

(1) Number of pages 2(2) Date of repair 7-3-42(3) Initials of the Referencer CR

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pension DEPARTMENT.G.O. No. 868

Press

~~Mis.~~Dated 10-7-

1881

Not to be folded or roughly handled

TO

THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE
BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF C. RAMA ROW,
LATE TALUQ SHERISTADAR OF CONJE-
VERAM RESIDING AT SAIDAPETT.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That the Petitioner was in the Government service for upwards of 33 years in several responsible posts and last held for upwards of 7 years the office of Taluq Sheristadar from which post Mr. Farmer, the Acting Sub-Collector of Chingleput, upon the *ex-parte* and false reports of the Tahsildar of Conjeveram Mr. Seethapathy Naidu, which were not shown to the Petitioner and, without holding any fair enquiry or taking any written explanation in spite of repeated requests, degraded him to a 3rd Class Revenue Inspectorship on Rupees 20 under that very Tahsildar, in compliance with his recommendation.

2. That against such order and Proceedings of the Sub-Collector, the Petitioner appealed to the Collector, fully and plainly setting forth all the facts and not only proving that the allegations made by the Tahsildar were absolutely and entirely false, but also that they were deliberate concoctions meant to cover his own serious faults and to hoodwink Mr. Farmer in respect of them. The petition sets forth with irresistible proofs the partial and prejudiced manner in which the Sub-Collector wilfully supported the Tahsildar, ignored the facts stated by the Petitioner and would give him no opportunity of a written explanation. The farce of the enquiry he held is fully exposed in the Petition to the Collector.

3. That the Petitioner considers it unnecessary to trouble the Honorable Board with an exposition here of the facts and charges, as a full, straight forward and conclusive account will be found in the petition to the Collector, and only most respectfully begs of the Honorable Members the favor of a patient perusal of the petition, in which the Petitioner has neither omitted nor run over any single matter that should be stated. The perusal is particularly requested, as it would be far more convincing than any narration here and as on that account no description is attempted in this paper.

4. That the Collector first returned the petition on the ground that it was "couched in exceedingly disrespectful and insubordinate language as regards the appellant's superior officer the Sub-Collector" and in reply to this the Petitioner, omitting a sentence which the Collector marked, resubmitted that petition with another covering petition dated 18th October last. In this covering petition the Petitioner respectfully submitted that he meant nothing disrespectful and insubor-

3

dinate but that "there was no use mincing matters or concealing the obvious injustice and partiality which the Sub-Collector has but too prominently displayed from the beginning" in his case, that "the existence of such a prejudice would be evident in every step of his Proceedings" and the Petitioner "would not have been candid or truthful, had he not called attention to this fact," that he laid bare the full facts as they happened in the hope of obtaining a redress on *the merits of the case*; that he expressed truly his grievances and could not conceal them "without serious want of candour," that he omitted the specific part objected to and was prepared to modify consistently with truth any other expressions which were thought objectionable, the remark having been general, and that the favor of an award of justice on the *merits of the case* was most eagerly requested.

5. This Petition too elicited a similar reply from the Collector (vide his endorsement of the 31st October last) as he would not still enter on the *merits of the case*, and absolutely refuses to receive the Petition on the same *preliminary objection*, namely "disrespectful and insubordinate language," still refusing to point out the expressions that seemed to him objectionable. He directs the Petitioner to the Board for appeal against this decision. If any expressions were of the nature he described, he might still have been pleased to inquire into the merits of the case, noticing also the language of the Petition. But the Honorable Board will perceive from this and other circumstances the anxiety of the Collector to shirk meeting the glaring revelations before him. The Petitioner submits that his too plain exposure of the scandalous proceedings against him has been purposely avoided under the plea set up by the Collector. A perusal of the Petition will convince the Honorable Members that, though the Petitioner may have expressed himself strongly because he has suffered severe and unprecedented injustice, he has still expressed himself *truly* and he is certainly unable to see the disrespect and insubordination which the Collector sees in the *disagreeable exposure of the whole truth*.

6. That the Collector's anxiety to evade justice to the Petitioner will be corroborated by the fact that though copies of certain papers for appealing against his decisions were repeatedly applied for (more than three times), none of the papers applied for have yet been granted. The Petitioner submits herewith copies of these applications and the preliminary objection to the 2nd of them. No reply to the other two has yet been received. The delay in appealing which has arisen from such causes along with severe illness has been reported by the Petitioner to the Board in his petition dated the 30th ultimo. He submits this appeal without the papers and requests the Board to direct the Collector to grant them.

7. That the Petitioner has been persecuted in every way by the Revenue authorities of the District. That even the six months' leave without pay applied for by the Petitioner, requested while he was Taluq Sheristadar, was after the lapse of more than 3 months denied by the Sub-Collector and on appeal to the Collector was denied by him too, though it was explained to both the officers that the leave was absolutely necessary for the purposes of appeal as well as for saving the Petitioner from further persecution and disgrace, nay, from the prisoner's 'dock' to which the Tahsildar was prepared to lead the Petitioner the moment he should get under his clutches. The Petitioner made no secret of the evident intention

of the superior officers to get rid, as avowed by them, of the Petitioner, by the devices of Mr. Seethapathy Naidu. Their marked partiality will be patent to the Board from the enclosed papers (Marked P, Q R, S, T and U) and the Board are respectfully requested to grant now 9 instead of 6 months' leave without allowances now become necessary as the period first asked for is fast running out.

8. That, in such minor matters as the transit pay and casual leave referred to in paras 14 and 15 of the Petition, the Sub-Collector has done Petitioner wanton injustice which the Collector has not remedied, and Petitioner begs to trouble the Board for the redress of his grievances therein stated.

