1. Number of pages. 44
2. Date of repair 20 7-3 6
3. Initials of Referee

M.R.O. 1—38,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	62.	~~Press~~ Mis.
Dated	22-2-	1972

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 149

REGISTER *of an application for Superannuation Pension under Pension Rules published under date 3rd May 1864, from the Establishment of the* Collectorate *of* South Arcot

1 Full name of Pensioner ... ... Conjeevarum Govinda Row

2 Sect or caste ... ... Madwa Brahmin

3 Residence ... ... Cuddalore

4 Present post ... ... Tahsildar of Trinomaly Taluq

5 Date of commencement of service ... 1st July 1834

6 Date of retirement from service ... 22d August 1871.

37 – 1 – 22
11 – 4 – 25
25 – 8 – 27

7* Abstract of the grounds of application.
- ~~1. Good service ... ...~~
- 2. Inability to serve longer ...
- ~~3. Reduction of Establishment~~

			Years.	Months.	Days.
8*	How long unemployed, and under what circumstances.	1. Resigned the service from to			
		2. † Reduction of Establishment from to			
		3. Suspended from 21st July to 4 August 1868.	"	"	15
		21st September 1868 ~~to~~ to 30th November 1868.	"	2	10
		4. Dismissed for misconduct from 9th October 1865 to 3d June 1866.	"	7	26
9	Total of service before 22 years of age exclusive of the period of 3 years 5 months and 24 days in ineligible grades deducted separately		8	10	9
10	Total of service not in Pension grades		3	5	24
11	Total of leave other than privilege and preparatory leave		"	2	1
	Grand Total...		11	4	25
12	Total period in Pension grades counted as service...		25	9	3
13‡	Age of the applicant at the time of this application		51	5	"

		Feet.	Inches.
14	Height	5	4

15 Descriptive marks— one boil mark on each knee on the calf and a scar below the right corner of the right eye.

		Rs.	A.	P.
16	Average salary of past 5 years	123	11	6
17	Proposed amount of Pension...	61	12	"

18 Date from which to commence ... ... 23d August 1871

19 Place of payment ... ... South Arcot

* *N. B.*—The reason of the applicant's retirement and of his being unemployed for the periods given being left, the other grounds of retirement and reasons of break in employment should be erased with red ink.

~~† It is hereby certified that no gratuity was drawn by the aplicant on reduction of Establishment in the year.~~
~~It is certified that gratuity having been granted was refunded to the amount of Rs. A. P.~~
~~Order sanctioning payment of gratuity was~~
~~Amount of gratuity granted was Rs. A. P.~~
~~Refund of gratuity was credited to the account for the month of 187 .~~

Accountant General's Office
Recd 4 10 1871
Ansd

‡ I do hereby certify, that, to the best of my belief, the applicant's age above-stated is correct. and that the al services have been proved from the records of this office & that the Ag. allowances drawn by applicant have not been reckoned in calculating the pension.

Deputy Colle

Statement of total period of Service.

