conversation yesterday in the bandy about all affairs. Tirumal Row's affair although I have been telling several times since eight months has not been settled yet. Yourself and Nayana Chary had settled it would appear Rs. 200 I therefore hope you will credit Rupees 200 to the amount you owe me, and to pay to Deputy Collector and inform me of favorable settlement of Tirumal Row's affair. He (Deputy Collector) was ready formerly to do any thing at mere word of then Zemindar's ministerial servants. Now even our repeated requests are not easily complied with.

Tells it and corroborates.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
8th September 1865.

During the latter nine months' tenure of office I had occasion to see a Takeed for Rupees 10,000 in the Zemindar's Office. I asked what it was. S. Ramia, who was associated with me in the managership, said it is for payment to the Deputy Collector. The Takeed was to Chengama Naidu's address, who was then Tahsildar. At that time the *Tyoor case* was pending in the Deputy Collector's Court, and Ramia was going to and for in the matter. At this time S. Ramiah was managing most matters at Head Quarters, as I was busy *negotiating a loan* from the Mahunt at Tirpati.

True.

Venkatakrishnen, sworn.—I am Gumastah in Chengama Naidu's service. I get Rupees 20 a month. There is close *intimacy* between Deputy Collector Soobbaroyaloo Naidu and Chengama Naidu.

E.

Proved by letters A., B., C., Nos. 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and by witnesses Nayana Chary, Tirumal Row, Y. Soobbayah and others.

Proved by exhibits from day books found during search submitted with Collector's letter, dated 29th May 1865, No. 26, marked No. 2.

They have money transactions. In January 1864 Soobbaroyaloo Naidu's younger brother Venkatasawmi Naidu came to Nagari on a visit. Chengama Naidu entertained him in his house, and presented him with a handsome Doopta cloth worth Rupees 50 or Rupees 60. The Deputy Collector was then present. I was there also. The Deputy Collector and Chengama Naidu conducted Vencatasawmy Naidu in state round the town with music and dancing girls. Venkatasawmy Naidu remained some four or five days at Nagari. The entry in Averja book No. 5, page 42, "Rupees 54-10-0 on account of January feast" was made by me at Chengama Naidu's dictation on account of presents paid by Chengama Naidu on Deputy Collector's order on that occasion. Besides these there were other supplies furnished by Chengama Naidu to Deputy Collector from Talooks which are not entered in these books, but may be in the public accounts. There was always in attendance on Deputy Collector a Zemindary Peon to see to such supplies. Deputy Collector Soobbaroyaloo Naidu lived in the Cutcherry built by the Zemindar. In any matters relating to his own matters, [illegible] which he had an interest, Chengama Naidu was accustomed to confer with the Deputy Collector in private. I wrote the entry in Averja book No. 5, page 42, "17th Vyasi year Rudirodgari, received through Y. Soobbaya, Rupees 105." When about to enter it asked Chengama Naidu what it was. He answered that *Y. Soobbaya* had written him (Chengama Naidu) a letter telling him to pay to *Tirumal Row* Rupees 200; that Tirumal Row who happened to be at Nagari, had asked him (Chengama Naidu,) to pay the amount to Deputy Collector on account of his (Tirumal Row's) transfer back to Naranavanam from Maderpak; that the Deputy Collector had asked him to pay Rupees 100 to his private Gumastah Bhujanja Row for his marriage and carry the balance Rupees 105 to the credit of his (Soobbaroyaloo Naidu's) accounts with Chengama Naidu; that not having Rupees 100 he had only paid Rupees 95 to the Gumastah, and the Rupees 105 was thus entered. The entry in book No. 2, page 37, runs "Vyasi 19, year Rudirodgari." On Y. Soobbaya's letter paid on account of Tirumal Row to Bhujanga Row, Rupees 95. At the time Y. Soobbaya was discharging the duties of manager, but I don't remember what was his official designation. Soobbaya and Chengama Naidu had money transactions. The palki and bearers which Soobbaroyaloo Naidu used on circuit, or whenever he went any where, belongs to the Zemindar who pays for all. Besides being told by the bearers themselves, I have seen them with the Zemindar himself when he came to Nagari. The items in the day book, on account of Soobbaroyaloo Naidu's bearers, were made good from the Zemindar's accounts. Chengama Naidu was paying from time to time small presents to Deputy Collector's private East Indian Writer.

Proved also by Nayana Chary who states that no rent was paid for this or bungalow first occupied.

Proved by Nayana Chary and by some witnesses in forgery case.

Corresponding date 28th May 1864.

Corroborated by Yanambakam Soobbaya.

Do. by Tirumal Row.

30th May 1864.

Subbaya confirms this.

Nayana Chary confirms.

Chengama Naidu told me that when objecting to small advances for fuels on account of Deputy Collector that I need not enter such items. When Deputy Collector first came he occupied a small bungalow of the Zemindar's near the river for two or three months, but paid no rent, the Talook Cutcherry people told me so. He afterwards moved into the Zemindar's Cutcherry building, the arrangement was effected through Chengama Naidu, then Tahsildar.

Corroborated by Nayana Chary.

The Tyoor Ryots made a complaint against the Zemindar. It was referred to Deputy Collector, and was pending before him for *five or six* months. During that time the Zemindar's people Ramia, Y. Subbaya, the Sumpraty, were in frequent conference with Soobbaroyaloo Naidu

By records pending from July 1863 to May 1864.

and Soobbaroyaloo Naidu was also visiting Nagaram. I heard from the complainants from Chengama Naidu, and from many others, that Soobbaroyaloo Naidu took either Rupees 4,000 or Rupees 5,000 in that matter, such was the universal report.

Besides cloths and money given from the Treasury, I have heard that orders for money in Madras were *passed through Koka Chellapathe Naidu*, the Zemindar's Agent there and a great friend of Soobbaroyaloo Naidu. When the search was being made in Chengama Naidu's house, Soobbaroyaloo Naidu sent for me and told me to tell Chengama Naidu's son to take out and return to him any letters in his (Soobbaroyaloo Naidu's) handwriting. I answered that I know nothing of the letters. He asked me whether the Inspector had got hold of any, I answered I did not know. He afterwards *called up the Inspector* and asked him. After that he was much displeased with me.

Nayana Chary speaks to same effect.

Verified by Inspector on Collector's verbal examination.