9. That, the Petitioner not having had the leave sought for, has been served with a notice through the Tahsildar threatening with dismissal if he should not join the Revenue Inspectorship in 3 days and the Petitioner forwarded a reply, copy of which (Marked X) is herewith enclosed. In spite of this explanation the Tahsildar has announced the Petitioner's dismissal by a Takeed (copy Y) herewith enclosed, of course, under the instructions of his superior the Sub-Collector, and the Petitioner addressed the Sub-Collector the application (Z) herewith submitted on one anna stamp for the return of his former representation with his endorsement. This application has been after a week's delay returned as requiring an 8 annas stamp, though it is sufficiently stamped under the Court Fees' Act with one anna. It struck the Petitioner that this was only evading matters so as to prevent appeal, and Petitioner has hastened to submit the Tahsildar's dismissal Takeed alone to the Board. Copies of the correspondence with the Sub-Collector in regard to the notice threatening with dismissal have been submitted to the Collector with application (copy S), who has not departed of in his usual way of not noticing such matters. The Petitioner humbly trusts that the Honorable Board may be pleased to take such notice as they think fit of the extraordinary aggravation of injustice, which the Sub-Collector has made bold to inflict on the Petitioner by the Tahsildar's dismissal order.

10. That the Petitioner having stated the facts above, has only to submit to the Board a true representation of the motives which induced the Tahsildar and Sub-Collector to be the instruments and the Collector to be the supporter of the series of unjust persecutions to which the Petitioner has been systematically subjected. The Petitioner would not have ventured to disclose the motives, if he had not strong grounds for proving their existence, and if the statement was not relevant to a proper understanding of the case.

The causes of the strong bias evinced by the Collector in direct disregard of the facts before him are mainly two:—1st The Collector's anxiety to vacate Petitioner's post by compelling Petitioner to retire, and 2ndly, the well known fact of Mr. Seethapathy Naidu the notorious Tahsildar being a favorite of the Collector and of the Sub-Collector. In November 1878, Mr. Price asked the Petitioner to retire from service on pension on the ground that he was entitled to a moiety of salary as pension. Petitioner begged to be excused because he was too efficient to produce a Medical Certificate of incapacity and because his circumstances did not permit leaving the service. Since then the Collector annoyed the Petitioner in various ways, however carefully he might work, and in spite of satisfactory explanation. Nothing availing however, he purposely transferred the Petitioner to work under

4

Mr. Seethapathy Naidu, as he was the only favorite and confidential Tahsildar who could take and carry out the hint thrown by such a step, namely:—trying to lay out some snare for the Petitioner and bullying him so as to make him leave office. The Tahsildar was not slow to take the hint, and the Sub-Collector to whom the Collector had, as the Petitioner hears, taken the labour of writing a number of demi official letters to work out the Petitioner's ruin, was prepared with his connivance at and ready support of the Tahsildar's mighty services to please the Collector. The Tahsildar who is known in the District as *the man* for such services, began to please the Collector by writing falsely against the Petitioner within a week after joining the new office and not long after occurred the *fracas* in the open public Cutcherry, which neither the Sub-Collector nor the Collector would notice even after repeated representations and for prosecuting the Tahsildar for which the petitioner has now appealed to the Board for sanction. The Collector, though he must know that his trusted Tahsildar over-did the service for him, naturally feels bound to screen him from the hands of justice. The 1st hint and the final support to the Tahsildar whose misdeeds are far-famed but who is emboldened to do them all by the sunshine of master's favor which he richly enjoys, are bad enough for a Collector in any case and are much worse in the case of Petitioner who has not offended either the Collector or his Tahsildar. His only offence was his refusal to retire and the Collector has been resolutely venting his grudge against him for that offence.

11. That the Petitioner was aware, therefore, that there was no use of any kind in an appeal to the Collector who was the secret source of the clique but that, as the Board insist on having the appeal brought through the usual channel, he did so. The Collector's motive in rejecting the Petition on a purely preliminary plea appears to be simply that the petition might be referred to him by the Board for report and that he could then have the opportunity of making an *ex-parte* version to suit to his own desire, and thus prevent a fair hearing before the higher authorities. The Petitioner most respectfully begs that, if any representation is made to the Board by the Collector, Petitioner's explanation might be taken on it before any action is resolved on.

12. That the Petitioner respectfully seeks the appointment of a Special Commissioner to inquire into any facts connected with the Petition, as the local authorities are too prejudiced to take a fair view of or hold a calm inquiry into the case. The revelations that will then be made will be sufficient to convince the Board of the amount and gravity of the injustice done.

13. That the Petitioner humbly prays, therefore, for restoration to a Taluq Sheristadarship in a different District, for payment of all arrears of pay lost by the Petitioner by such arbitrary proceedings, for the grant of leave from the 24th of June last to enable Petitioner to redress his grievances in appeal and for the grant of such other redress as to the Board may seem proper.

Petitioner begs to remain,
The Board's humble obedt. servant,
(Signed) C. RAMA ROW,
Late Taluq Sheristadar of Conjeeveram.

SAIDAPETT,
10th December
29th September 1880.

To

J. F. PRICE Esq.,

The Collector of Chingleput District.

MOST RESPECTED SIR,

1. I C. Rama Row, late Taluq Sheristadar of Conjeeveram, beg respectfully to submit this appeal against the order of the Sub-Collector No. 361, dated 23rd June last (copy A sent herewith) and the Proceedings No. 1 of the Sub-Collector therein referred to, as bearing date the 23rd Idem, but found to be actually dated the 7th idem, as per copy B herewith sent.

2. The order above referred to is brief and refers me to the Proceedings next mentioned. This Proceedings is an elaborate document consisting of 3,823 words, where the same things are often repeated to swell its size and to offer matter for another condemnation or abuse of myself or an additional puff of flattering testimony to the Tahsildar. In every para and in the finding of every issue, the Sub-Collector has been uniform in awarding a snub unfailingly to me, irrespective of the quality of the act and without desiring to sift it thoroughly, and on all those points which affect the Tahsildar praising him in highly eulogistic terms. A calm perusal of the Proceedings alone would show how anxious and predetermined the Sub-Collector is to support every act of the Tahsildar and to condemn every act of mine and how one-sided and partial his off-hand and ill-considered decisions are on each point. In dealing with this document, I thought of analysing the substance and meeting each charge thus analysed. But he has often repeated the same matter in a way that might leave an impression of something being unanswered, if I followed that plan. I shall therefore deal with each para separately in a brief and precise manner, answering fully all the accusations.

