

(1) Number of pages_____

(2) Date of repair_____

(3) Initials of the Referencer_____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

Press
Mis.

to be tolded ughly handled

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 22nd July 1871.

Read the following letter from J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Palamnair, 20th June 1871, No. 329—

In reference to the endorsement on Board's Petition No. 542 of 1871, presented by Chinna-samy Mudely, late Taluq Gomastah in Wallajah, I have the honour to forward copies of the Head Assistant Collector's letters No. 285, dated 10th instant, and No. 468, dated 28th November 1870, and to observe that although petitioner was not 5th or Record Gomastah, he appears nevertheless to have been recognized as such and had been verbally ordered to attend to the records on being found unable to draft orders and read reports, etc., which form the regular duties of other Gomastahs.

Mr. Wilkinson distinctly states that his order personally given to the petitioner was not obeyed; that the records were in a state of confusion, and that petitioner was not only unable to find, but even did not know where to search for any record required for reference.

3. This apparently led to petitioner's dismissal. His total service amounts to about 30 years. He was originally Muchi in the Head Assistant Collector's office, and was appointed a Taluq Gomastah or to the pensionable grade only in 1866. Mr. Price recorded an unfavourable opinion of him in the Service Register (copy enclosed) and warned him to be more careful.

I consider that petitioner has been hastily dealt with. Some consideration ought to have been given to the length of his service. I think that six months' suspension would have been a very adequate punishment. He has now been out of employment for eight months, and this I think the Board might adjudge as sufficient punishment for the carelessness which has thus brought him into trouble.

5. His petition and its enclosures are returned.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From F. H. WILKINSON, Esq., Head Assistant Collector, to the Acting Collector of North Arcot, dated Ranipett, 28th November 1870, No. 468.

With reference to your endorsement on the appeal petition of Chinna-samy Mudely, late Record Gomastah in the Wallajah Taluq, I have the honour to submit the following remarks.

2. In paragraph 4 of his petition, appellant states that his work was not that of a Record-keeper, etc. This assertion is false. Chinna-samy Mudely always held the post of Record Gomastah, and has constantly received orders both from the Tahsildars and from myself to see that the records are kept in proper order. It is true that the appellant was also employed in preparing the different accounts mentioned in this paragraph, but this has always been the custom. The work of preparing these accounts is very light and need not interfere with record work. The Gomastah who has succeeded appellant has precisely the same work to do, and yet when I inspected the record office on Saturday last, I found all the *dufters* had been neatly arranged, records which in appellants time were lying scattered about neatly tied up in *dufters*, and all the old *cadjan* accounts arranged and docketed.

3. The assertion in paragraph 5, that when I inspected the records in 1869 appellant was acting as Revenue Inspector, is also false: appellant has never acted as Revenue Inspector, and on the 15th October was present at my inspection, and was then warned that the state of records was most unsatisfactory. It is true that the 8th Gomastah was about 1½ years ago promoted to the 5th Gomastah, but not in order that he might be employed in the record-room. Appellant was passed over because he was considered useless, and as he was unable to perform the duty of a Gomastah in preparing takeeds, reports, etc., he was always employed in the record-room and in preparing minor accounts.

4. The reason assigned (marked C.) was not that appellant would be unable, etc., but that on the day of inspection, when asked to produce such and such accounts of such and such a *Fusly*, he was utterly ignorant in what part of the record-room to look for the accounts.

5. The services of the two temporary Gomastahs employed for sorting records, was dispensed with in May 1869, and appellant and the attender were then ordered to complete the work left undone by the above two Gomastahs. These consisted of arranging, etc., the records of Fuslies 1276 and 1277. On my inspection of the records last month, I found that nothing whatever had been done, nor had the want of dufter cloth been brought to notice either by appellant or the attender.

6. The statement of appellant that the almirah was not in his charge, is false. The key of the almirah was entrusted to him and he was responsible for the state of its contents. This he partially admits in paragraph 6 of his petition.

7. The appellant was asked for an explanation at the time, but was unable to furnish any. All he could do was to attempt to throw the blame on the attender who is as useless and incapable as the appellant.