Terumal Row, sworn.—When Mr. Locke was in charge in 1863, he sent me from Naranavanam Cutcherry, where I was Head Gumastah, to Maderpak, as Acting Sub-Magistrate. After acting for a month and half, I was relieved by Bhujanga Row, and returned to my substantive appointment in the Naranavanam Office. The Sub-Magistrate fell ill, and I was, by order, officiating as Sub-Magistrate; whilst so placed an order came from the District Magistrate directing that the Tyoor case then pending in the office should be transferred to the Deputy Magistrate for inquiry. The Deputy Magistrate came to Naranavanam and was very angry with me. I told him I had nothing to do with the case; that the Sub-Magistrate Arunachellia had taken it up. He sent for A.; was very angry with him also, and then took the records with him to Nagari. A Magistrate Takeed came to me, to the effect that the Deputy Magistrate had no full powers; he could not hear appeals. I, therefore, sent all the extracts of calendars direct to the Magistrate without forwarding them to him. I went to Nagari to inquire into a robbery case which *happened* in Soobbaroyaloo Naidu's house. He asked me then, why I did not send the extracts of calendars to him. I answered, that as he had no jurisdiction in appeals I was not sending them; but that if he liked, I would send copies. He was very angry, and threatened me with fine and dismissal. The Sub-Magistrate received charge, and shortly afterwards a Takeed came from the Deputy Magistrate's Office transferring* me to Maderpak. Some correspondence had taken place between the Deputy Collector and Collector with reference to this. I went to Maderpak. I fell ill, and *took leave* to Naranavanam. I returned with determination to effect an exchange either at Collector or Deputy Collector's Office. I saw the Deputy Collector, and asked him to change me anywhere, even to a post of Rupees 12 or 3 less than I was drawing. He said he could not change me. I said I would go and represent matters to Collector. Deputy Collector called his *Head Clerk, C. Rungasami Mudali*, and ordered him to write my dismissal and Memorandum to Collector. I represented the injustice of such an order to R.; he said nothing, but the order did not go that day. At that time Y. Soobbaya was at Nagari. He was a great friend of the Deputy Collector, the Zemindar's Manager. I went to him and represented the injustice done to me, saying I would resign rather than be subjected to such disgrace. Y. Soobbaya advised me not to do so, and said he would speak to Deputy Collector. He did so, and told me to remain quiet; that I had got some of my leave to run, and that the Deputy Collector would do me some good office. The Deputy Collector's Cutcherry went on circuit to Poliput. Soobbaya went there as I did also. There, S. said to me, Deputy Collector wants something from you; have you nothing to give; I said I could not. Two days after, S. told me that Deputy Collector had told him he intended well by me, but that he had a *Bramin** to get married and wanted assistance, and that he had said well, and consented. After that, Soobbaya sent me home. About ten days after, an order came *transferring me back from Maderpak to Naranavanam*, on the ground that I should not be under the Sub-Magistrate of former division. Some fifteen days afterwards I again met Y. Soobbaya. He told me that he was talking over my matter with Deputy Collector; it was arranged that Rupees 200 should be given on my account for marriage, and that he S. had written to C. N to pay that amount to the Deputy Collector. I said nothing at time. I was quiet. In course of three or four months a public Takeed came requiring me to attend at Nagari. I went. I found Deputy Collector and C. N. together. On seeing me, retired into another room, and after a time C. N came alone. He asked me whether I had repaid to Y. Soobbaya the money which he had paid on my account to Deputy Collector. I answered that I had taken no money from Soobbaya, and would give none.

F.

5th August 1863.

* 31st October 1863.

27th February 1864 one month's leave.
26th March ,, three do.

Now in Bellary Collector's Office.

* Bhujanga Row, Deputy Collector's private Gumastah.

4th June 1864.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 8th September 1865.

The Deputy Collector, who was within, heard my answer, and shouted out to me to be off in great anger. C. N. afterwards sent for me again, and advised me to make it right with Soobbaya. I answered, when Soobbaya speaks to me I will see how it stands, it is not your affair. I afterwards met Soobbaya and told him about this. He answered don't trouble about it. I give to many a Brahmin, if it comes well and good, if not no matter.

Continued on Oath, 22nd July 1865.

Dreading to implicate myself in a direct act of bribery I mis-stated in the former part of this deposition certain facts relating to the negotiation and eventual payment of the Rupees 200. These facts I now wish to set right. I was speaking then under much anxiety and embarrassment, and to facts which had happened a considerable time ago.

I have looked at the rough draft handed to me, it is in my handwriting. After representing my case, as already stated to Y. Soobbaya, I made a like appeal to the Deputy Collector's great friend, Chengama Naidu, and to *Vakeel Nayana Chary*, and Y. Soobbaya also spoke to them. Chengama Naidu and Nayana Chary then gave me distinctly to understand that nothing could be done unless I paid to Deputy the prescribed consideration of Rupees 200. I mentioned this to Y. Soobbaya, and then wrote from Soobbaya's dictation the rough draft now produced. Soobbaya put this aside, and wrote another letter to Chengama Naidu's address, which he gave to me to deliver. I gave the letter to Chengama Naidu, who took it with him into the Deputy Collector's house. C. Naidu came out shortly afterwards, and told me that the matter was arranged, and that I might go.

Confirms.

Between ten and twenty days afterwards my transfer was ordered.

G.

Ragupatti Naidu, sworn. I am one of some fifty who wrote petitions to Government, the Board, and the Collector, complaining of the exactions of the Zemindary Officials. The matter was referred for inquiry to Deputy Collector and C. N. afterwards sent for me again, and advised me to make it right with Soobbaya. I answered, when Soobbaya speaks to me I will see how it stands, it is not your affair. I afterwards met Soobbaya and told him about this. He answered don't trouble about it. I give to many a Brahmin, if it comes well and good, if not no matter.

Continued on Oath, 22nd July 1865.

Dreading to implicate myself in a direct act of bribery I mis-stated in the former part of this deposition certain facts relating to the negotiation and eventual payment of the Rupees 200. These facts I now wish to set right. I was speaking then under much anxiety and embarrassment, and to facts which had happened a considerable time ago.

I have looked at the rough draft handed to me, it is in my handwriting. After representing my case, as already stated to Y. Soobbaya, I made a like appeal to the Deputy Collector's great friend, Chengama Naidu, and to *Vakeel Nayana Chary*, and Y. Soobbaya also spoke to them. Chengama Naidu and Nayana Chary then gave me distinctly to understand that nothing could be done unless I paid to Deputy the prescribed consideration of Rupees 200. I mentioned this to Y. Soobbaya, and then wrote from Soobbaya's dictation the rough draft now produced. Soobbaya put this aside, and wrote another letter to Chengama Naidu's address, which he gave to me to deliver. I gave the letter to Chengama Naidu, who took it with him into the Deputy Collector's house. C. Naidu came out shortly afterwards, and told me that the matter was arranged, and that I might go.