3. I beg the favor of your kind attention to one very important feature in my case. The Tahsildar forwarded against me numerous Urzees, misrepresenting matters in which he himself is guilty and falsely accusing me without my knowledge. I do not know how many he sent and what they contained. Having had reason to suspect strongly the existence of such correspondence, I requested the Sub-Collector that they might be sent up to me and a *written explanation* taken from me regarding each of them. I made this request repeatedly. I addressed Urzee No. 1 so early as the 5th May last (Copy C herewith sent) requesting the according to me of the simple and fair justice of hearing me by a *written explanation* regarding the Tahsildar's Urzees of which I knew not the contents. This not having been replied to, I addressed a second Urzee No. 5 of the 1st June last (copy D herewith sent) making the same request. I also begged the Sub-Collector verbally to take a written explanation. To none of these requests was there any reply. They were quite unheeded. Such a course of Proceeding must certainly involve a favorite Tahsildar and it was not to Mr. Farmer's point to see that such should be the case. This simple fair act of hearing the other side, conceded publicly by

2
law to the worst criminals was studiously avoided and denied in my case. My repeated representations were of no avail and this course, though directly opposed to the spirit of G.O., Department Public Works No. 1,401, dated 15th September 1879, which distinctly requires written defences to be taken, was yet the method which was most suited to the Sub-Collector's intentions and was carried out persistently by him. Too great attention cannot be invited to this intentional and studied omission.

4. Para. 1 of the Proceedings is to the effect that the Tahsildar reported me for 4 acts of insubordination, for incompetence, for repeated inattention to well known orders and for gross carelessness and recommended me for degradation to a Revenue Inspectorship. The Sub-Collector, of course, finds every one of the Tahsildar's allegations true and awards the punishment recommended by the Tahsildar in a manner that should be most agreeable to him—namely by reducing me to the very last class of Revenue Inspectorships and to an appointment under the very Tahsildar whose malice will be immensely gratified and vanity and importance greatly enhanced by such a result. From what will appear in subsequent paras, it will be clear to your honor that all these charges are illfounded. The Sub-Collector has, it will be seen, identified himself throughout with the Tahsildar, and, pledged as it were to such a unity of interests, very carefully made the Proceedings an exposition that would most naturally be expected from the ill-willed Tahsildar himself; and has, by himself assuming consistently the position of the prosecutor and the Judge at the same time, saved the Tahsildar the trouble of making a further superfluous prosecution. In not a single instance does he say that he has any reason to find fault with the Tahsildar or to consider me free from fault. He says he thoroughly believes the Tahsildar in all he says and, of course, thoroughly disbelieves the Sheristadar in anything which may call into question the veracity of the favorite Tahsildar or the propriety of his conduct. The Sub-Collector has had, however, the candour to assert such a preconception at every stage of his decision, pronouncing unhesitatingly the Tahsildar's evidence trustworthy and Sheristadar's untrustworthy. The remarkable Proceedings under notice abounds with proofs of the Sub-Collector's marked partiality to the Tahsildar which will speak for themselves but it will be necessary to consider the facts that happened prior to the production of this memorable Tahsildar—Sub-Collector's document as throwing light on the prejudices and feelings that were uppermost in his mind.

5. Mr. Farmer says in para. 2 of the Proceedings that he considered that he could not "do justice to the case without a personal enquiry on the spot," that he therefore examined the Sheristadar, Tahsildar, and witnesses at the Conjeveram Taluq Cutcherry on the 29th May and 5th of June, and that the Tahsildar's and the Sheristadar's statements are in English. This sounds just enough. But let me first submit the instances that had previously occurred, to which I referred in the last sentence of the preceding para in which Mr. Farmer showed the desire to "do justice" to me in a note worthy manner.

On the 18th April last, I joined my Taluq Sheristadar's appointment at Conjeveram. Since then I went carefully into the state of business going on in

3
7
the office. I found that a number of books, accounts and registers which ought to have been kept under the Board's and the Collector's orders were not kept at all, and some which were kept were not regularly entered or rightly kept, that the Gumastahs had no defined work and responsibilities, that they and the peons, in fact all the office establishment, were strictly instructed by the Tahsildar not to obey me and were in fact instigated to set my orders at defiance, that gross irregularities and omissions and inaccuracies were prevalent in the office owing to the disorder that existed in it for a long time prior to my joining it, and subsequently through the Tahsildar's instigations, that the Tahsildar was angry with some Gumastahs for having shown to me some Arzis relative to my department, and treated me with wilful disrespect and contempt and that, in every way he could, he prevented the satisfactory conduct of business by me. Finding all my overtures to the Tahsildar my servile attentions and my special request unavailing, I alluded to the irregularities in my Arzi No. of the 5th May last (copy C) promising a subsequent full report and on the 15th of May 1880, I addressed Arzi No. 4 (copy E sent herewith) reporting all the above facts and praying that under the circumstances either myself should be transferred to any other Taluq or strict instructions be issued to the Gumastahs and Accountants not to slight my orders and to the Tahsildar not to disturb the working order. To this, no reply whatever was given nor was this matter inquired into at the time of the so-called personal local enquiry. I alluded to the matter again in my Arzi No. 5 of the 1st June last (copy D). Of this, too, no notice was taken. The matter was a very important one and seriously involved state interests and the proper conduct of official business. But my Arzi D on this subject reflected great discredit on the conduct of the Tahsildar and the Sub-Collector considered that 'justice' would best be done to this case by not noticing the matter at all. Here then is a beautiful proof of the Sub-Collector's professed anxiety "to do justice" by local enquiry, in any matter where the Tahsildar is involved, whatever may be the interests of the state at stake.

The Proceedings (copy B) is dated the 7th June 1880, but as remarked in para. 1 of this appeal petition according to Takeed A. should bear date the 23rd idem. If this be so there is another pretty instance of glaring partiality that had happened before that date.

On the 11th June last the Tahsildar came to my room and used criminal force against me in public Cutcherry while I was doing Magisterial business. He pulled the Magisterial papers in my hands and on the table with which he had no concern and directed his peons to carry away forcibly my table to a corner in another room, notwithstanding that I held it pressed. My very turban, my private box containing my private papers and money and the Treasury and Magisterial seals and keys, were thus forcibly carried away.