Establishment.	Post.	Pay. Rs.	A.	P.	Period. From.	To.	Yrs.	Ms.	Ds.	Accountant-General or Controller of Miltary Accounts Remarks.
Cuddalore Sudr As. Court	Gumastah	5	"	"	1 July 1834	30 November 1836	2	5	"	Need not be verified as this Service does not Count for Superior pension
do	4th do	7	"	"	1 December 1836	18 May 1837	"	5	18	
District Moonsiff's Court	3rd do	8	"	"	19 May 1837	30 April 1840	2	11	12	
do	3rd do	9	"	"	1 May 1840	3 November 1844	4	6	3	
Civil Court	3rd do	12	"	"	4 November 1844	15 June 1847	2	7	12	Verified from the records of this office - acting allowances have not been taken in Calculating the average Salary.
do	2nd do	15	"		16 June 1847	7 December 1847	"	5	22	
do	1st do	21	"	"	8 December 1847	20 July 1848	"	7	13	
do	do	21	"	"	5 August 1848	31 March 1850	1	7	26	
do	Javabnivis	28	"	"	1 April 1850	15 April 1852	2	"	15	
do	Cl. Record keeper	30	"	"	16 April 1852	5 August 1853	1	3	20	
do	Javabnivis	28	"	"	6 August 1853	16 April 1854	"	8	11	
Collector's office	Magl. Javabnivis	35	"	"	17 April 1854	30 November 1855	1	7	14	
do	Ag. Revenue Hd do	75	"	"	1 December 1855	31 January 1856	"	2	"	
do	Magl. Javabnivis	35	"	"	1 February 1856	25 March 1857	1	1	25	
Trickaloor Talug	Tahsildar	100	"	"	26 March 1857	30 June 1858	1	3	6	
Mannargudy Talug	do	100	"	"	1 July 1858	18 August 1859	1	1	18	
Cuddalore Talug	do	75	"	"	19 August 1859	30 June 1860	"	10	13	
do	do	200	"	"	1 July 1860	30 April 1863	2	10	"	
Chedumbaram Talug	do	250	"	"	1 May 1863	30 November 1864	1	7	"	
Cuddalore Talug	do	200	"	"	1 December 1864	8 October 1865	"	10	8	
						Break of		7	26	
Collector's office	4th Vernacular Clerk	30	"	"	4 June 1866	6 December 1867	1	6	3	Offg Asstt to the Acctt Genl
do	do on ½ pay									
Ellavanasur Talug	Ag. Tahsildar do	157	8	"	7 December 1867	29 January 1868	"	1	24	
Villupuram Talug	Tahsildar	250	"	"	30 January 1868	20 September 1868	"	7	22	
						Break		2	10	
Trivady Talug	do	150	"	"	1 December 1868	22 August 1871	2	8	22	
						Total......	36	3	7	

	Years.	Months.	Days.			
Deduct service before 22 years of age ...	6	10	9			
Deduct service not in Pension grades ...	3	5	24			
Deduct leave	"	2	1	10	6	4
Net period of Service......				25	9	3

Explanation of Column 8 with quotations of orders of reinstatement.	*Explanation of any degradation.*
Vide separate sheets	Vide separate sheets

Detail of leave on half pay and full stoppage of pay.					*Remarks by the Head of the Office on past character and conduct of the applicant through out the service.*
From	To.	Yrs.	Ms.	Ds.	
Sick leave on ½ Pay					Vide separate sheets
9 August 1865	24 September 1865	"	1	17 A	
Private affairs leave on ½ Pay					
22nd May 1869	4 June 1869	"	"	14 B	
	Total of leave...	"	2	1	

South Arcot Collector's OFFICE,
The Cuddalore 2d October 1871.

Deputy Collector

J. H. Garstin
Collector

No. 4231
REPORT OF THE Accountant General.

	Years.	Months.	Days.
Service qualifying for pension is proved for a total period of	25	9	3
	Rs.	A.	P.
In the last 5 years of his service the average pay of the applicant's permanent post was... ...	132	5	2

under section 63(b-1) of the Pension Code, & not Rs 123-11-6 as stated by the Collector.

Applicant ~~is~~ will be eligible to an invalid pension not exceeding ~~of~~ Rupees 66-2-7 per mensem, ~~equal to~~ the moiety of his average salary during the last 5 years, under ~~Clause~~ Section 54(C) of the ~~Revised Pension Rules~~ Draft Pension Code. Should Government consider that his dismissal in the latter end of 1865 did not entail forfeiture of previous service - Otherwise, he will be entitled under Section 54(a) of the Code only to an invalid gratuity not exceeding Rs 750 equal to 5 months salary for his Service of years 5-0-11- from the date he was allowed to re-enter the service or from 4th June 1866. The Collector however has recommended a pension of Rs 60-"-".

Fort Saint George
Accountant Genl's OFFICE,
2d December 1871.

Offg Asstt to the Acctt Genl

To
The Chief Secretary to Government,
Civil Pension Department.

A. Vide Bd. Pro. of 18 October 1865 No. 6625.
B. Vide Collector's letter No. 138 of 15 September 1869.

PENSION 1871 DEPARTMENT.

No. 979.

From the Offg. Assistant to Acctt. Genl.
Fort Saint George,

To the Chief Secretary to Government,
Civil Pension Department.

No. 423

Dated 2nd } December 1871.
Received 4th }

Enclosures.

1

Verifies the service
of C. Govindoo Row
late Tahsildar of Trinomalay Talug
borne on the establishment of the South Arcot Collectorate.

G.O. No. 62.

PENSION 1871 DEPARTMENT.