Confirms.

Between ten and twenty days afterwards my transfer was ordered.

G.

Ragupatti Naidu, sworn. I am one of some fifty who wrote petitions to Government, the Board, and the Collector, complaining of the exactions of the Zemindary Officials. The matter was referred for inquiry to Deputy Collector and C. N. afterwards sent for me again, and advised me to make it right with Soobbaya. I answered, when Soobbaya speaks to me I will see how it stands, it is not your affair. I afterwards met Soobbaya and told him about this. He answered don't trouble about it. I give to many a Brahmin, if it comes well and good, if not no matter.

Continued on Oath, 22nd July 1865.

Dreading to implicate myself in a direct act of bribery I mis-stated in the former part of this deposition certain facts relating to the negotiation and eventual payment of the Rupees 200. These facts I now wish to set right. I was speaking then under much anxiety and embarrassment, and to facts which had happened a considerable time ago.

I have looked at the rough draft handed to me, it is in my handwriting. After representing my case, as already stated to Y. Soobbaya, I made a like appeal to the Deputy Collector's great friend, Chengama Naidu, and to *Vakeel Nayana Chary*, and Y. Soobbaya also spoke to them. Chengama Naidu and Nayana Chary then gave me distinctly to understand that nothing could be done unless I paid to Deputy the prescribed consideration of Rupees 200. I mentioned this to Y. Soobbaya, and then wrote from Soobbaya's dictation the rough draft now produced. Soobbaya put this aside, and wrote another letter to Chengama Naidu's address, which he gave to me to deliver. I gave the letter to Chengama Naidu, who took it with him into the Deputy Collector's house. C. Naidu came out shortly afterwards, and told me that the matter was arranged, and that I might go.

Confirms.

Between ten and twenty days afterwards my transfer was ordered.

G.

Ragupatti Naidu, sworn. I am one of some fifty who wrote petitions to Government, the Board, and the Collector, complaining of the exactions of the Zemindary Officials. The matter was referred for inquiry to Deputy Collector and C. N. afterwards sent for me again, and advised me to make it right with Soobbaya. I answered, when Soobbaya speaks to me I will see how it stands, it is not your affair. I afterwards met Soobbaya and told him about this. He answered don't trouble about it. I give to many a Brahmin, if it comes well and good, if not no matter.

Continued on Oath, 22nd July 1865.

Dreading to implicate myself in a direct act of bribery I mis-stated in the former part of this deposition certain facts relating to the negotiation and eventual payment of the Rupees 200. These facts I now wish to set right. I was speaking then under much anxiety and embarrassment, and to facts which had happened a considerable time ago.

I have looked at the rough draft handed to me, it is in my handwriting. After representing my case, as already stated to Y. Soobbaya, I made a like appeal to the Deputy Collector's great friend, Chengama Naidu, and to *Vakeel Nayana Chary*, and Y. Soobbaya also spoke to them. Chengama Naidu and Nayana Chary then gave me distinctly to understand that nothing could be done unless I paid to Deputy the prescribed consideration of Rupees 200. I mentioned this to Y. Soobbaya, and then wrote from Soobbaya's dictation the rough draft now produced. Soobbaya put this aside, and wrote another letter to Chengama Naidu's address, which he gave to me to deliver. I gave the letter to Chengama Naidu, who took it with him into the Deputy Collector's house. C. Naidu came out shortly afterwards, and told me that the matter was arranged, and that I might go.

Confirms.

Between ten and twenty days afterwards my transfer was ordered.

G.

Ragupatti Naidu, sworn. I am one of some fifty who wrote petitions to Government, the Board, and the Collector, complaining of the exactions of the Zemindary Officials. The matter was referred for inquiry to Deputy Collector and C. N. afterwards sent for me again, and advised me to make it right with Soobbaya. I answered, when Soobbaya speaks to me I will see how it stands, it is not your affair. I afterwards met Soobbaya and told him about this. He answered don't trouble about it. I give to many a Brahmin, if it comes well and good, if not no matter.

Continued on Oath, 22nd July 1865.

Dreading to implicate myself in a direct act of bribery I mis-stated in the former part of this deposition certain facts relating to the negotiation and eventual payment of the Rupees 200. These facts I now wish to set right. I was speaking then under much anxiety and embarrassment, and to facts which had happened a considerable time ago.

I have looked at the rough draft handed to me, it is in my handwriting. After representing my case, as already stated to Y. Soobbaya, I made a like appeal to the Deputy Collector's great friend, Chengama Naidu, and to *Vakeel Nayana Chary*, and Y. Soobbaya also spoke to them. Chengama Naidu and Nayana Chary then gave me distinctly to understand that nothing could be done unless I paid to Deputy the prescribed consideration of Rupees 200. I mentioned this to Y. Soobbaya, and then wrote from Soobbaya's dictation the rough draft now produced. Soobbaya put this aside, and wrote another letter to Chengama Naidu's address, which he gave to me to deliver. I gave the letter to Chengama Naidu, who took it with him into the Deputy Collector's house. C. Naidu came out shortly afterwards, and told me that the matter was arranged, and that I might go.

Confirms.

Between ten and twenty days afterwards my transfer was ordered.

G.