I reported these unprecedented and high handed criminal proceedings against a Magisterial colleague in a public office, to the Sub-Collector on that very day in my Arzi No. 8 of the 11th June last (copy F sent herewith). No notice whatever was taken of such a serious matter. On the 14th idem I addressed another Arzi (copy G sent herewith) reporting my inability to get on with the completion of the Magisterial Proceedings without the seal which was carried away. The Tahsildar

had thus virtually deprived me of the Taluq Sheristadarship, in anticipation of favorable orders from the Sub-Collector. Of course the Sub-Collector came to the rescue of his friend and wrote to me a reply (copy H herewith sent) in which he acknowledged the receipt of the last mentioned Arzi and replied that he did not believe in any of the matters mentioned therein by me and further than this—that he “would suspend” me “even without reporting to Government if I made excuses without performing Magisterial work.” This reply speaks for itself. I might add that since then I applied for sanction to prosecute the Tahsildar for the public commission of the criminal offence and after a long and evasive delay and subsequent reminders, the Sub-Collector replied he declined to move in the matter, and as I have appealed against this decision, which is based on no grounds, to your honor, I shall not say more, on this subject here. But I invite the favor of your notice to the course adopted by the Sub-Collector which sufficiently indicates his determined partiality.

It will be thus clear that the personal enquiry thought fit to be instituted in the present case against me was to do me the sort of “justice” that he had resolved to deal out to me. Your honor is aware of the peculiar facilities which a *viva-voce* examination indifferently carried on affords for distorting facts and case so as to suit them to the examiner's own intentions. There is no guarantee that the correct answers are given and, if given, are correctly recorded, with reference to the right contexts, and ample room exists for manipulating matters agreeably to one's views especially when the statements which the Sub-Collector states were taken down from me in English have neither been read out and explained to me nor required to be signed by me. I was not made aware of what was written or what portion of my verbal explanation was taken down, and whether every statement was taken with any qualifications I made. To avoid such imperfect inquiry I requested often enough that a written explanation might be taken from me. But this, as I have already pointed out, the Sub-Collector purposely studiously avoided. The questions to the witnesses put to them under unfavorable circumstances in the presence of their dreaded Tahsildar were besides far too leading and suggestive to admit of their mistaking the intention of the Examiner. I was prevented from cross-examining the witnesses.

6. The Sub-Collector refers to 4 cases of insubordination. The first of them on the 27th of April which is disposed of in para 2 of the Proceedings was in respect of receipt of money from the Vettiyanis. It is not true that the Vettiyanis were *clamouring*. But they were waiting with the money. I asked the shroff to receive the money and caused receipts to be entered in the chitta in their order up to 3 P. M. and afterwards to receive and keep in the Amanath Box. The Tahsildar then came at about 2-30 P.M., and asked the Shroff to continue the work of receiving money and entering the same in the Chitta till 4 P.M. After 4 P.M., he directed further receipts to be kept in the Amanat Box. I accordingly directed the Shroff and Masalgi to take such money to the Amanat Box. But the Tahsildar required me to count the money from each village and to carry and place it myself in the Amanat Box and prohibited the Shroff and others from rendering any assistance. This work of counting and carrying to the Amanat Box is not the usual duty of the Sheristadar and I accordingly considered it a wilful

provocation and respectfully refused to do so, saying it was not my duty. Had the Tahsildar not wilfully interfered, treasury work would have smoothly gone on. These are the facts of the case. I did not refuse to receive remittances—a duty which I have been daily doing as the Sub-Collector who has swallowed the Tahsildar's story entire gives out. Of course the Sub-Collector believes the evidence against the Sheristadar quite trustworthy and disbelieves the Sheristadar's. He does not however say where I contradicted myself or prevaricated, but, adding this insult to injury, finds this *grave* insubordination proved against me.

The next case is referred to in para. 4 of the Proceedings and is stated to be a refusal to sign the statement of particulars of coin in the box, kept in a note-book. These particulars were voluntarily written by the Tahsildar and I have signed the note-book—a fact which makes the whole accusation false. The Sub-Collector states I denied and asserted—I asserted and I denied. He tries to make out a prevarication on my part. Of course there is no limit to the extent to which he can charge with prevarication so long as an offhand, imperfect and ambiguous *viva voce* examination is made, and the different answers are not explicitly understood or read out by him. But the beauty of the *mis-spent* zeal he displays in his finding against me in this instance is that the signature the *absence* of which he says I am unable to explain is really *present*—that therefore the ground work of the whole charge he has found proved against me with the aid of his trustworthy Tahsildar is really a phantom of his own and his guide's imagination. In fact it never occurred to Mr. Farmer to send for the note book and look into it during the inquiry. Such was the ready confidence he put in the gospel of the Tahsildar. The Tahsildar is in this para praised for his truthfulness. I hope however that the page which must be now an eyesore to Mr. Seethapathy Naidu is not abstracted and replaced by another.

The 3rd case, of alleged refusal to count the notes, is dropped gratuitously by the Sub-Collector. However he is not on better grounds here than elsewhere. There was no refusal actually but a request for the assistance of the Shroff in doing the business, as the notes which were very numerous and formed a good bulk could not be counted within the time then before me. The Tahsildar insisted on my doing the whole work unaided, and, as he was the examining officer and I was only assisting him in the work, I respectfully suggested that he might be good enough to count a portion. This was *grave* insubordination, for which also Mr. Farmer is sorry he is unable to do me “justice.”