No. 978

From the Collector of South Arcot

To the Accountant-General ~~or Controller of Military Accounts.~~
Madras

Dated 2d } October 1871.
Received }

No. 149

Register of an application for Superannuation Pension in behalf
of Conjivorum Govinda Row
late Tahsildor of Trinomaly Talug
borne on the establishment of the Collectorate of South Arcot

9119

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

5

No. 1226 1/2

V. S. Whiteside Esqr.
Sub. Collector of South Arcot

To
C. W. Reade Esqr.
Collector of South Arcot

Sir

I have the honour as requested in your Memo No. 357 of the 25th Ultimo in the Magisterial Department, to forward for your information the following statement in explanation of my remark, in my Magisterial Memo to your address No. 230 of the 22d Ultimo that Govinda Row Tahsildor of Chillembrum is "an extremely inefficient public servant" and after its perusal, request your Consideration of the advisability of retaining that officer any longer at the head of an important portion of the District in the discharge of the duties of which post he has so completely failed.

2. Govinda Row was promoted to the post of Tahsildor of Chillembrum in May 1863.

he

reemployment

He had then some 28 years' service and it was believed that he would quickly succeed in restoring to order his new Taluq, the most important, highly paid, and wealthy in the whole District. He was considered to be an officer of experience, sound judgment and probity, who had had former experience of a portion of the Taluq (before the recent amalgamation took place) and I therefore viewed his appointment with some satisfaction and looked forward to the Taluq's rapidly assuming the pleasing state of order and good management exhibited by my other Taluq under its present zealous and efficient Tahsildar, Vencatasubbiah.

3 I had several lengthy interviews with Govinda Row, and talked over with him my views as to the state and future treatment of the Taluq which I also communicated to him officially in writing. I urged upon him the necessity of making strenuous efforts to collect the enormous outstanding Revenue arrears, to wipe off the accumulated arrears of Revenue and

magisterial

magisterial work in other branches, and shew that, as I believe, the Taluq is susceptible of as much improvement in every way as any other Division of the District. Govinda Row promised very fairly indeed, but when I looked for some performance of his promises I was utterly disappointed.

4. There was no improvement in the Collections of Revenue. The Revenue and Magisterial Petitions were terribly in arrears, an enormous number of Darkhasts unsettled, many Boards Petitions of old date were lying unnoticed in his office, spite of repeated orders on the subject. Revenue fines were uncollected. Requisitions for informations of all kind from my office received no reply. Takids calling for answer by return of post were similarly neglected as also reminders on the same subject. There was the most unaccountable delay in the submission of the periodical statements and Returns; while, (what was far more serious and reflected directly upon his honesty) I found that Govinda Row was in the habit of abstaining from

recording

reemployment

recording his decision in magisterial Cases, that he had himself tried and disposed of, keeping the parties dancing attendance at his own office waiting for his sentence, which he continued to postpone for weeks (once for upwards of 2 months) and explaining when he did send in the Calendars that the delay had been "in order to allow the parties time to compromise".

5. Instead of improving the state of the Chellumbrum Taluq rapidly fell from bad to worse; and I became very much perplexed, knowing that Govinda Row was not a stranger to the Taluq, that he was an officer of much local experience and that he had a firm will of his own. I was the more puzzled - I found that he was in the enjoyment of excellent health and that he never left the Kasba or travelled in the Taluq, although at that time he had the assistance of a very excellent and zealous Sheristadar Colandavaloo Pillai, who had had long experience himself of the Taluq and could safely be trusted alone at the Kasba

6.

Explanation of Column 8.

The first break in the applicant's service, from 21st July to 4th August 1848, was owing to his suspension from office on suspicion of having furnished question papers to the Candidates for a Vakil's post in the Cuddalore District Moonsiff's Court. He was restored to his post on the 5th August 1848. Copies of the orders of suspension and restoration are not to be found in the records of the Civil Court, and the Civil Judge says that all the Diaries prior to 1853 have been destroyed.

The second break from 9th October 1865 to 3rd June 1866 was in consequence of his having been displaced from the office of the Tahsildar of Cuddalore on account of excessive delay in reporting the death of a Yeomiadar in the Taluq of Chedumbrum, while he was Tahsildar of that Taluq. Vide orders of Government dated 14th July and 15th September 1865 Nos 1614 and 2217, also communicated to the Accountant General.

