M.R.O. 1—77,006—3-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 36.

(2) Date of repair 6-12-40.

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 145 Press / Mis.

Dated 12-3- 1873.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 18

Rajahmundry Civil
Court, 20th January 1872.

From
Henry Morris Esqre.,
Civil Judge of
Rajahmundry.

To
Honorable R. S. Ellis
Chief Secretary to
Government Fort St George
Madras.

Honorable Sir,

In conformity with the instructions contained in the 4th para of the orders of Government dated 18th December 1871 No. 820, Financial Department, I have the honor to submit two medical certificates declaring that M. Jánakirámayya, Head Clerk of the Principal Sudr Amin's Court, and V. Pantayya, 3d Gumasta of the Ellore District Munsiff's Court, are physically fit for further service; and I beg to propose that the services of the latter may be retained in the public service till the end of this year, when he will be entitled to a pension of one third of his present salary. I have already recommended that the former may be permitted to remain in the service till 11th July 1872.-

I have the honor to be
Honorable Sir
Your most obt. servt.
H. Morris
Civil Judge

This is to Certify that that I have Examined Mamidela Janakiramiah, Head Clerk to Principal Sudr Ameen's Court Rajahmundry, and am of Opinion that he is physically fit for further Service.

C. King
Asst. Surgeon
Actg. Civil Surgn

Rajahmundry
10. January 1872

8th Feby 1872. No. 136.

The Govt. are pleased to sanction the retention in the public service until the 11th July and the 31st December 1872, respectively, of V. Pantayya and M. Janakiramayya.

2. The attention of the Civil Judge will be requested to Section 53 of the Civil Pension Code republished in the Fort Saint George Gazette of the 30th January 1872.

To The Civil Judge of Rajahmundry
To Accountant Genl. } despd. 8/2 c2/2/72

26-27

Ins. 18 December 1871. No. 820. Finl.

8th Feby

1872

Financial Department

From the Civil Judge of Rajahmundry

To The Chief Secretary to Government Fort St. George Madras

Dated 20th January } 1872
Received 26th do }

No. 126. No. 18

Enclosures two

Submitting medical certificates for the physical fitness of M. Janakiramayya and V. Pantayya.

With an order

Medical Certificate
for the physical
fitness of V. Paula-
=ramayya
Recd: 19/1/72

Enclosure II
In a letter from the
Civil Judge of Rajah-
=mundry dated 20th
January 1872 No 18

This is to Certify that
I have examined V. Paulayya,
3rd Gumastha Ellore Munsiff's
Court, and am of Opinion that
he is physically fit for
further service.

C.W.J.
Asst Surgeon
Actg Civil Surgeon

Rajahmundry
18th January 1872

Enclosure I

In a letter from the Civil Judge of Rajah-mundry dated 20th January 1872 No 18

Medical Certificate for the physical fitness of J. Vanlaggo

In Final 126/72

---

(9)

Audit DEPARTMENT. To be returned with reply on reverse

No.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant General's Office,
25 January 1873.

FROM THE Dy ACCOUNTANT GENERAL
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

TO THE Acting Principal Sudr Ameen
Rajahmundry

~~Sir~~, Vide your office Application for pension on behalf of M. Janakiramiah.

The Undersigned has the honor to request Explanation on the following points—

1. What was the cause of Applicant's suspension on the 9 October /52 by the then Subordinate Judge? Please forward in the translation copies of orders in connection with the suspension and restoration on appeal by the Civil Court. and state whether for the period he was under suspension any allowance was granted to him, if so the number & date of the bill should be given—
2. What was the cause of Applicant's degradation from the office of Civil Record Keeper on a pay of Rs 35 to that of 30 Rs on the 27 June /59. and from the office of Nazir on a pay of Rs 45 to that of Civil Record Keeper on a pay of Rs 30. on the 14 Feby /61—
3. What was the cause of break of one day (1st February /61). in the Applicant's Service?

DK

4. Why was the applicant shewn in the History of Service as permanent Civil Record Keeper from 14 Febry 61. while from the Annual return of Survey of that year he appears to be only Acting?

5. What was the cause of nearly 4 months delay in the submission of this application. The applicant appears to have ceased to do duty from 12 July last.

An early reply is solicited.

W. Donald
Offg Dy Accountant Genl

The undersigned has the honor to forward the following answers to the above questions.

Reply to para 1. For having been directly or indirectly concerned in giving certain parties information which enabled one of them to evade process of the Court. Copies of Proceedings in English connected with his suspension & restoration are herein enclosed. No allowance was granted them for the period he was under suspension.