The 4th case of insubordination (referred to in para. 6 of the Proceedings) is one of refusal to certify the correctness of an account under the Land Improvement Act. The facts of the case are these. The Nagadi Gumastah prepared the account from certain materials under instructions from the Tahsildar. The Tahsildar sent the account on to me by the Nagadi Gumastah, stating that it was ready for despatch and must be signed by me at once. There was nothing in the statement prepared to show the different periods and some other materials with reference to which the interest was calculated on each item of a long list of 124 entries. The Tahsildar hurried me and required me to sign it at once and send the same on, as it must be immediately despatched. Under the circumstances, with the mate-

rials before me, I could only calculate and see whether the totals of the figures therein given were correct. This I did, and afterwards signed the account. The Nagadi Gumastah took the account to the Tahsildar. A day or two afterwards the Tahsildar sent the account by another Gumastah, writing thereon that I should certify the correctness of the account. Now too the Tahsildar was in great hurry. I replied that with the usual work on hand I wanted a day or two to check the accuracy of the account from materials to be picked up from other papers. I could not certify its accuracy without such an examination. I wrote accordingly on it and sent back the account to the Tahsildar, who, instead of giving the account and the time required, kept it to himself and carried a tale to the Sub-Collector. It was also a fact that the Gumastah did not show me the Takeed as alleged by him—but this was not the ground on which I refused to certify. I had suspicions of the incorrect preparation of this account. Subsequent revelations during the enquiry, which showed that only 5 of the 124 entries were correct, clearly established beyond doubt that the account was thus a wilful snare created by means of a Gumastah for involving me. It will appear, however, further, that, though I did not certify the account and make myself responsible for it, the Tahsildar preserved it without sending it to me for examination as I requested and informed the Sub-Collector that I signed the false account, without explaining why I signed and the extent to which I stated I was responsible and the pressure of emergency alleged to me. The fraudulent Gumastah who committed the many mistakes was let scot free screened by the Tahsildar for whose benefit he did so. When the Sub-Collector and the Tahsildar tried to fasten on me a responsibility from which I receded as far as I could consistently with official subordination and care, without even so much as censuring the Gumastahs, it will be clear to your honor that the Tahsildar caused the snare to be laid out. My having declined to verify till I should examine is here made a charge of, instead of being considered a good point. Even when barely signing under pressure, I had taken care to calculate the correctness of the paper from such materials as were apparent on it, though it is not the duty of the Sheristadar to do the work of the Gumastah over again in every such matter.

In para 7 the Sub-Collector takes me to task for having refused to sign the stamp chitta, saying "I do not know what scorpions or snakes there might be in it." This is all his statement of the case and looks ludicrous in itself. The Sub-Collector has not stated all the facts, not having elicited the cause from the Tahsildar.

In the course of the examination of stamps the Tahsildar sometimes contradicted the numbers as stated by me and sometimes would not say whether I was right or wrong. When he asked me at the end to sign, I said, I could not do so without verifying the account myself under the circumstances. My having figuratively referred to the dangers in such accounts as snakes or scorpions has afforded matter for ill-timed ridicule.

In para 8 the Sub-Collector has come to the conclusion, after such a statement of the cases of insubordination, that I have been guilty of repeated acts of

insubordination coupled with insolence. The inference does not follow from his premises, and little comment is necessary on this foregone conclusion.

7. Para 9 of the proceedings dwells on my incompetency in the conduct of Treasury work. Case No. 1 cited under this head is my closing the chitta at 3 p. m. on the 27th April and the alleged refusal to receive remittances after that time. The former act which the Sub-Collector considers a proof of ignorance or disregard of orders, is quite in accord with Board's Standing Order No. 196.

which states that the chitta should be closed at noon on the day of preparation for accounts. This day is the 27th under a recent order. The Sub-Collector is therefore wrong and his comment over my 'excuses' is here also so much labor lost. The alleged refusal to receive remittances is not true so far as I was concerned. In the very yadast to which the Sub-Collector refers, I have stated that persons who came to me then with the money were expressly required by me to deposit it in the box.

The Shroff who reported a different practice in the Taluq was told he might do as he pleased, as I thought such an order might have emanated from the Tahsildar. But I myself strictly required the receipt of such remittances in the Amanath Box.

The next case (para 10) is one regarding an issue of stamps to the Stamp Vendor. The Treasury Deputy Collector's letter quoted assumed that I was unable to supply the stamps indented for—which was not the case. The story reported to him is false and all the superstructure falls to the ground. I was able and was in the act of supplying. The facts were consistently with what I have stated to the Sub-Collector these only. On the 27th April the Tahsildar purposefully examined the Treasury before closing the general chitta and without permitting me, in spite of repeated requests, to close the book. The Stamp Vendor had indented for stamps of the value of 75 Rupees and paid the money. It was entered in the stamp chitta as usual and the stamps were about being delivered when the Tahsildar interfered, to stay delivery and proceeded to examine accounts and stamps and found an excess of stamps of the value to be delivered; but, without heeding my explanation, recorded that there was found to be excess on examination. I beg to invite your honor's kind attention to the wilfully false record he has thus made, and by a curious irony of fate, every mischief of the Tahsildar is interpreted as my fault, whereas my procedure is perfectly correct. Mr. Farmer apparently takes exception to the entry in the chitta before delivery. If I had delivered, however, before entering in the chitta—which was an improper thing to do—he would still have a nut to crack. Mr. Farmer misstates the facts, when he says that the indent would be left with the Stamp Vendor, because on entry into the chitta it was with me. His further remarks become therefore useless. The stamps in question were delivered the very day by the Tahsildar soon after examination and, if he had done this before examination, there was no room for even making a show of this charge.

In para 11, the Sub-Collector speaks of my ignorance or neglect in having received on the 26th April a remittance of arrears of revenue on land in another Taluq. This was placed in the Amanath Box without my knowledge by the

Shroff, being a remittance from his relative, but, being detected on the next day, was not entered in the chitta of the month and was entered in that of the next month. Thus no order was violated and Mr. Farmer has been betrayed here too by his pet Tahsildar.

8. Para. 12 infers my general incompetency from the fact of the mistakes in the account under the Land Improvement Act adverted to by me already in para. 6 above. The Sub-Collector refers to a yadast in which I speak of my having scrutinized it. Yes, this was done, so far as was possible from the materials on the paper. Facts connected with this case are already stated in the para. above-mentioned.