8. I enclose an extract from the last Service Register submitted in 1866, from which you will observe that as long ago as that petitioner was warned on account of his inability and carelessness. He was responsible for the state of the records, and the condition in which I found them last month, and which is inadequately set forth in petitioner's takeed of dismissal, left me no alternative but to dismiss him from the service.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. D. ROBINSON,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From C. J. KNOX, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector, to the Collector of North Arcot, dated Ranipett, 10th June 1871, No. 285.

I HAVE the honour to report on Board's Petition No. 542, dated 21st February 1871, presented by Chinnasamy Mudely, late Gomastah of Wallajah Taluq, praying to be restored to his post from which he had been dismissed by Mr. Wilkinson.

Enclosures of the docket No. 440, are herewith returned.

2. It appears that the petitioner was dismissed on 20th October 1870 on the ground that the records of the office were kept in a very careless manner in spite of frequent warnings. The petitioner pleads that he was never the Record Gomastah and therefore not responsible for the state of the records.

3. According to Mr. Pelly's scale, the 5th Gomastah should be Record-keeper, and it is true that petitioner never held the post of 5th Gomastah; he was 7th Gomastah, as stated by petitioner; in the year 1867, one Teruvengadasamy Mudely, a Volunteer in the Head Assistant Collector's office, was appointed 5th Gomastah; he was, however, afterwards removed and made 9th Gomastah; the latter from his knowledge of Maharatta, which would enable him the better to perform his duties as Record-keeper, being appointed in his place.

4. But though petitioner was never 5th Gomastah, the Tahsildar informs me that he had charge of the records. It appears that Mr. Pelly's scale was not very closely followed and that the Tahsildar used to employ the Gomastahs as he thought fit according to their ability. In this way the 5th Gomastah, under verbal orders of the Tahsildar, was doing the 2nd Gomastah's work and the petitioner that of the 5th Gomastah.

5. I must state that these facts have only been ascertained by the Tahsildar by mere inquiry in his office, there being no written orders, and I cannot say that they rest on a very firm foundation. It is evident, however, that Mr. Wilkinson all along issued directions to the petitioner as if he was the Record Gomastah, and petitioner apparently never disclaimed being such. In May 1869 the petitioner and an attender were ordered by Mr. Wilkinson to sort and classify the records, and again in October 1869 he spoke to him. Both these points the petitioner denies; with regard to the first he asks for the production of the special order, but the order was verbally given by Mr. Wilkinson in the Talook Cutcherry, and my Head Clerk tells me that he was present and remembers the circumstance; with regard to the second point, there appears to be no clear evidence, but we have the positive assertion of Mr. Wilkinson contradicting the petitioner.

6. I have now gone through the essential points of the petition. I am inclined to believe that though petitioner was never 5th Gomastah, and therefore not Record-keeper according to Mr. Pelly's scale, yet he was entrusted by the Tahsildar with the duties of that post and therefore responsible for the state of the records. Mr. Wilkinson seeing that the records were in a very bad state, a fact which petitioner does not attempt to deny, in spite of frequent warnings, dismissed him. Of course, it is for the Board to say whether the punishment was commensurate with the offence; but I think that petitioner is entitled to some consideration from his length of service.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. D. ROBINSON,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Service Register.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Petition.

THE Board do not consider that the petitioner Chinnasamy Mudely is entitled to much consideration: after long service as a Muchi he was appointed Taluq Gomastah for which post he was found quite incompetent: then he was put in charge of records and here he was negligent and useless. More than this his present petition is disingenuous, and intended to mislead.

2. The Board will not however refuse compliance with the Collector's recommendation on petitioner's behalf; petitioner has now been unemployed more than half a year, and they authorize the Collector to restore him to the public service: the Collector will ascertain if he is fit for the post which he held when dismissed. If not, he will appoint petitioner to some lower post.

3. Petitioner will be referred to the Collector, who has received instructions in his case.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) F. BRANDT,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Collector of North Arcot.

Copy to the Accountant-General.