Ragupatti Naidu, sworn. I am one of some fifty who wrote petitions to Government, the Board, and the Collector, complaining of the exactions of the Zemindary Officials. The matter was referred for inquiry to Deputy Collector and Soobbaroyaloo Naidu, we were all summoned to Nagari. After hanging on there some ten days, a deposition was taken from Gungi Reddy. We were all present; we objected that only one deposition had been taken. Deputy answered it is all one matter; a single deposition is sufficient; you can go home. I will call you up again at another time; but in the meantime you must choose out some of the more intelligent of your members as spokesmen, and let the others remain behind. We selected four as our representatives, and had our Vakalatnamah drawn out. On presenting it, Deputy Collector refused at first to file it; we returned home afterwards we filed it. We were going to and fro between the Deputy Collector's Office and our villages for some four months. Nothing was done. Then Deputy sent for Sampratti Shervana Pillay and Budrachellia, Zemindary officials. He was rough and angry with them, but at that time was conciliatory towards us. About that time, Ramaia and Y. Soobbia came to Nagari. Ramaia did not speak to us, but Y. Soobbia made overtures which we would not listen to. Deputy then sent for accounts, and Monigars and Curnums, of our payment and the other which had petitioned to Nagari. I don't know what came of all this. After this, we went home and returned twice. Soobbia came about that time, called us out one evening outside the town, told us he had brought Rupees 5,000 to pay to Deputy Collector, and would get the case decided against us. Soon after, the Deputy called us up, and told us to get all ready for him as he was coming in person to village. We went home; we waited for a month and he never came. We heard he had gone meanwhile to Nagaram with all his family. There we were told he was received in great state; was presented with a Chandraharam gold necklace, and his wife with a cloth worth 20 Pagodas. I and Pullama Naidu went to Nagari. Deputy received us with much displeasure; said we must pay the Zemindar's demand. He afterwards ordered us home saying he would come soon. Shortly afterwards, Munshi Rungasami Mudali came. As he was making inquiry the Deputy Collector himself arrived from Chittoor. He was much displeased with us, and said Mr. Bourdillon had already decided against us, that he would do so too. We declined to sign the accounts then prepared by Munshi. Deputy returned to Nagari, and thence went to Poliput; from that time Warrants came for us. We were brought up. We were present when the Deputy collected from the Curnums and Monigars Rupees 2,000 due by them to Zemindar. I only know the money was collected, but cannot say how it went afterwards. Chengama Naidu the Tahsildar, was also at Poliput, who were there forced through C. N. to go to Nagaram. When there, Deputy and C. N. disappeared, and just as we were leaving Munshi Rungasami Mudali stopped us and took us before the Zemindar. We don't know what took place between them, but the Zemindar ordered us to pay up the demand, saying he would not let us off. We declined the terms and returned home. Thus we have been bullied for eleven months and no decision has been made up to this time. Since that, the Zemindar's people have harassed us in every way, collecting what they could; taking bonds from us, and otherwise annoying and injuring us.

(A change of tactics.)

To force the better bargain out of their fears eventually.

H.

Nayana Chari, sworn.—I was Zemindar's Vakil in the office of the late Deputy Collector S. N. I have held that post since 1862. I believe I have been recently removed by Zemindar, but have received no order. My pay was at Rupees 50 per mensem; latterly it was reduced to Rupees 30. I had close intimacy with late Deputy Collector, both public and private. I remember Tirumal Row's transfer from the Naranavanam Sub-Magistrate's office to that of Maderpak. It took place in 1863. I am well acquainted with Tirumal Row. Tirumal Row was much annoyed at the transfer, and took leave several times from Maderpak to Nagar to try and effect his re-transfer. He represented his case several times to Deputy Collector, and frequently solicited my assistance. I spoke to Deputy Collector about the matter, when he told me he had one Bhujanga Row, a private Gumashta, whose marriage he had to get performed, and that if Tirumal Row would pay the expenses of that, he would re-transfer him. Tirumal Row was also informed, that this was the condition by Chengama Naidu. Both Tirumal Row and Chengama Naidu told me that the Deputy had so settled. One day, Tirumal Row handed over Rupees 100 to me, and told me to make the money over to Deputy and get his exchange. Deputy declined to receive the money saying that the cost of the marriage must be paid. I gave Tirumal Row his Rupees 100 back. A little time after this the Deputy said to me that if Tirumal Row gave Rupees 200 he would order the transfer. He also told Chengama Naidu to tell him the same thing. Tirumal Row then got a letter from Y. Subbaya authorizing Chengama Naidu to pay him (Tirumal Row) Rupees 200 of some money due by C. M. to Subbaya. Know about his bringing the letter, because Tirumal Row was living in the house with me. I did not read it, as it was in sealed cover. I did not see C. N. pay the money to Deputy Collector; but both the Deputy himself and Chengama Naidu told me it had been so paid. In about ten days afterwards, the transfer back to Naranavanam was ordered. There was close intimacy between the Deputy and Chengama Naidu. There was frequent conference between them on public matters. I had the opportunity of observing this from my position in the office. Tirumal Row and Y. Soobbaya are great friends, and have dealings one with the other. I was retained as Vakil for defence in case against Policherla Poligar's son, pending before the Deputy Collector; Bynani Rangia made the arrangement when case came on. Deputy Collector told me to let Poligar know that as he had not attended on summons a Warrant would issue. The Poligar himself was witness in the case; it was pending some five or six months

By records of Case from September 1863 to April 1864.

in the Deputy's Court. I let the Poligar know that he was threatened with a Warrant. At this time, Bynani Rangia was going to and fro between the Poligar and the Deputy's office. On one occasion after threat of issue of Warrant, B. Rangia came to me and said he had brought and paid over Rupees 800 to the Deputy, and Rupees 500 to his Munshi, Rangasamy Muddelly, to stop issue of Warrant. The Warrant was not issued, nor was the attendance of Defendant, his son, enforced. The Deputy Collector told me, at the time himself, that the Poligar had sent the Rupees 800; that that was Rupees 200 less than the Rupees 1,000, and that I must get the Poligar to make up the balance. He added, that of the Rupees 800 even Rungasamy Mudali had had

Proved by Poligar B Rangia and Suboo Row.

Rupees 300; after that Deputy sent Rangasami Mudali in his own palki to the Polliem. He told me at the time, he had doubts whether Rangia had delivered all the money entrusted to him for that purpose, and that he wanted the Rupees 200 to be made good. I don't know whether Rangia got any money then or not. On Rangasami's return, the case was thrown out. It was afterwards committed on order from Session Court. On the Deputy's arrival in the Zemindary, a close friendship was struck up between the Zemindar and him. He occupied the Zemindar's house at Nagari and paid no rent. Neither did he pay any for the Cutcherry building he afterwards occupied as a residence. He frequently visited the Zemindary. At his head quarters on those occasions, cloths and other presents were given. I myself used to write for Zemindar's bearers when the Deputy Collector had occasion to go anywhere. The Deputy Collector never paid for them, and Zemindar even gave batta. He had one palki of his own, and when another was wanted the Zemindar's was sent for. I often accompanied him, and witnessed the gift of cloths, &c. Since six or seven

Venkatasami Naidu.

months ago, the Deputy Collector, accompanied by his *younger brother*, paid the Zemindar a visit when a horse worth Rupees 700 was presented to the latter. I was present on the occasion. Last year, there was a marriage in Deputy's house at Madras. I took down, with a note from Zemindar to Deputy's address, about Rupees 1,400 worth of cloths. I delivered them to Deputy. About four months after Deputy's arrival in the

5th August 1863.

Zemindary a robbery was committed in his house at Nagari. He valued the lost property to the Munsiff at Rupees 400, and gave the same in report to the Sub-Magistrate. The Zemindar sent his Dewan Ramen to inquire into the matter. The Deputy then represented that hit loss was Rupees 5,000; that it had been incurred in his estate; that it was a great discredit, and should in some way be made good. I was present while the inquiry was going forward and

Entered as Rupees 231 in the Police Occurrence Report, No. 727, and as Rupees 3,085-14-0 in column No. 103 of 1863 of Session Court of Chittoor.