It is only necessary here to refer to the test which Mr. Farmer thought fit to put me to in Simple Rule of Three and Multiplication. He gave me two sums for calculation of interest and says I was right in one after working for five minutes and was wrong in the other after a long delay. So he readily concludes I would make an indifferent Kurnum. Granting that there is no exaggeration in his statement, I have passed his examination by clearing half the number of marks. But Mr. Farmer will perhaps be surprised to hear that I have been in accounts work during the whole of my 33 years' service (vide list annexed copy M) and that I passed the Account Test not to mention the Revenue, Criminal and Precis Tests which are out of the question. I have received testimonials for my good work (copy enclosed vide M.) and for two years since 1855 my services were detained by the Revenue Department on Government sanction even after transfer to Public Works Department, for doing useful work in the adjustment of Public Works accounts, concerning upwards, of two lacs of rupees. For the first time during my whole service and that too at the tail-end of my career, Mr. Farmer has found a 33 years' accountant to make an indifferent Kurnum and has been trapped into the discovery by his friend, philosopher and guide—the notorious Tahsildar of Conjeveram.

9. The last case Mr. Farmer mentions in para. 13 is a defalcation in stamps to the extent of Rupees 15-9-0. Mr. Farmer markedly enough trips over the matter gently, not wishing perhaps to speak out fully, on this subject. I shall however undertake myself to narrate the facts as already explained by me to him. On the 26th of May last, I took charge from the Deputy Tahsildar, of the Treasury and stamps, on return from circuit with the Inam Deputy Collector. I counted the stamps and myself and the Deputy Tahsildar certified that they were correct. On the 27th idem corresponding to the same date of the previous month, when the Tahsildar interfered before the chitta was closed, the Tahsildar again visited the treasury. Myself and the Shroff had just then counted out and kept outside certain stamps in answer to stamp vendor's indent. There was not time then for locking the stamp box which contained the remaining stamps, before the Tahsildar came. I asked the stamp Vendor to take the stamps, thinking that as usual the Nagadi Gumastah entered the item in the stamp chitta. But the Stamp Vendor stated that it had not been so entered. So I asked the Nagadi Gumastah to make the entry. The Tahsildar interfered and prevented him from making the entry which used always to be done by Gumastah and not by Taluq Sheristadar and insisted upon my making the entry in my own hand writing. I had to yield

and go to my seat, to make the entry and the Tahsildar thus succeeded in diverting me from my stamp box which, as I explained, was left shut but unlocked. The Tahsildar was seated by the box as also the Shroff only, when I left the place for my writing table. In the meantime while I was writing the chitta the Shroff was sent to me by the Tahsildar twice to bring the key of the big box. After finishing my entry and delivering after counting again the stamps reserved outside to the stamp Vendor, I went back to the Tahsildar who had till then remained with the box. Without the least suspicion I now locked the box. The Tahsildar remained some time longer and then left. I kept the box in the bureau at once and locked the bureau. Next day afternoon, at about 2 p. m., the Tahsildar examined the treasury and the stamps and then I found that the cover which contained the adhesive stamps for the value of Rupees 15-9-0 remaining after the quantity delivered to the Stamp Vendor, was missing. The cover itself was not to be found. I do not know how this loss came to happen but these are the circumstances. I must have taken them, or *some body else*, but it is clear I am responsible and there is no good that the abstraction can do me. I should account for all stamps in my charge, and that was the stamp examination day generally. If I did not take, as it was even against my interest to do so, I leave it to your honor to find out how this mysterious abstraction or loss could have taken place. But one fact is clear and that is, if the Tahsildar had not sent me away or interfered with me in the manner he had done, there could have been no room for this loss.

10. In para. 14 the Sub-Collector thinks it unnecessary to notice some cases of insubordination which, he says, exist, as he has noticed a sufficient number. The character of the allegations already made which reflect discredit on the Tahsildar and not on me, has been seen, and the Sub-Collector does me the *favor* of sparing me from more accusations of the kind. The fact that I was not shown many takeeds by the Tahsildar will appear too true to need further proof, but I have not, as represented, insisted on this circumstance as a plea for any of the alleged charges against me. The Sub-Collector observes that my allegation that even the ryots of the taluq will give false evidence against me to please the Tahsildar, speaks for itself. The Sub-Collector makes it however a *good point* in him, and attributes his being detested and unpopular to his singular and unrivalled strictness, as though strictness was incompatible with being liked. The Sub-Collector considers that this very point will embolden the ryots and subordinates to get rid of him. A little reflection only is necessary to show the fallacy of this argument. The much dreaded magisterial terrors with which he is armed and which he so atrociously abuses, on the one hand, and the sunshine of master's favor which he so richly enjoys, on the ground of what the master considers the *virtue* of unpopularity, on the other hand, are enough to shut the mouth of the boldest man under his reign of terror. It is a notorious fact well known throughout the District that Mr. Seethapathy Naidu is a favourite of his superiors and the enormity of abuse of authority on his part is conspicuously due to the master's favor which he fully enjoys. Even his *faults* are considered as *virtues* and there is no wonder that such a cold and deaf-ear should have been turned to a poor man's grievances, the rights of the weak being by the sufferance of the strong. If the superiors were not so much prejudiced in the Tahsildar's favor, they would have doubtless seen the truth. But the Tahsildar being peculiarly in their good graces, and fearless of the public

opinion which is pent up in individual minds, and is too weak to stand the dread of the magistracy, is free to do whatever he wills. The case of the Tahsildar Mr. Seethapathy Naidu is that of a person having a giant's strength and using it like a giant.

With superiors who consider unpopularity howsoever obtained a virtue, an unpopular Tahsildar is viewed as a strict officer and the amount of praise which Mr. Farmer has thought fit to shower on Mr. Seethapathy Naidu will be seen to be undeserved, if the rottenness inside the office of the Tahsildar is sifted behind the whitewash and if the laxity prevalent is exposed from behind the professions of strictness. I know myself of several instances of laxity there within my short experience and can adduce them if required. I beg the favor of a reference to Arzi (copy E) which enumerates some of the irregularities I found in the office. I can boldly assert and prove that the notoriety he has obtained is due, not to his much boasted of strictness, but to his high handed despotism and cruelty.