The Government in their order dated 26 January 1866 No. 240 (also communicated to the Accountant General) had on reconsideration of the applicant's Case sanctioned his reemployment as a Gumasta - He was accordingly reappointed on the 4 June 1866 as 4th Vernacular Clerk on Rs30 in the Collector's office and was subsequently promoted to a Tahsildorship on the 7th December 1867 (Vide order of Government dated 10th July 1867 No 1538, also Communicated to the Accountant General.)

The third break in the applicant's service from 21st September to 30 November 1868 was owing to his suspension for certain irregularities brought to notice in Connection with the Taluq Treasury at Villupuram (Vide Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 12 November 1868 No 8027, also Communicated to the Accountant General.)

The applicant was removed from the post of Cuddalore Tahsildor from 9th August to 24th September 1865 on being permitted to retire without the production of a medical Certificate in Consideration of his long service of more than 31 years (Vide Government order dated 14 July 1865 No 1614.) but he was subsequently put in charge of the Cuddalore Taluq on the 25th September 1865 on the recommendation of the Collector's to

Government

Government to the effect that he should be allowed to retain his appointment as Tahsildor of Cuddalore as it was foun that his service in pension grades did not amount to 30 years and the Governmen acceded to the Collector's recommendation (Vide their order dated 15 September 1865 No 221) but although the Government only sanctione the applicant's retention in office till 30th Septem 1865, he was not displaced from office till 8th October under the circumstances represented in the Collector's letter No 39 dat 24 February 1866 (recorded in Government order dated 15 March 1866 No 658 also Communicated to the Accountant General) He was under medical treatment from 9th August to 24th September 1865 - He wa furnished with a medical certificate by the zillah surgeon, but the medical Commit refused to ratify the zillah surgeon Opinion, and thus he was not qualif for pension - As the Board in their Proceedings dated 18* October 1865 No 68 had directed that the time passed un medical treatment should be Considere

*also Communicated to the Accountant General

a

as sick leave, the period from 9th August to 24 September 1865 has not been shewn as a break in the service, but as sick leave.

Explanation of degradation

The transfer from Criminal Record keeper on a salary of Rs 30 to gwamimires on a salary of Rs. 28 was not a degradation, but a transfer consequent on the Nazir reverting to the former post (Vide Copy of the diary order of the Civil Court accompanying.)

The transfer in the 2d Instance from the post of Tahsildar of the Talug of Mannargudy on a salary of Rs 100 to that of Cuddalore Talug on Rs 75 was for having delayed payment of a cheque issued by the D. P. W., for having returned to the Supervisor a yadash said to have been couched in disrespectful terms, and for having incurred the displeasure of the Collector in consequence of several

complaints brought against him during and subsequent to the Settlement of Chedemberum Talug. The translation of the Takid No. 71 dated 19 August 1859 issued by the Collector is herewith sent.

The transfer in the third instance from the post of Tahsildar of Chedemberum on a salary of Rs. 250 to that of Cuddalore on Rs 200, was in consequence of the applicant's repeated acts of neglect of duty and gross inattention to the orders of the Sub-Collector. Vide copy of the letter of that officer dated 2d November 1864 No. 1226/2 accompanying.

In the 4th instance the applicant was not degraded, but displaced from the post of Cuddalore Tahsildar on a salary of Rs. 200, and permitted to retire from the service. Vide explanation for this item given in the preceding Column.

His employment as Gumastah was sanctioned by Government and Govinda Row was reappointed as 4th Clerk in the Collector's office on Rs 30.

In the 5th and last instance the applicant's transfer from the post of Tahsildar of Villupurum on Rs 250. to that of Trinomaly Taluq on Rs 150. was on account of certain irregularities brought to notice in Connection with the Taluq Treasury at Villupurum. Vide Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 12 November 1868 No 8027, also Communicated to the Accountant General.

Remarks by the Head of the office

It will be seen from what has been stated that the applicant's Conduct in the instances mentioned was not satisfactory. He has however served the Government for upwards of 36 years & though nearly 10½ years of that period were spent in grades not qualifying for pension and in service before 22 years of age. Deducting these as well as the time spent on leave, his net service qualifying for pension is Ys. m. d. 25-9-3. He is now 51 years old and being incapacitated for further service by defective vision as will be seen from the accompanying medical certificate he is allowed to retire from the service.