Letter 16 found in second search, in which writing to Chengama Naidu Deputy Collector ascribes power of Police control to Zemindar.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
8th September 1865.

so heard all that had passed. Ramia said he would represent it to the Zemindar and returned to Nagaram. Some ten or fifteen days later Ramia returned to Nagari. He put up at my house. We went both together to the Deputy Collector. On the way, Ramia told me he had brought a Letter of Credit to Koka Chellapathi Naidu Zemindar's Agent in Madras in favour of Deputy Collector. He delivered the letter to Deputy saying if you send to address you will receive Rupees 5,000 on it. I then left, Chellapathi Naidu and Deputy Collector have money transactions.

I remember a complaint of the Tyoor Ryots against Zemindar being referred to Deputy for inquiry. I watched the case in the Zemindar's interests. It was pending some seven or eight months. The Ryots were kept moving to and fro; no decision was made. The Deputy went with his Cutcherry to Poliput. He sent Rungasami Mudali to Tyoor to measure the disputed lands and prepare accounts. From the time the case came into his hands he was giving me, Samprati Savaraya Pillay, Ramia and Y. Sobbaya, to understand that the case was a grave one, and that he must have something large to settle it in favor of the Zemindar. We all communicated this to Zemindar, who ordered Rupees 5,000 to be paid, and had an order prepared on Chengama Naidu for the amount and something more. Chengama Naidu was then Tahsildar of Nagari and Tirtam Talooks. Chengama Naidu brought the money to Poliput. Dewan Ramia also came from Nagaram. We three, I, Ramia, and Chengama Naidu, conferred together and then went to Deputy Collector's lodging. He put up at Savarana Pillay's. Y. Soobbaya was not there. Thirteen Currency Notes were then and there counted out before Deputy Collector by Chengama Naidu, whilst I wrote a Memorandum of the amounts and *numbers* according to Ramia's order, who was likewise present; we did so as a voucher to Zemindar for payment of money. Chengama Naidu then took up the Notes and delivered them to Ramia, who handed them over to the Deputy. As the aggregate amount of Notes thus paid was short of Rupees 5,000 by some Rupees 120 that balance was paid in cash. The Memorandum which I now hand is the Memorandum then written. Some ten days later, the case was decided in favour of Zemindary and a Khat despatched to him communicating the results. There was no further inquiry made on either side; but decision was passed on the papers and accounts prepared as before stated. The Deputy Collector was taking bribes from first to last in the most public manner.

Nos.	Amount Rupees.	Paid in Madras Bank.
* 2,650	1,000	* Paid to Arzeezalmall, Butler, residing at Triplicane Shathumal, by M. Venkata Naidu, 14th March 1864.
17,818	50	
14,560	50	
† 7,525	50	† Paid to Soobbaroyuloo Naidu, Deputy Collector Chittoor, by his Gumastah Narasinga Row, 28th April 1864.
16,195	50	
12,422	50	
‡16,528	50	‡ Paid to Chukka Chinna Kistnama Naidu, Madras Bank, Golla Vardiah, 6th May 1864.
15,597	50	
25,272	10	
1,759	1,000	Paid to [illegible] residing at Govindappa Naik Street,
2,774	1,000	No. 24, Gumastah Subboya, 22nd
3,134	1,000	March 1864.
3,852	500	Paid to Venkatasami Naidu, P. & Co.'s Dubash by Maistry Muneappa Mudali by self, 14th April 1864.

I.

Narrain Row, sworn.—I am Head Gumastah in office of Sub-Magistrate of Maderpak Division. I was formerly second Gumastah there for some three years. At that time Arunachellia was Sub-Magistrate. Arunachellia was transferred* in 1864 to Maderpak

* 23rd April 1864.

Division. He was very partial to me. I asked him when he was going to get me promoted. He promised. A Takid came promoting† me

† 30th July 1864.

to Head Gumastah in the Maderpak Cutcherry. At that time Arunachellia had gone to Nagari and passed through Naranavanam; on his return to Maderpak, I asked him how I had been appointed, he said the Deputy had told him that as *Venkia* the then Head Gumastah was useless,

Was removed at that time.

he had removed him and given his place to me, at his (Arunachellia's) recommendation. I joined at Maderpak, Arunachellia then said to me that after the Takid of promotion had been issued the Deputy had told him that as he carried out his (Arunachellia's) recommendation he must have Rupees 100. Arunachellia added, that he had consented, and asked me what I would do. I answered that the amount was beyond my means, and could not possibly be paid by me. The demand thus continued on me for some two months. A Takid then came ordering Sub-Magistrate to come up to Nagari with all his

* Dated 19th September 1864

Cutcherry. That Takid* may be seen in Office records. We all went to Nagari. The Deputy Collector was highly displeased with Arunachellia and myself in the Public Office, and observed to me that he had promoted me under the idea that I was worthy of it. I asked Arunachellia why the Deputy was thus angry. He replied because the Rupees 100, promised, have not been paid him, and again asked me what I would do about money. I pleaded inability again. Then Arunachellia had Rupees 50 brought from some source which I cannot point out, and gave the money into my hand telling me it was for Deputy Collector, and to be paid to him through present Head Clerk,

Ramasami Mudali, I took it to Ramasami Mudali, but he would not have it, saying he would take Rupees 100 if I brought it to Deputy Collector, but not this. I returned the Rupees 50 to Arunachellia. He went with money to Ramasami Mudali. He returned and told me that he had paid the Rupees 50 to R. Mudali to give to Deputy Collector, and had arranged to send the other Rupees 50 on return to Maderpak. He told me to remain meanwhile at Nagari. Some ten days afterwards he sent me Rupees 50 by the hand of *Income tax Peon, Nagari Narayadu.* A note accompanied. I tore up at the time. It directed me to pay money to Ramasami Mudali for Deputy Collector. I delivered the Rupees 50 accordingly to R. M. He took it into the Deputy's house. A little after the Deputy came out and told me I might go. Arunachellia dunned me, whilst alive, for money, and stopped one month's pay, Rupees 15.

Confirms.

Naggari Narayadu, sworn—I am Income Tax Peon in the Maderpak Division since more than a year. I recollect the late Sub-Magistrate Arunachellia giving me some money to take to Nagari. The amount was Rupees 50. I was directed to deliver the money to Narrayana Row, Head Gumastah in Maderpak Cutcherry, and then waiting at the Deputy Collector's office at Nagari, the Sub-Magistrate gave me a letter to Narrayana Row at the same time. I was not told what the money was for. I delivered the money and letter to Narrayana Row. He gave me leave saying he would follow in two days.