Exd. T. Cartledge.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Name of appointment.	Nature, i.e., whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.
సహకార కలెక్టర్ గౌరవారికి కార్యం హంబంతు ముల్లా	"	"	5	"	1841 మే 8 మే 18 మే 25 మే 31	అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు
కలెక్టర్ గౌరవారికి కార్యం హంబంతు ముల్లా	"	"	7	"	1849 మే 18 మే 25 మే 31	అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు
మేజిస్ట్రేట్ హంబంతు కార్యం కలెక్టర్	"	"	7	"	1850 మే 8 మే 18 మే 25 మే 31	అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు
మేజిస్ట్రేట్ హంబంతు కార్యం హంబంతు ముల్లా	"	"	"	"	1859 మే 8 మే 18 మే 25 మే 31	అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు
గౌరవార్థం హంబంతు కార్యం హంబంతు ముల్లా	"	"	12	"	1865 మే 8 మే 18 మే 25 మే 31	అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు
హంబంతు ముల్లా కార్యం హంబంతు ముల్లా	"	"	15	"	1865 మే 8 మే 18 మే 25 మే 31	అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు
హంబంతు ముల్లా కార్యం హంబంతు ముల్లా	"	"	15	"	1871 మే 8 మే 18 మే 25 మే 31	అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు అధ్యక్షుడు

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Name of appointment.	Nature, i.e., whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.

1. అధ్యక్షుడు కలెక్టర్ గౌరవారికి కార్యం మే 8 1865
2. గౌరవార్థం హంబంతు కార్యం మే 8 2018

APPLICATION FOR ^{PENSION} GRATUITY.

1. Name of Applicant. *Boondy Scharaswamy Moodalia.*
2. Father's name. *Boondy Scharaswamy Moodalia.*
3. Sect or Caste. *Vellala, Vishnu Sect.*
4. Residence. *Chittam*
5. Present or last employment. *Inspector of Maudupet Division*
6. Date of beginning service. *15 September 1840.*
7. Date of end of service. *30 September 1874.*
8. Length of service including breaks
 of which superior
 inferior
 non-qualifying and breaks... ..
9. Class of {pension} applied for, and cause of application* *Section 4 of the Medical Certificate is herewith sent.*
10. [Average] emoluments or pay. *Rs. ...*
11. Proposed pension. *Low*
12. Proposed gratuity. *90 Rs.*
13. Date from which to commence. *...*
14. Place of payment. *Chittam*
15. Age of Applicant on this date. *34 - 10 - 25*
16. Height. *5 feet 10 inches*
17. Marks. *I have on the right cheek bone four corners of the eye on the left side of the back. Marked.*
18. Date. *31 January 1875.*

* 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.

[Signature]
 SIGNATURE OF THE HEAD OF OFFICE.

SERVICE BOOK

Name.	Name.	
	Residence.	
Caste or Race.	Residence.	
	Date of birth.	

Can be filled up to 31st Dec 1874

29261
1895 Dept.
C. V. M.

APPLICATION FOR {Pension or Gratuity —

Date of application 21st January 1898.

Name of Applicant. *Cond. Commissary Woodley*

Last Appointment. *Superintendent of the Van der Meer R. Division North West Prov.*

Class of {pension or gratuity

Amount of pension sanctioned.

Amount of gratuity sanctioned.

Date of commencement.

Date of sanction.

Grant ... order

20/10/74
gan

CERTIFIED that I have carefully read the application of the above named person and the statement of the person himself.

His age is, by his own statement 44 years and by appearance, about 44 years. I consider him to be completely and permanently incapacitated for service in the Government of the Colony to which he belongs, in consequence of

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

Civil Surgeon, Chittoor.

Vol. of {1873} Madras

PENSION.

The Accountant-General,

&c. &c. &c.

Dated 17 March 1875

G. O., 17 March 1875

Granting an invalid
gratuity of Rs 90 to
Coondy Chinnaswami,
Moodelair Cate. Komatta,
of Manderspank D.
North.