The moiety of the average salary drawn by the applicant during the past 5 years is Rs. 61-12-0, but as his Conduct for efficiency has in several occasions in his service been Called in question, the Collector is not prepared to recommend him for the full moiety of his average pay. Having in view however the applicant's long service the Collector Considers that only a slight reduction should be made and he accordingly recommends him for a monthly pension of Rs. 60 to Commence from 23d August last.

South Arcot
Collector's office
Cuddalore
2d October 1871

Deputy Collector

J. H. Garstin
Collector

List showing the services of Govinda Row Tahsildar of Tiroonamalay on the Court establishment.

Establishment	Post	Pay			Period					Remarks
		Rs.	A.	P.	From	To	y	m	D	
Cuddalore Sudr A's Court	Goomastah	5	"	"	1st July 1834	30th November 1836	× 2	5	"	×. This is not borne out by the records of this Court. It appears that the salary was paid by the Sudr Ameen out of the fees to which he was entitled under section XVI, Reg VIII of 1816.
Do.	4th ___ Do. ___	7	"	"	1st December 1836	18th May 1837	"	5	18	
Cuddalore Dt. Mff's Court	3d ___ Do. ___	8	"	"	19th May 1837	30th April 1840	2	11	12	
Do.	3d ___ Do. ___	9	"	"	1st May 1840	3d November 1844	4	6	3	
Civil Court	3d ___ Do. ___	12	"	"	4th November 1844	15th June 1847	2	7	12	
Do.	2d ___ Do. ___	15	"	"	16th June 1847	7th December 1847	"	5	22	
Do.	Head ___ Do. ___	21	"	"	8th December 1847	※ 31st March 1850	2	3	24	※. Suspended for 15 days from 21st July to 4th August 1848 on suspicion that he had furnished the Question papers to the Candidates for Vakils in the Cuddalore District Moonsiff's Court.
Do.	Javabnevis ___	28	"	"	1st April 1850	15th April 1852	2	"	15	
Do.	Criml. Record Keeper	30	"	"	16th April 1852	5th August 1853	1	3	20	
Do.	⊗ Javabnevis ___	28	"	"	6th August 1853	16th April 1854	"	8	11	⊗. Reverted to this appointment Consequent on the Nazir reverting to his former post (Criminal Record Keeper).
						Total	19	9	17	

Cuddalore
Civil & Session Court
8th September 1871

W Hodgson
Civil and Session Judge

Exd. WH

Recd. 9/8/71.

Enclosure

14

The Acting Civil Judge having had cause to observe that considerable irregularities prevail in the Nazir's department, and not being satisfied with the officiating Nazir's performance of the duties of the office, resolves to remand him back to his former situation of Fouzdaree Recordkeeper. The Officiating Fouzdaree Recordkeeper will accordingly revert to his former office of Criminal Javabnevis.

(signed) George Harris

6th August 1853.

(True Copy)

P. Cundasawmy

Sheristadar

Exd. W.J.

Translation of a Tallik dated [illegible] 19th
1871 No 71. from the Collector of South Arcot to the
of Mannargudy Taluq.

Your Arzi No 88 dated 11th Instant stating that Mr. Bywater Supervisor in the Engineers Department wrote to you a yadast in disrespectful terms have been received. In the yadast it is written in Tamil as [illegible] (i.e. with you in singular number). You should not have on this account returned the yadast to him as you have done without paying up the required amount so as to cause hindrance to the Dharmamut works. You should have properly sent up the money as requested by him and then you might have written to me about his having addressed you disrespectfully. But you have not done so and your having delayed payment for 3 days was very improper on your part. — Further I verbally enquired into some of the Complaints that have been brought against you when I was there

for

Enclosure 1

322/71

Recd 19/8/71.

remarkably and other irregularities taken in respect of some others that have also been brought against you. Although there is no satisfactory evidence to inflict on you severe punishment, still a good deal of suspicion attaches to your conduct and I am of opinion that you are not competent for a high post.

Though you deserve severe punishment for your not having paid the Engineer's Cheque, still you appear to have done so not wilfully but through ignorance. I have therefore concluded that you are unfit to be Tahsildar of such an important Talug and do transfer you from this date to the post of Tahsildar of Cuddalore Talug. You will give over the charge of the Treasury &c of that Talug to the Sheristadar and take charge of the Cuddalore Talug from the Sheristadar of that Talug.