K.

2nd Deposition, on oath, of Ramaswami Mudali.

Last year Sub-Magistrate Arunachellia and Gumastah Narrayana Row came to Deputy Collector's Cutcherry at Nagari. They came by order. One day Narrain Row came to me and said that the Deputy Collector, Arunachellia, and Rungasami Mudali, had discussed together the matter of his promotion, and that he had brought Rupees 50, as then settled for me, to give to Deputy Collector. I declined to receive the money, observing that he better give it to those who had made the bargain. About a week afterwards, as I was sitting in the office, Narrain Row came in and said he had brought the Rupees 50 as settled by Rungasami Mudali and others, and wanted me to hand the money over to Deputy Collector; whilst speaking the Deputy Collector came in. Narrain Row arose and gave the paper parcel in which the money was wrapped into Deputy's hand. Deputy asked how much, and was answered Rupees 50. Deputy told him to return to Maderpak. He was waiting at Nagari altogether some fifteen days.

L.

I don't recollect that there was any thing particular going on at time between Sub-Magistrate and Deputy's office.

(Signed) J. D. ROBINSON, *Collector.*

Enclosure No. 2.

Case No. 2.

Case of Ramasami Mudali and Narnaya.

Ramasami Mudali, Head Clerk, Deputy Collector's Office, sworn.—On the transfer of Head Clerk Rungasami Mudali to *Bellary* the post fell vacant in the Deputy Collector's office. The salary of that post is Rupees 30 per mensem. I was at that time 2nd Clerk in the office on Rs. 15. Hearing that post was to be given by Deputy Collector to others, I pressed my claims. I was *appointed* Acting Head Clerk. I continued such until the Cutcherry went with Deputy Collector *to meet the Collector* at Arconum. There the Deputy Collector introduced me, and recommended me for the confirmed appointment to Collector. I was *confirmed.* About two months afterwards, the Deputy Collector asked me to give him Rupees 100 for having got me appointed to a good situation. I represented my inability to pay that amount, but promised to give Rupees 50. In three or four days I paid the amount myself into Deputy Collector's hands. I paid it in the evening at the Deputy Collector's house. The amount was made up out of Rupees 30 pay and Rupees 20 which I got up from Madras, from my younger brother Sabaputhi Mudali by my servant Ponnambalam Mudali. My brother will remember sending the money, although not informed by me for what purpose.

True.

Vide District Gazette, dated 26th November 1864, page 834.

True; distinctly recollect circumstances.

Vide District Gazette of the 18th February 1865, page 96.

Narnaya, 4th Clerk in the Deputy Collector's Office, sworn.—I was Attender on Rupees 7 in Deputy Collector's office. On Head Clerk Rungasami Mudali's transfer to Bellary a regular move

M

up the list took place. As Rupees 12 fell vacant, the Deputy Collector wanted to give it to his own man *Bhujanga Rowalia Murttingi Iya.* I represented that I had fallen out on reduction of establishments; that I was next to succeed in list and showed the *Collector's Order.* He *appointed* me acting. I was subsequently confirmed with the others above me. Some two months after the Deputy Collector observed angrily to me that I had stood in the way of his man's appointment. He showed his displeasure at all times I came in contact with him. I happened to know Sittaramia, a great friend of the Deputy's, and asked him why Soobaroyaloo Naiudu was always angry with me. He said you have stood in his way. You must give him something, or mischief will happen. I said I was a poor man, so I let my elder brother, who lives in Tirumani in Gudiatum, name Ramaia, know through my sister that there was a demand upon me. After some time, and with much difficulty, my brother raised the Rupees 30, brought it himself by train to Tirtani, this was in month of March. The Deputy Collector's *Cutcherry* people put up in the Chuttrum. I was there with them. My brother brought money there and gave it me. In the evening I gave the Rupees 30 to Sittaramia, saying that the money had been raised with great difficulty, and that I could not give more. I gave it to him for the purpose of being handed over to Deputy Collector. I know the money was in right hands, as Sittaramia was a friend of mine as well as of the Deputy Collector. Sittaramia afterwards told me he had delivered the money to the Deputy Collector.

Has been ascertained that he had such a person in private employment.

Produces this.

Vide District Gazette, page 834, above quoted.

Do. do. page 96, above quoted.

Proved from records that Cutcherry was at Tirtani from 3rd to 7th March 1865.

Sittaramia, sworn.—Last March I put up at the Chuttrum in Tirtani near the Tippagunta. The Deputy Collector and his Cutcherry people were halting there too. Narnaya, Gumashta in the Deputy Collector's office and an acquaintance of mine, brought me Rupees 30 saying that Ramasami Mudali had asked him 10 Pagodas to pay to the Deputy Collector for the appointment he had promoted him to, and that he wanted me to take the money in (the Deputy was sitting in the inner verandah) and see if it was so. I took the money in and delivered it to Deputy Collector. He asked me from whence it came. I answered from Narnaya. He retained it, observing it would do for charity.

N.

(Signed) J. D. ROBINSON,
Collector.

Case No. 3.

Subba Reddi's Case.

Subba Reddi, sworn.—I am Monigar of Puther. Mullappa Reddi was Munsiff at same time. When Chengama Naidu was Tahsildar of the Talook he disgraced me so much in connection with the collection of revenue that I tendered my resignation. It was accepted. I was appointed Village Police Inspector when that system was introduced. Whilst I was so employed Munsiff Mullappa Reddi died; the Inspectorship was abolished, when Sub-Magistrate directed me as temporary arrangement and until he could get final orders, to act as Munsiff. Sub-Magistrate gave Takid to that effect. Three months after, Sub-Magistrate called me up and told me to go to Nagari as he had written about me. I went, I arrived in the morning and met Chengama Naidu near Deputy Collector's Cutcherry. Chengama Naidu asked me whence I had come: the Deputy Collector was looking on from inside. I answered that Sub-Magistrate had written on my behalf for the vacant Munsiffship of Puthur. Chengama Naidu answered, the Arzi was received, and I have recommended you strongly. Chengama Naidu then went off to his house telling me to return in the evening. I went and found that Chengama Naidu had gone to the Deputy Collector's tent. I went there. The Deputy Collector had closed office so Chengama Naidu returned with me towards his house telling me he would speak about me in the morning on the following day. Deputy Collector Soobbaroyuloo Naidu held Cutcherry in the morning. I went there and saw Subbarayuloo Naidu. He told me to stop ten days as he was going to Kalahastri, and then there was a further delay of some days on account of Soobbarayuloo Naidu's absence in Madras. Eventually I went with Chengama Naidu to the Deputy Collector's Cutcherry tent. Soobbaroyuloo Naidu and Chengama Naidu were seated in chairs under a mango tree in front of tent. I went up, when Soobbaroyuloo Naidu called out to Head Gumastah, Ramasami Moodelli, to bring out the Arzi about me. The tent was close by where they were sitting. Soobbaroyuloo Naidu had the Arzi read, then both Soobbaroyaloo Naidu and Chengama Naidu got up, and were speaking together a little apart, then Chengama Naidu separated and called me to him. He said, the Arzi appointing you Munsiff will be despatched. The Deputy Collector says you must send him for his private use a good milk cow. I said such a cow was not now to be found. You will get into disgrace if you don't send one, there is another party