11. In para. 15 the Sub-Collector, apparently himself not satisfied with the nature of the charges he had on hand, seeks to obtain support and to prejudice my case by wandering away from the present case and referring to certain trivial cases of fines, &c., for alleged negligence imposed by the Collector and the Treasury Deputy Collector. But I shall be swelling this appeal enormously if I should state here in detail the facts of each case and the thoroughly satisfactory explanation which I have given in reference to each such matter, and which will be found on the records of your honor's office. Although the superiors did not excuse the small fines of one rupee or half rupee (four or five being enumerated by Mr. Farmer) for trifles, (in all of which I am of opinion and this will appear from the exhaustive explanation given from time to time that with the exception of one instance of petty oversight I am not to blame,) I did not think it worth while for me to make an appeal to have the fines cancelled especially as such appeals mean no more than inviting the continuance of master's disfavor or prejudice. The single instance of so called "disingenuous" excuse which Mr. Farmer says the Collector found, will be found to be perfect truth, if my explanation be dispassionately viewed. I do not leave every thing to the Nagadi and Head Gumastah as stated. On the contrary I go into what I should do carefully. Mr. Barlow, who suspended me for the alleged 2 careless acts, appears himself to have attached no value to that affair, as within a year since then he promoted me from a mere 35 Rupees' clerkship to the 60 Rupees' Taluq Sheristadarship. Mr. Farmer's worst distortion of facts occurs, where he would consider me as suspended for insubordination during the time I was without employ on appeal in 1858, prior to the time I was honorably reinstated by Government with an express order that a vacancy should be created purposely for me, and with a remark of disapprobation of the District Engineer's having ordered me to the wrong place and thus caused me to be without employ. The whole affair was disposed of by Government very favorably to me in G. O. No. to which I beg the favor of your honor's reference. Mr. Farmer's Proceedings discloses to me one fact of which I was not made aware previously. The Collector appears from Mr. Farmer's statement to have made an exparty representation to Government with reference to that favorable, G. O., and to have so obtained G.O., No. 1858, dated 11th September 1879, (copy of which has not been to this day communicated to me) viewing the unemployed interval as passed

on suspension, to avoid break of service. I know this now for the first time and I beg the favor of your granting me a copy of this G. O. to enable me to appeal against it.

All the other statements made by Mr. Farmer in this concluding para. 15 consist of reiterations of accusations refuted already and of a volume of abuse and unpleasant epithets he has freely showered on me before he should take this last leave of me in the Proceedings. It would be merely idle and useless to notice the gratuitous assertions emanating freely from a prejudiced mind which has been betraying itself all throughout and at the end most nakedly. These statements are none of them supported by facts and all his previous charges which betray only the Tahsildar's wilful mischief are treated by him in a partial and indifferent manner and not with reference to the truth which has been expressed by me.

Mr. Farmer's anxiety to save me humiliation at the end of my long career and to see that my pension does not suffer seriously is probably due to some secret stings of conscience but his prejudice however conquered him in the conflict.

14. Two more acts have occurred since the date of the proceedings which also I beg to bring to your honor's notice for the favor of redress. I applied on the 14th June last for a week's Casual leave from the 13th idem as I had fallen very sick and was attending the hospital and I had not availed myself of any kind of leave, privilege or other and even the Christmas and the general Holidays, (except 10 days' casual leave) for three years previously. Long after this leave had been availed of, I received intimation that only 2 days' leave was granted and after my seeing the surgeon, the kind of leave that should be granted would be considered (*vide* copy I sent herewith) I asked for casual leave and such was the order received. I again applied for the grant of casual leave on the Tahsildar stopping my pay (*vide* copy J sent) but the Sub-Collector endorsed that no other than 2 days' leave could be granted. I beg the favor of your honor's cancelling, under these circumstances, this extremely cruel order.

15. When I was transferred from Ponnery to Conjeveram I was entitled to transit pay during the time of my travel. This was however denied to me though I repeatedly applied for it. I beg the favor of your honor's directing the grant of this my legitimate pay for that period. I enclose copies K L on the subject.

16. The Tahsildar has thus succeeded in doing me the worst injury he could by a series of unscrupulous acts by which he has hoodwinked Mr. Farmer himself. From the shock I received from this most unjust order of degradation, I fell ill and was not able to appeal earlier. I was even compelled to apply to your honor for retirement on pension, owing to my state of health at the time and to the wanton indignity inflicted on me, and the despair of any justice at Mr. Farmer's hands. I most respectfully beg that I may be favored with the justice my case merits at your hands. I pray for restoration to Taluq Sheristadarship, for arrears of my pay and for transfer as a Sheristadar to a different Taluq in the District. Begging a favorable order.

I beg to remain,

Most Respected Sir,

Your Most Obedt. & humble Servant.

(Signed) C. RAMA ROW,

Late Taluq Sheristadar of Conjeveram.

SAIDAPETT,

29th September 1880.

ENDORSEMENT ON MY APPEAL PETITION TO THE COLLECTOR OF
CHINGLEPUT.

(Miscellaneous Petition No. 673, dated 1st October 1880.)

Returned to the Petitioner on the ground that this petition is couched in exceedingly disrespectful and insubordinate language as regards the Appellant's superior officer the Sub-Collector.

SAIDAPET,
9th October 1880.

(Signed) CHARLES WEIR,
Assistant Collector for Collector.

SAIDAPET, 18th October 1880.

To

J. F. PRICE, Esq.,
Collector of the Chingleput District, Saidapet.

MOST RESPECTED SIR,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your honor's endorsement of the 9th Instant on my appeal petition of the 29th ultimo, returning it on the ground that it is "couched in exceedingly disrespectful and insubordinate language as regards the appellant's superior officer the Sub-Collector."

I respectfully submit that I meant nothing disrespectful and insubordinate in respect of the Sub-Collector but there is no use mincing matters or concealing the obvious injustice and partiality which the Sub-Collector has but too prominently displayed from the beginning in my case. The existence of such a prejudice would be evident in every step of his Proceedings and I would not have been candid or truthful, had I not called attention to this fact. I felt strongly the injustice premeditatedly and persistently done in my case and I laid bare the facts as they happened in the hope of your honor's granting me redress on the merits of the case. I expressed truly the grievanecs and cannot conceal them without serious want of candour.