(Signed) A. C. L. Macdonell
Collector

True Translation

J. H. Garstin
Collector

Then I called to mind what you had mentioned to me when Govinda Row first joined the Talug that his great fault was his disposition to apathy and procrastination, and inattention to orders received from his superiors. I proceeded to call upon him to fulfil his promises, to exert himself more than he had been doing, and to show that his selection for the only first class Talug in the District had not been a mistake. My remonstrances, both verbal and in writing had no effect whatever, when I was near him I believe Govinda Row really did a good deal of work, as soon as I was at a distance he seemed to do, literally nothing.

The infliction of repeated petty fines upon an officer of the grade of Tahsildar is, I consider, a great mistake, and I studiously have avoided it. Indeed had I fined Govinda Row for the innumerable shortcomings I have had to notice the amount and number of the fines would speedily have attracted the attention of the Board of Revenue. I consider that occasionally when a Tahsildar or Taluk Magistrate has been guilty of gross or excessive irregularity and delay a fine may fairly be inflicted and it is this that I have to record so comparatively [illegible] upon Govinda Row. If for a Tahsildar should be above the punishment of the petty fine incurred by a lazy Gumastah or clerk, and if he systematically neglects his work, he is not fit for the post he holds and should be removed.

8. I continued to remonstrate by Takid and urge Govinda Row to greater diligence, and on more than one occasion I wrote to him in a friendly manner with my own hand on the same subject. For your information I enclose copy of an official memo. I sent him in English on the 18th December last in which I urgently drew his attention to his continued neglect of duty and called upon him to try and earn the handsome salary he was drawing, warning him in conclusion that if he continued to neglect his work

he must infallibly lose his Taluq. I mention all this in order to show you what consideration I have always shown towards Govinda Row from 1st July 1863 to 31st October last no less than 154 Takids on various subjects were sent to him from my office noticing, with reproof, delays and irregularity of different kinds on his part and issuing orders which have hardly ever been obeyed.

9. These are general statements I proceed to show more minutely the various items of his misconduct at the close of 1863 (that is when Govinda Row had had charge of the Taluq 8 months) there were Rs. 18630 Revenue Kist in arrears, Rs. 142 of Revenue Fines uncollected, 8 Boards Petitions several of them of dates as far back as 1861, 26 Magisterial Takids unanswered, 1295 Magisterial Petitions undisposed of, 195 Revenue Takids and 904 Revenue Petitions in the same state, Magisterial Cases pending settlement and 1413 Darkhasts.

10. At C[illegible]lose of Fusly 1273

(where

(when Govinda Row had been at the head of the Talug 16 months) the state of the Talug was as follows. There were Rs. 74,373. Revenue Kist in arrears; Rs. 514 of Revenue Fines uncollected, 15 Boards Petitions several of them of dates as far back as 1861, 61 Magisterial Takids unanswered, 1097 Magisterial Petitions undisposed of, 289 Revenue Takids and 1108 Revenue Petitions in the same state, 1 Magisterial Case pending settlement and 1558 Darkhasts.

11 I have lately been compelled to hold a public investigation (Calendar Case No. 149 of 1864) in which Govinda Row was Defendant charged with gross and continued disobedience to my express orders prohibiting his employment of a large and excessive number of Volunteers in his office, whereby an unlimited opportunity for fraud and tampering with official records was afforded. I assigned a certain number of individuals whom I mentioned by name as Volunteers in his office, and I forbade his allowing any other Volunteers to enter the Kachery or interfere in the discharge

of

of public business. This order Govinda Row deliberately set at defiance; he openly admitted several friends of his own to the Kachery as Volunteers, and that for many continuous weeks. The result was that one of those men so brought in by Govinda Row was accused tried by me on the charge of criminally misappropriating the records of a Magisterial Case (which Govinda Row had himself tried, and in which an appeal had been preferred to me). I convicted him, fined and imprisoned him, and also fined Govinda Row on the charge stated above under Section 188 of the Penal Code. The Sessions Judge has since reversed this sentence on the legal ground of the indictment being incomplete, and the evidence not showing clearly to whom the disobedience of Govinda Row had caused harm or annoyance. Considering that it is not advisable that he should thus escape punishment for the offence to which he has himself pleaded guilty. I am now taking proceedings against him on another and similar charge, which I should not have pressed to a trial but for the action of the Sessions Judge as above shown.