1664

Reply to para 2. Was not degraded. His pay as Civil Record Keeper of the Subordinate Court was Rs 35, and his pay as the Civil Record Keeper of the Principal Sudr Ameen's Court, to which the former Court was converted, was only Rs 30. He of his own accord resigned the office of Nazir from inability to discharge the duties connected therewith, and preferred the post of Civil Record Keeper, to which he was in consequently appointed.

Do to para 3. He resigned the office of Nazir on the 12th Febry 1861 and he was not appointed to the post of Civil Record Keeper till the 14th idem, no pay was drawn for him for the 13th, hence the break.

Do to para 4. His name is entered in the Register as "Civil Record Keeper", but upon a reference to the Salary Bills I now find that full pay was drawn by him though he was designated as Ag. Civil Record Keeper until the end of June 1861.

Reply to para 5. The delay was nearly 6 and not 7 months. The Princl. Sadr Amin was absent on sick leave from the 20th August 1872. There was no Court till I assumed charge of the Court on the 22nd October 1872. In consequence of an accumulation of work in arrears, which devolved upon me, and as until the Princl. Sadr Amin's present extension of leave was applied for I was under the impression that my Ag. appointment would not continue longer than the 30th Novr. I was unable to attend to the matter and to examine the Records connected therewith until the Christmas holidays, and which I examined the records and prepared the application.

Rajahmundry
Princl. Sadr Amin's Court
3rd February
1873

Pamulottam
Ag. Pl. Sadr Amin

27th Fb.
Ag. H. C.

Accountant General's Office
Recd 11
Ansd __ 2 1873

15

Extract from the Diary of the late Subordinate Court of Rajahmundry dated the 9th October 1852.

Read the defence given by Janakiramiah Civil Record Keeper dated 8th October 1852 in reply to the charge that he had been directly or indirectly concerned in giving information to certain parties concerned in an investigation before the Subordinate Judge by means of which information one of the parties was enabled to evade the Court process.

It appears in evidence that the information in question was conveyed to the party in question the 1st Defendant in this Suit through a letter given to one Haridoss Paupiah, a private Servant in the employ of the Said Janakiramiah by the 4th Defendant who is a relation of the same cautioning him of the issue of a Summons for his & his brother's appearance before the Subordinate Judge to answer to certain counter accusations brought against them during a Summary investigation which was being conducted with reference to a Raginamah, filed in this Court falsely & deceitfully, so as stated by the 1st and 2nd Defendants in question.

The Summons for the attendance of these two Defendants was prepared altogether impromptu stale in the afternoon of the 15th Ultimo and the fact of its issue could only have been known to a very few persons (four) in the Court-house, of whom of course the Civil Record keeper was one. His duty being to enter all such in his Book. The man Haridoss Ramiah was seen by 2 peons as well as others about the Court house the same evening bringing water to the Court and the Summons having been entrusted to the above 2 peons that evening they proceeded the following morning together with another person a Police Peon acquainted with the parties to point them out,

to

---

he permitted, if he did not order, to go for that purpose and the Subordinate Judge accordingly in consideration of his previous service (he knows nothing of his conduct tho' this has not been without suspicion in reference to matters similar to that now under consideration) will not suffict the full amount of punishment which the Subordinate Judge considers he has rendered himself liable, viz: dismissal but in sentencing him to suspension for the period of 6 months trusts that the example will prove a sufficient warning to himself and the other Court Servants to prevent a repetition of the offence.

(Signed) J. J. Cotton.
Subte Judge.

(True Copy)

Ag. H. Secretary

Exd.
B.
Ag H.C.

to Narsapur the residence of the 1st and 2nd Defendants who are brothers. On the arrival at the house on the morning of the 18th they were surprised to find Haridoss Rampiah there before them and on enquiring of him what brought him there, he at once acknowledged before the *three* that he had taken 4 days leave *from* *his master* Janakiramiah, the Civil Record keeper, to go to Narsapur. Before the Court Haridoss Rampiah states that he took a letter from the 4th Defendant to the 1st, and delivered the same to him *in person*, that he reached Narsapur on the evening of the 17th having left this station, Rajahmundry, early in the morning of the 16th having been instructed to go with all despatch. He states further that he had been in the employ of Janakiramiah but had left it just previous to going to Narsapur. (He was exceedingly contradictory in this part of his evidence). It is quite clear from the examination of such witnesses as the Court has called for that the 1st Defendant was enabled to abscond through the information carried to him by this man, Haridoss Raupiah, and though Janakiramiah declares he was dismissed two months previously. It is clearly false. Or why should Haridoss Raupiah say before three witnesses examined, that he had taken leave for 4 days from Janakiramiah and again contradict the statement of his dismissal 2 months previously by saying even at the outset of his examination on this subject, that it was only one month previous, and he further denied at first all knowledge that his own brother was and is now employed in the service of the same Janakiramiah.