If your honor was kindly pleased to point out the particular expressions which were disrespectful and insubordinate I would only be ready to modify them consistently with truth. But your honor's remark is general and if your honor refers to the sentence marked probably by your honor by red pencil I now cancel that part by omitting it altogether (*i. e.* the concluding part of para. 11 marked in the original in red pencil.)

The comparison I made there was the result of strong feeling but I have specially requested there itself not to construe it as disrespectful. However I have no objection to withdraw that sentence.

I respectfully submit that I cannot withdraw any portion of the facts or arguments stated in my petition. I have only to beg humbly that your honor may be pleased to award justice to me on the merits of the case. I resubmit my petition with its enclosures herewith.

I beg to state that as I live at Saidapet and as the fact is known to your honor's office I should have been saved unnecessary postage if the cover had been sent by peon, instead of by post service bearing. I have not been drawing any salary for about 4 months and am in very straitened circumstances. What is worse, the cover was sent by letter post instead of by packet post bearing, I having thus had to pay 15 annas instead of the 4 annas for packet post and nothing whatever for despatch by peon. As I am very poor, this unnecessary burden is hard on me and I beg the favor of your taking such notice as your honor may think fit of such despatch having been made. I beg also the favor of covers to me being sent by peon or if this cannot be done by packet post in the case of heavy covers hereafter at least.

I beg to remain,
Most Respected Sir,
Your Honor's most obedient Servant,

(Signed) C. RAMA ROW,
Late Sheristadar of Conjeveram.

ENDORSEMENT.

Petitioner is referred to the Collector's endorsement No. 678 dated 9th October 1880.

The Collector refuses to receive from any subordinate a petition couched in the language that this petition, at present, is.

This order is in accordance with the Petition Rules with which it cannot but be presumed that the petitioner is fully acquainted.

Whatever may be the petitioner's views in regard to his case, he is bound to state them respectfully and temperately and this he has not, in the Collector's opinion, done.

It forms no part of the Collector's duty to, in regard to a petition the tone of which throughout he considers insubordinate and disrespectful, point out particular phrases or words as being objectionable, what was marked in red pencil was so marked as being held to be outrageously improper.

If petitioner feels aggrieved at this decision, he has an appeal to the Board of Revenue.

It forms no part of the duty of Government Peons to deliver petitions to parties. The rules are that they should be returned "Service Bearing," these were strictly complied with and the officials concerned, having done nothing more than their duty, the Collector declines to interfere in the matter.

If petitioner is dissatisfied with this decision he has an appeal to the Board of Revenue.

It is observed that the petitioner has no right to be residing at Saidapet, as he is not absent from duty upon leave granted to him by either the Sub-Collector or Collector.

(Signed) C. E. PLUNKETT,

Deputy Collector for Collector.

CAMP STREEPERUMBOODOOR,
21st October 1880.

19
CURRENT No. 1628

To

The Honorable

The Governor in Council

Madras.

The humble petition of
b. Maria Rao, late Salug
Shristadar, Conjeveram
Salug Chingleput Dist^{te}

Most respectfully sheweth.

That the
petitioner after serving honestly and
faithfully the Government for a period
of 33 years was degraded from a post
of Salug Shristadar on pay of Rs
60 a month to that of a Measur
Inspector on Rs 20 on false charges
and subsequently dismissed. He
humbly begs to enclose a copy
of the appeal to the Honorable
Members

Members of the Board of Revenue
presented so early as 10th December
1880 which is still pending enquiry.

2. The Collector was called upon
by the Honorable Members of the Board
to submit his full report on the said
appeal so early as January 1881. As
he submitted no report up to date
(8 months), the petitioner was put
to all sorts of inconvenience and
hardships, having no other resources
for the maintenance of his large
family under his support.

3. But the petitioner now
learns that the Collector has submitted
his Pension Roll to Government
for sanction with certain remarks
therein prejudicial to his interest.

4. The Petitioner, therefore,
most humbly begs that the Honorable
the Governor in Council may be pleased
not to sanction the said roll.

mitted by the collector before his
appeal to the Board of Revenue is
finally disposed of.

Saidapet
15th August 1881 } Your Petitioner begs
to remain
Your Honor most obedt Servt
Shama Rao
Late Shrivastad
Carpuram Sahib.

Ret^d 1/1881/Sept

From

G. Rama Rao
late Shrivastava
Campusani Sahay
Chingleput St.

August 1881

Received 16

CURRENT No. 1628.

Stating that he was
degraded on false charges
and subsequently dismissed, had
appealed to the Board as far
back as 10th December 1880 which
still remains undispensed of
owing to the Collector's not having
furnished the full report
called for, prays therefore that
the Pension roll submitted
by the Collector on behalf of
the Petitioner with unfavor-
able remarks may not
be sanctioned pending
the disposal of appeal.

Petition (1881) DEPARTMENT.
DISPOSED OF

31 R.

From BY ENDORSEMENT
C. Rama Rao

late Saristada
Conjeveram Taluk
Chingapur B.

No. —
Encl. One.

Dated 15th August 1881.
Recd. 16th

No.

CURRENT No. 1628.

SUBJECT.

Praying that the Pen-
sion Roll submitted on
behalf of the petitioners
by the Collector with
unfavourable remarks
may not be sanctioned
till the disposal of the
appeal to the Board of
Revenue, of 10th Decr 1880,
which is still pending.

(With order)

For the Secy }
3rd Decr 1881 }

By Secy Secy.

Transferred to Pension Department.

Order No 661 of 3rd Decr 1881

Secy Secy

Pension

(1881) DEPARTMENT.

N^o 1382

From

*Pension Department
N^o 661*

J. N. 1544 of 1881

Dated

3^d September 1881

Recd.

SUBJECT.

*Transferring a petition
from C. R. Ames to the
Petition Roll submitted in
his behalf of the petitioner by the latter
with unfavorable remarks may
not be sanctioned till the
disposal of petitioner's appeal
to the Board of Review, which
is still pending Sept/81 N^o 868
Order taken 20 Sept/81
Lodged, pending receipt of
application Jan 9/81.*