12 Since the close of last Fusly I have continued to incite Govinda Row to some semblance of activity but in vain. The state of the Taluq now is as follows. There are Rs. 26,340, Revenue Kist in arrears for past Fusly, Rs 225 of Revenue Fines uncollected, 13 Boards Petitions several of them of dates as far back as 1861, about 22 Magisterial Takids unanswered, 1256 Magisterial Petitions undisposed of, 305 Revenue Takids and 1298 Revenue Petitions in the same state, 4 Magisterial Cases pending settlement and 1557 Darkhasts. And as you know the last Quarterly criminal statement for the whole District was detained until the 22d ultimo owing to Govinda Row's failure to send his statement in spite of repeated peremptory orders. The arrears of Revenue is being collected at the rate of Rs. 20 to Rs 30 per diem for the whole Taluq, often it is much less,

---

16 October 1864
No 387

in the other branches of his work no improvement is taking place.

13 That his neglect is not only complained of by me I may mention that the Superintendent of District Police has lately brought to my notice that Govinda Row has not yet submitted his B Form statement for September, and also that the former similar statements from January to August which had been returned to him for correction were still detained by him, spite of repeated reminders. On [illegible] June last Mr. Harington the District Engineer complained to you (during my absence on leave) that he had 4 times written to the Tahsildar of Chellumbrum for certain agency accounts which he needed quickly for reference in the preparation of some estimates in his own office, and that Govinda Row had paid not the slightest attention to his requisition.

14. To such an extent does this neglect prevail as regards my own demands that I am now frequently obliged (when I must have certain information out of Govinda Row's

office) to send one of my own Delayets with the Takid to Govinda Row and order him to wait at the Kachery until the Tahsildar gives him a written reply. This is now being done in the case of the Board's Petitions Nos. 1341 and 3388 of 1861 relating to the Village of Valayamádevi, and to which Petitions the Board of Revenue have specially referred in the concluding portion of their Proceedings of the 24th ultimo No. 6992. The Tahsildar was specially called on by an order from this office on a Memo from your own office No. 2296 dated 22 April last, to state when he would send in his report on these Board's Petitions as also on 2 others of 1862, he named a certain date and subsequently obtained an extension of the time. Up to this date though nearly 6 months have expired since that date as fixed by himself, he has not sent in any report upon any of those Petitions.

15. His Darkhast statement for August 1863 was not sent in till

October

October, when it was useless and when he was called on to explain the delay in question he did not reply until February 1864.-

It is a standing order that sales of land for arrears of Revenue shall be conditional for one month after such sale in order to allow time for appeal, and Tahsildars must of course report the sales as soon as they take place. Such a sale took place in June last in the Varigalweli village but the Tahsildar Govinda Row did not report the sale to me for 2½ months and when I sent him an order asking for further information and explanation of the extraordinary delay on his part in his reply he studiously avoided attending to the delay. On this occasion I considered his conduct so culpable that I fined him Rs.-

It is needless however for me to go on multiplying instances of Govinda Row's continued and surprising neglect of duty. I could furnish you, if you

Consi

Consider them requisite with scores of similar cases, but at present it seems to me not required, and only tending to make this letter more prolix.

17. I have endeavoured to show you as clearly and concisely as I can the grave cause for complaint that Govinda Row has persisted in furnishing against himself. I have treated him with continued consideration and forbearance. During the 18 months that he has had the Taluq he has only been fined three times, and those at long intervals. I am sick of the wearisome effort of endeavouring to carry some work out of a man in Govinda Row's position. He has got the finest Taluq in the District, it is a troublesome one I admit and the post of Tahsildar is no sinecure but still a man of even ordinary capabilities could do something in the way of maintaining order and conducting routine work. But Govinda Row does really nothing. The Taluq is getting a bad name as unmanageable and ruinous to the credit of the officer at its head,

which

which it does not at all deserve, and as Govinda Row has shown himself so impervious to rebuke or remonstrance, so thoroughly [illegible] and indolent as really not to care what happens about him, I would beg earnestly to put to you for serious consideration the question Can Govinda Row be allowed to remain longer in the Taluq he has so mismanaged.

18. He has had 29 years' service and can now retire from the service with a claim to pension, and as he has shewn so decided a determination in this persistent [illegible] of duty I do not see how he can consistently with the interests of Government be allowed to go to a less important Taluq which I believe he is very anxious to do.