O.

looking out for the post. I said very well, and returned home. Out of my own cows I selected one worth some Rupees 14 and handed it over to my servant, Chakala Munigadu, with *a letter to Chengama Naidu*. My servant returned in the evening with the cow saying it had not been approved of. Some four or five days after, Parasaramudu was *appointed* Munsiff. He is not a Mirasidar. After my resignation was received, Chengama Naidu sent for me several times. I did not go. He then lost his Tahsil. I am not in bad terms with him. The cow is speckled black and white, and is still in my possession.

This letter the Inspector informed Collector he saw during the first search in Chengama Naidu' house; but could not find it when second search was made.

True.

P. *Chakala Munigudu.*—I am village washerman in Puthoor, and go messages for the Monigar Soobba Reddi from time to time. One day Soobba Reddi called me to take a milk cow which he was sending to Deputy Collector Soobbaroyuloo Naidu at Nagari. I said I did not know Deputy Collector. He told me then to take it with a note which he gave me to Chengama Naidu. I took them to Chengama Naidu's house at Nagari. Chengama Naidu asked me where I had come from. I answered from Puthur Soobba Reddi, and gave him the letter. He read it. He told me to take the cow by his back yard to the Deputy Collector's house. I took it that way. Chengama Naidu went in and told me to bring in the cow. The Deputy Collector was there. Chengama Naidu said to him this is the cow Soobba Reddi has sent. The Deputy Collector examined the cow and said it had little milk and that I might take it back again. I accordingly took it back, and told Soobba Reddi what had occurred. The cow is speckled black and white.

(Signed) J. D. ROBINSON, *Collector*.

1. The foregoing letter and its enclosures relate to certain charges which have been brought forward against the Deputy Collector Soobaroyooloo Naidoo, who has lately applied for pension. In their Proceedings, dated 21st July 1865, No. 4,261, forwarding to Government the Collector's letter, dated 18th July 1865, the Board requested the Collector to submit the case against the Deputy Collector as soon as he was in a position to do so in a complete form. The Board can only now express their regret that the Collector should have so entirely failed to carry out their wishes; for anything more incomplete, or less intelligible, than the mass of papers which the Collector has forwarded has rarely come before the Board. There is nothing to shew how any of the charges originated; and though a copy of the Collector's letter to Government, dated 27th May 1865, No. 25, is submitted, no copy of the Head Assistant's letter, from which perhaps this information might have been obtained, is sent. No account is given of the circumstances under which the document (translations of which are submitted) were obtained; nor is it clear whether they are translations of the documents referred to in the Collector's letter to Government of the 29th May No. 26 or not. No precis of the Cases against the Deputy Collector, with the evidence in support of each, has been prepared, and the enclosures of the Collector's letter are not arranged in any intelligible order; much of the evidence recorded under Cases II and IV being found to appertain to Case No. 1. Under ordinary circumstances it would have been the Board's duty to return the papers to the Collector for revision; but as the Government are apparently anxious that no more time should be lost in the disposal of the matter,* they will be submitted to Government with the following remarks.

* See Proceedings of Government, 11th July 1865, No. 1,589.

2. The Board have lettered the depositions taken by the Collector (from A to P) independently of the so-called Cases, and have left the Collector's numbers on the other enclosures of his letter. They gather from the papers that the Deputy Collector is accused of

I. Obtaining a bribe of Rupees 1,800 from the Poligar of Policherla for forbearing to do an official act.

II. Obtaining a bribe of Rupees 5,000 from the Carvetnuggur Zemindar for shewing favor to him in the exercise of his official functions.

III. Obtaining gratifications from persons likely to be concerned in proceedings before him.

IV. Permitting an official of the Carvetnuggur Zemindar to obtain an undue influence over him, and being thereby induced to issue orders contrary to justice.

V. Obtaining, or attempting to obtain, bribes for the performance of certain official acts in five different instances.

3. The first charge is based entirely upon the depositions marked A, B, C, and H. It is stated that the Policherla Poligar's son was charged with misappropriation of valuable securities, and that the Poligar himself was summoned as a witness. That in the first instance Rupees 500 was sent to the Deputy Collector, who then directed the Poligar to compromise the case; that afterwards a further sum of Rupees 1,300 was sent, upon which the case was dismissed. The Collector has drawn attention to a serious discrepancy which exists between the account of the transactions as given by Deponent A, and by Deponents B and C. The Board also observe that Deponent H states that Deponent C told him he had disposed of the money in a different way from that stated in his deposition; and his account of his conversation with the Deputy Collector on the subject is hardly consistent with the account of the matter given by Deponent C.

4. The second charge rests on the evidence of Deponent H, partially confirmed by Deponents G, D, and E. It appears that when a dispute between the Zemindar of Carvetnuggur, and some Ryots of Pyoor, regarding the rates on their land, was pending before the Deputy Collector, it was currently reported that a large bribe was given. Deponent H asserts that he was present when Rupees 5,000 was paid over; that he noted the numbers of the Notes, and it seems that one of the Notes was exchanged at the Bank of Madras by the Deputy Collector's brother, and another by the Deputy Collector himself. The defect in this case is, that Ramaia, the Zemindar's Dewan, who was stated to be present when the money was paid, has not been examined. The Collector gives no explanation whatever of this omission.

5. The evidence on which the third charge is framed is more satisfactory. Deponent H speaks to several matters in which the Deputy Collector placed himself under obligation to the Zemindar. He states that he saw Ramaia, the Zemindar's Dewan, give a Note to the Deputy Collector, and heard Ramaia say that if the Note was presented to the Zemindar's Agent at Madras, Rupees 5,000 would be paid. He also states, that he himself took valuable presents to the Deputy Collector, and his son, from the Zemindar. There is no corroborative evidence of these statements; but his further statements that the Deputy Collector lived free of charge in a building belonging to the Zemindar; that supplies were found him free of charge; and that a set of bearers was kept for him, are corroborated fully by Deponent E, and are referred to in the documents Nos. 2 D (an account,) 7, 8 and 10.