Upon a review of the whole proceedings the Subordinate Judge considers that it is satisfactorily proved that the information sent to 1st Defendant by which he was enabled to abscond and evade the Court's process was conveyed through the private Servant of Janakiramiah, the Civil Record Keeper, whom

he

No. 161.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Civil Court of Rajahmundry Dated 2d December 1852

Read again Extra Petition No. 788 of 1852 presented by Munchulla Janukiramaia Civil Record keeper of the Subordinate Court complaining of the Sentence of Suspension for 6 months passed on him by the Subordinate Judge as recorded in this Courts' Proceedings dated 17th Ultimo.

Read also Extra Petitions Nos. 543 & 631 of 1852, Depositions of Vissapragada Lutchana, Guddam Atchanna, Bogala Venkataswamy 4th and 5th Defendants' depositions Ameens reports see connected with the case which accompanied the Sub Courts Memo dated the 27th ultimo.

The Civil Judge is of opinion that there is no evidence that the Civil Record keeper was in any way Cognizant of the mission of Haridoss

Raupia

Paupia to Nursapoor but very much the reverse. Had he wished to convey such important information at such risk to himself he would have employed a trusty friend and not an enemy.

2 Harridoss Paupias entire statements are unworthy of credit- he is reported to have said he got 4 days leave to go from Rajahmundry to Masulipatam and of course back- his wanton falsehoods as to his ignorance that his own brother was employed by the Civil Record Keeper should not damage the credibility of his former employer but his own.

3 Petitioner's long service, high character, correctness & prudence entitle him to credence in preference to a person like Harridoss Paupia and render it also very unlikely that he would mix himself up uselessly in such a way and in such a matter as has been represented.

4 The Civil Judge is of opinion that Munchulla Jánikirámaia should be at once restored to his office and the Sub Judge is requested to take the necessary steps.-

Ordered that extract from these Proceedings together with the records be forwarded to the Sub Judge of Rajahmundry by precept returnable within 4 days from and after its receipt.

(True Extract)

(Sigd) T. A. Anstruther -
Civil Judge

(True Copy)

Exd. P.S.
of P.C.

Acting Principal Sadr Amin

1 In return to the foregoing Precept and extract of Proceedings of the Civil Court dated 2d Instant directing that the Civil Record keeper Mr. Janakiramiah be at once restored to his office. The Subordinate Judge begs respectfully but firmly to protest against the same, and further declines to comply with the foregoing Precept under the following reasons.

2 The Petitioner was *suspended* from his Office by the Subordinate Judge for reasons specified in his Summary Proceedings as entered in his Diary dated 9th October 1852, and upon what appeared sufficient evidence for the step. The Civil Judge has picked out the statements of one witneſs Harridoſs Paupiah, the servant of the accused (whose sole object being to screen, his employer was convicted of frequent prevarication to the satisfaction of the

Subordinate Judge himself) to reverse the sentence of suspension against the Petitioner; this witness being actually the very tool, by which, the Offence charged was Committed; and if it had been a Criminal case, would have been arraigned, together with Petitioner and 4th Defendant!

3 The order for Petitioners' suspension was grounded upon the evidence of the other witnesses and the truth and falsehood of Harrydoss Paupiah's evidence, was elicited by these also no one but the Civil Judge of Rajahmundry Could have viewd the record thro such a distorted medium as to call Harrydoss Paupiah the enemy of the Petitioner, or have construed the evidence of the other witnesses, so as honorably to acquit the accused after an impartial examination of the whole.

4 The Petitioner is a relative of the 4th Defendant who had lodged with him previously. What is more reasonable to suppose than that Petitioner gave the information to the 4th Defendant and the use of his own servant to perform a secret mission?

5 The Civil Judge is specially tenacious it would appear, of the honor of the servants upon the establishment of the Sub Court, as he appointed them and will not permit any fault to be found with them, which he cannot & does not instantly, and with a facility peculiar to himself, satisfactorely explain away, and set at nought the authority of the Subordinate Judge.