19. His natural abilities are superior. He has good judgment when he chooses to use it. He can get through his work very fairly indeed, when he likes to exert himself, but he will do neither one nor the other, either of his own accord or

on my stimulation and therefore I have addressed you at so much length in order that you may decide how much longer he is to be left an incubus on the Chillamberum Taluq. The time for remonstrance has passed and it is now to be considered what punishment should be awarded.

I have the honour to be
Sir
your most obt. Servant
(Signed) W. S. Whiteside
Sub Collector

South Arcot
Sub-Collector's office
Cuddalore
2nd November 1864

(True Copy)
J. H. Garstin
Collector

J.H.G
23/8/71

I Robert Wilson Civil Surgeon Cuddalore do hereby certify that I have carefully examined C. Govindo Row Tahsildar of Trinamaly Talook. South Arcot that his age is by his own statement 51 and by his appearance about 55 and that I find him to be physically unfit for further service from defect of vision. the result not in my opinion attributable to intemperance or other irregular habits

R. Wilson MD
Surgeon
Civil Surgeon

Cuddalore
23 August 1871

Pension Department,

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter:

From the Collector of South Arcot, dated 2nd October 1871 No. 149.

From the Officiating Assistant to the Accountant General, dated 2nd December 1871 No. 423.

Order thereon 22nd February 1872 No. 62.

Conjeveram Govinda Row on whose behalf the foregoing Application is submitted entered the service in 1834, and up to the 22nd August 1871, had served for years 36-3-7 of which period years 25-8-27 qualify for pension. He is now declared to be unfit for further service.

2 In 1848 he was suspended on suspicion of having furnished question papers

JDS

I would say 55

Considering that

for a whole year

of the last 15 years

he was on [illegible]

Pens 978/71

papers to candidates for Examination as Vakeels.

3. In 1859, when Tahsildar of Munnargudy he was degraded to a lower Tahsil for having refused payment of a D. P. W. cheque accompanied by what he considered a disrespectful communication, and on account of suspicion attaching to him in connexion with some complaints investigated by the Collector.

4. In 1864, he was again degraded from the taluk of Chedumbram on Rs 250, to that of Cuddalore on Rs 200, for gross and obstinate neglect of duty and disobedience of orders. On perusal of the copy of the sub: Collector's letter on this subject, the Government are surprised

that

that he escaped dismissal.

5 In 1865, a case of extreme delay in reporting the death of a Yeomiahdar having come to notice, the Government directed that Govinda Row, who was in fault, should be displaced from his Office as Tahsildar and made to retire on pension. On its appearing that he was not entitled to it, without a medical certificate, the Government permitted his re-employment as a Gumastah, and subsequently authorized his promotion to a tahsildarship on the occurrence of a vacancy. The second break in his service is the period during which he was out of employ on this occasion. The Government are of

opinion that this break ought not to be considered as caused by dismissal and entailing forfeiture of previous service. He was displaced in order that he might retire on pension.

6. In September 1868, it was ascertained that the treasury of Govinda Row's taluk, Villapuram was in great disorder, that sums of money were not credited when paid in, and that there was an actual deficiency of cash. The Tahsildar was tried magisterially on a charge preferred by the Shroff, of having extorted from him 3 bonds for Rs 900 to cover a defficiency in the treasury. The charge was dismissed there being no evidence of compulsion; but it appeared beyond doubt that the bonds had been obtained for the purpose specified. In view of the great neglect and incompetence shown by the Tahsildar, though no dishonesty was proved against him, the Revenue Board authorized his degradation to a lower taluk. On this occasion he was under suspension for 2 months 10 days.

7. What has been said above shows that the applicant was never efficient and that he several times his conduct was open to grave suspicion. It is impossible that he should be granted the maximum pension. He is eligible

ligible to Rs 66-2-7
er mensem and the
Collector recommends
Rupees 60. The Government
cannot grant more than
Rupees (5~~0~~5) fifty five per men-
sem which sum is sanc-
tioned with effect from
the 23rd August 1871.

&c.

(drafted by Mr Stokes)

To The Collector of South Arcot
— a — Accountant Genl.

Govt. of {1872} Madras.

Pension

To

The Collector of
South Arcot

Dated Feby 22d }
Recd. }
1872, No. 62.

Nos.

Granting a reduced pension of Rs 55 to C. Govinda Row late Tahsildar of Trinomalay Taluq of South Arcot Dist.

20-2-94√
~~19-11-95~~
19.6.03