6. The fourth matter is found mentioned in the documents 3, 4, 5 and 6; from which it would appear that Chengama Naidoo, the Zemindar's Tahsildar, had great influence with the Deputy Collector. Many of the witnesses also depose to the intimacy which existed between the Tahsildar and the Deputy Collector, and the same is traceable from documents numbered 24 to 31, which relate to the forgery case, which the Deputy Collector directed to be dismissed. The Board much doubt, however, whether this charge could be legally proved.

7. The fifth charge includes no less than five bribery cases: the giver in each case being a subordinate of the Deputy Collector. The first, that of Trimul Row, a Gumastah in one of the Sub-Magistrate's offices, who states that he gave Rupees 200 to be removed from one office to another is better supported than any of the others. It rests upon his own evidence (Deponent F,) corroborated by Deponents D, H and E, and there are entries in the account No. 2 D to the same effect. The defect in the case is, that Trimul Row told a different story when first called upon from that deposed to by the other witnesses, though he afterwards altered his statement. The other four cases rest almost entirely on the unsupported deposition of the party stated to have given the bribe. Narran Row (Deponent I) states that Rupees 100 was paid to the Deputy Collector for his promotion in a Sub-Magistrate's Office; but his only witness, Deponent L., does not agree with him in detailing the circumstances relating to the actual paying over of the money. Deponent L himself a Gumastah in the Deputy Collector's office, says that he paid the Deputy Collector Rupees 50 for his promotion; but no witnesses are examined. Nisnai (Deponent M) another Gumastah in the Deputy Collector's office, states that he paid Rupees 30 to the Deputy Collector after his promotion; but the circumstances of the payment are not corroborated by his only witness Deponent N. The remaining case in which Sooba Reddi, the Munsiff of Puthur states that the Deputy Collector endeavoured to obtain a cow from him for giving him the Munsiffship rests on his own testimony, corroborated by the statement of Deponent P. that a cow was taken to the Deputy Collector but rejected by him as an inferior animal.

8. It must be remembered that the whole of the inquiry has been conducted without any cross-examination of the witnesses, and that the Deputy Collector has not yet had an opportunity of making his defence. On the whole, however, the Board think that there is sufficient on record to justify a formal inquiry into the conduct of the Deputy Collector should such a course appear to the Government to be desirable.

No. 189. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd September 1865, No. 5,433.

Read the following Official Memorandum from W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, to R. A. DALYELL, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Fort Saint George, 1st September 1865, No. 121:—

The Board of Revenue will ascertain and report whether the rumour of Subrayalu Naidu's death is well founded.

The Board understand that Deputy Collector Subrayalu Naidu died on Wednesday, the 30th ultimo.

No. 190. ORDER THEREON, 8th September 1865, No. 2,150.

Miscellaneous.

The Government cannot but express their surprise at the exceedingly confused and crude form in which Mr. Robinson has sent up this case, but as Subrayulu Naidu is no longer living, they consider it unnecessary to pursue the matter further.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Revenue 1865 Depart

Procs: of Government

No. 2150

Dated 8th September 1865

Memo: 43

The Under Secry to Govt. Pension Depart. is directed to call the attention of the Collector of North Arcot to the Notification of the 26th April 1861 published at page 591 of the Fort Saint George Gazette of the 30th idem and to request that the Collector will take measures with a view to [illegible] the immediate relief of M. Soobaroyaloo Naidoo, Dy Collector on his Estt. and report the date of his relief, so as to enable Govt. to pass orders on the application for a Pension, made on M. Subbaroyaloo Naidu's behalf.

F.B.

47

The applicant's service
counting towards pension
being only 22 y. 2 m. 15 d
he is entitled to one third
of his average salary for
the last 5 years, = to
Rs 109-10-1

The applicant was pro-
nounced unfit for further
service on the 26th April
last, and duly certified by
the Civil Surgeon. But
has been continued in
his post, pending the
selection and appointment
& posting of a successor.

— . —

No. 12 49

Pension

Official Memorandum

CIVIL PAYMASTER MY 4 1865

62 Reci

The Collector of North Arcot has the honor to retransmit the Register of Application for pension on behalf of Subbarayalu Naidu Deputy Collector returned with Mr. Donalds Official Memo of the 29th Ultimo No. 333, the age as given therein having been certified to be correct.

J. M. B.

Collector.

North Arcot
Collrs Office
Chittoor 2d May /65

Ex FMK
H.

Register of an Application for Superannuation Pension from the Establishmentof the Collector of North Arcot prepared under the Ruels passed by Government under date 13th Ap[illegible] No. 1915.

Name of the Person by whom the Pension is applied for, with name of his Father.	No. on the Establishment	Identification of Applicant's person.	Size. Feet.	Size. Inches.	Age of Applicant at the time of application. Years.	Months	Days.	Religion Caste, or Tribe.	Where residing. Province.	Pergunnah.	Village	Present Employment.	Total period of Service. Years.	Months	Applicant's service continuous or not.	How long unemployed and under what circumstance	Date of application to Government.	Average salary or authorized official allowance per mensem for the five years preceding the date of application		Salary or authorized official allowance per mensem at the time of Application.		Abstract of the grounds of Application.	Remarks by the Head of O[ffice]	Proposed amount of Pension per mensem and date from which to commence	Treasury at which the party if pensioned wishes to draw his pension	Orders of Govern[ment]
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19		20		21	22	23	24	25
Módarapu Subbarayalu Náyadu son of Módarapu Rámaswámi Náyadu	1	Fair fullface a scar under the right eye.	5	7½	50 (The applicant not having produced his horoscope his age has been entered upon the faith of his own statement which his appearance indicates to be correct.)	8	"	Vishtnu Balija	District of North Arcot	"	Nagari.	Deputy Collector 3rd Class	27	8	Continuous		26th April 1865	330 (Roughly computed as the actual data are not obtainable in this office.)	" "	350	" "	Long standing diabetis & general debility	None	165 " from the date of delivering over charge to his successor who shall be appointed by Government.	At the Presidency Treasury	

North Arcot
Collector's Office
Chittoor 26th April/65

[signature]
Collector

B:V
I.T.A.H.C

1865 - Depn.
From the Collector
of N. Arcot.
To the Civil Paymaster
Madras
dated 27th May/65
Recd
No. 12
Returned to the Registry

Collector of Kurnool
to the Civil Paymaster
Madras dated 26th
April 1865 No 6-

Register of
applications for
superannuation
Pensions-

Pens/65 Dept-
Con No. 5-1/2-