6 In the present case, the Subordinate Judge questions the propriety, if not authority, of the Civil and Session Judge ordering the restoration to office of a functionary suspended from employ by a competent authority, the chief of that office & till he is satisfied on this point he must decline to restore the Petitioner as directed above to his situation.

Given under my hand &c this 6th day of Decr 1852

(True copy) (Signed) J. J. Cotton
Sub Judge

No. 167.

ct from the Proceedings of the Civil Court of
hmundry. Dated 9th December 1852

Read Return dated the 6th to this Courts Precept of the 2d. Instant directing the restoration to office of Munchulla Jaunekiramaia Civil Record keeper of the Subordinate Court.

1 With reference to Circular order of the Court of Sudr Udalut dated 11th March 1830 & Extract from the Minutes of Consultation of the 18th November 1851 the Civil Judge has no doubt that he has authority to direct the restoration to Office of any person suspended or dismissed by the Subordinate Court and under Section II Regulation XXII of 1802 the Civil Judge resolves to require the Subordinate Judge to give effect to the orders of the Civil Court for the restoration of Munchulla Jaunekiramaia to his Office.

2 The Civil Judge has had under

serious consideration the necessity of referring to the Court of Sudr Udalut for their orders regarding the improper and unbecoming tone adopted by the Sub Judge in the return in question and in others also, and should the present warning fail of effect in future such an extreme step will be resorted to. The Subordinate Judge is still at liberty to apply for the withdrawal of the proceedings mentioned in this Courts Proceedings dated the 7th instant.-

Ordered, that Extract from these Proceedings be forwarded to the Subordinate Judge of Rajahmundry by Precept returnable in two days from and after its receipt.-

(True Extract)
(Signed) J. A. Anstruther.
Civil Judge

In making return to the foregoing Precept and

and Extract from the Proceedings of the Civil Court of this days date No 167 directing the restoration of Munchella Janakiramaia to the Office of Civil Record Keeper, the Sub Judge has the honor to state that the orders therein contained have been duly executed.

The Sub Judge greatly regrets that the Civil Judge has not reconsidered his Pro. in the foregoing case & also that his own remarks upon these proceedings has given offence.

Given &c 9th December 1852.

(Sigd) J. J. Cotton
Sub Judge

Exd H. of P.C.

(True Copy)

Acting Principal Sadr Amin

33

APPLICATION FOR {PENSION / GRATUITY.

1. Name of Applicant.	Manchella Janakiramayya
2. Father's name.	Ramadass.
3. Sect or Caste.	Brahmin of the Smartava Sect.
4. Residence.	Rajahmundry
5. Present or last employment.	Head English Clerk of the Princl Sudr Ameen Court, Rajahmundry
6. Date of beginning of service	6th December 1833.
7. Date of end of service	15th July 1872.
8. Length of service including breaks	Y. M. D. 38-7-10
of which superior	Y. M. D. 38-7-10
inferior	
non-qualifying and breaks	
9. Class of {pension / gratuity} applied for, and cause of application.* ...	Superannuation Pension. [illegible]
10. [Average] emoluments or pay.	Rs [illegible]
11. Proposed pension.	25
12. Proposed gratuity.	
13. Date from which to commence.	16th July 1872.
14. Place of payment.	Rajahmundry
15. Age of applicant on this date.	Y. M. D. 62-11-15
16. Height.	5-3
17. Marks.	A scar [illegible] on the right [illegible]
18. Date.	10th January 1873.

* If the application is for a compensation pension or gratuity, the nature of the change of establishment which has given rise to the claim should be fully stated.

Accountant General's Office
Recd 16/1 1873
Ansd

Ag. Principal Sudr Ameen

SIGNATURE OF THE HEAD OF OFFICE.

HISTORY OF THE SERVICE (SHOWING BREAKS) OF [illegible] Head English Clerk of the Principal Sudr Ameen's Court of Rajahmundry

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay RS.	A.	P.	Acting allowance. RS.	Date of beginning.	Date of end.	Period reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Period not reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by Accountant-General.
Late Zillah Court Rajahmundry	[illegible]	35	-	-		[illegible] 1833	[illegible] 1835	3	[illegible]	8					From the records of the Court	Verified from the records of this office. Applicant's qualifying service after deducting the period of suspension is years 38-5-16 and not years 38-7-10 as shown by the Principal Sudr Ameen
	[illegible]	25	-	-		[illegible] 1835	[illegible] 1839	2	8	[illegible]						
	Ag. [illegible]	35	-	-	35	5th [illegible] 1839	[illegible] May 1840	-	8	7						
	[illegible]	28	-	-		[illegible] May 1840	[illegible] 1843	3	4	6						
In Court of [illegible] Rajahmundry	Do. Do.	35	-	-		1st Sept. 1843	[illegible] 1843	-	-	15						
	Do. Do.	35	-	-		[illegible] 1843	5th July 1844	-	[illegible]	[illegible]						
	[illegible]	35	-	-		5th July 1844	12th January 1853	8	6	8						
	[illegible] English [illegible]	35	-	-	35	12th January 1853	[illegible] 1853	-	-	7						
	Ag. Naziz	45	-	-	45	[illegible]	16th June [illegible]	-	1	26						
	[illegible]	35	-	-		[illegible]	[illegible] July 1856	3	1	14						
	Ag. Naziz	45	-	-	45	[illegible] 1856	[illegible]	-	4	[illegible]						
	[illegible]	35	-	-		[illegible]	[illegible] March 1857	-	[illegible]	[illegible]						
	Ag. Naza	45	-	-	40	[illegible] 1857	[illegible]	-	[illegible]	[illegible]						
	[illegible]	35	-	-		[illegible]	[illegible]	-	5	15						
	Do. Do.	35	-	-		1st January 1858	1st Feby 1859	1	1	-				[illegible]		
	Ag. Sheristadar	70	-	-	70	3rd Feby 1859	4th May [illegible]	-	3	-				[illegible]		
Principal Sudr Ameen's Court of Rajahmundry	Do. Do.	70	-	-	70	[illegible]	28th June [illegible]	-	1	25				[illegible]		
	[illegible]	30	-	-		[illegible] June [illegible]	[illegible]	-	4	4				[illegible]		
	Naza	45	-	-		[illegible]	15th Feby 1861	1	3	13						
	[illegible]	30	-	-		15th Feby 1861	11th July 1867	6	4	[illegible]						
	Head Writer	50	-	-		11th July 1867	11th July 1872	5	-	[illegible]						
					Total period of {superior / ~~inferior~~} service...		....	38	7	10						
					[illegible]			-	1	24						

38-5-16

REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant.

There is nothing on the records reflecting against his character and conduct. The Principal Sudr Ameen who is on leave furnished him with a testimonial on the 18th July 1872 testifying to his good character.

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation.

He was suspended by the then Subordinate Judge on 9th October 1852 but was restored to office by the Zillah Court on appeal on 2d December 1852.

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by Applicant. See Chapter XX.

None.

4. Explanation under Section 47, Rule 1, so far as the Head of the Office can give it.

5. Any other remarks.

[illegible]
of [illegible]

SIGNATURE.

CERTIFICATE AND REPORT OF ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL.

No. 669.

CERTIFIED that (~~subject to the remarks below recorded~~) qualifying service in {~~inferior~~ / superior} grades has been duly proved for 38 years 5 months and 16 days; and that a retiring {pension / ~~gratuity~~} not exceeding Rs. 25 per mensem, is admissible under Section 58 of the Civil Pension Code. The calculations have been duly verified.

The cause of delay in the submission of this application has been explained by the Ag. Principal Sudr Ameen in his reply dated 3d Instant to this Office Objection Memo dated 25th Ultimo both accompanying.

Fort Saint George,
Accountant Genl's Office,
14th February 1873.

[illegible]donald
Offg. Dy. Accountant-General.

To,
The Chief Secretary to Government
Pension Department.

No 2694

No 118. Pension 1873 [illegible]

APPLICATION FOR {PENSION OR GRATUITY—

Date of application.

10th January 1872

Name of applicant.

M. Janakiramayya

Last appointment.

Hd English Clerk

Class of {pension or gratuity.

Amount of pension sanctioned.

Amount of gratuity sanctioned.

Date of commencement.

Date of sanction.

List

Order thereon 13 ~~[illegible]~~ March 1873 No 445

Under Section 58 of the Civil Pension Code His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to grant to Manchella Janakiramayya late Head English Clerk of the Principal Sudr Ameen's Court of Rajahmundry a superannuation pension of Rs 25 per mensem being a moiety of his salary for the last 5 years payable from the 12th July 1872

CL

To the Subordinate Judge of Rajahmundry
~~To the~~
To the Collector of Godavery Dist
Accountant General
With Regr

Dated 12/3/73

Write an order No 445