1. Number of pages 18
2. Date of repair 7-4-36
3. Initials of Mender

M.R.O. 1—82,400—29-11-30.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 530 —Press Mis.

Dated 15-6-1882.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 12th July 1881, No. 1341.

Read—again Board's Proceedings, dated 29th September 1880, No. 10553, Mis., submitting for early orders of Government letter from Collector of Tinnevelly forwarding a petition from the Zemindar of Sivagiri and others against the General Charge Deputy Collector, A. Ramachandra Rau, and the Tahsildar of Srívilliputur, T. Saravanamuttu Pillai.

Read—again Board's Proceedings, dated 4th October 1880, No. 10758, Miscellaneous, communicating to Collector of Tinnevelly G.O., dated 1st October 1880, No. 3348, Revenue Department.

Read—the following letter from J. B. PENNINGTON, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 7th March 1881, No. 139 :—

I have now the honor to submit the report called for in G.O., No. 3348, dated 1st October 1880, on certain charges brought against the General Charge Deputy Collector, Ramachandra Rao, and the Tahsildar of Srívilliputur, Saravanamuttu Pillai.

2. I have already, in my letter, No. 62, dated 7th February 1881, partially explained the delay that has occurred in the matter, and will only add that a good deal of it was caused by the Deputy Collector's refusal to cross-examine witnesses at once, so that they had to be summoned again; and still more by his persistent refusal to answer the most ordinary questions until the prosecution was completed, so rendering it necessary to take evidence on points which might as well have been admitted.

3. As already reported, he would give in no list of witnesses till the 19th January, and then wished them to be summoned at once and examined, lest, as he explained, they should be tampered with by the complainants. The consequence was that when they had been examined (on the 28th January), I was obliged to reserve my cross-examination until I could make inquiries as to their character, &c.; and, as the most important of them were natives of Madura, I did not receive reliable information about them till the 13th February, and then had to summon them again; so that I had not completed the examination of witnesses till the 26th idem.

4. The protracted nature of the inquiry is much to be regretted, but I have given it precedence over all other work to the neglect of many other matters of importance; and I do not think I could possibly have submitted anything like a complete report in less time; even as it is, I am conscious of many imperfections; but I have never been able to give it my undivided attention on account of the census and other emergent work.

5. Subjoined is a statement of the charges I framed after hearing the evidence for the prosecution—

(1) Collecting oil and ghee, &c., either for nothing, or for a low price.
(2) Collecting a cess on officials' salaries.
(3) Taking large sums as wedding-presents or nazzars from Zemindars, ryots, &c., who have had, or may have, business with him, and from officials, either directly or through a nautch girl, the sister of the Deputy Collector's concubine, such sums being not always paid willingly but more or less on compulsion.
(4) Borrowing money from persons having official dealings with him.
(5) Taking 500 rupees from the Sétúr Zemindar under very suspicious circumstances.
(6) Keeping his concubines in a room closely connected with the room in which he held office, and frequently resorting to their company during office-hours, to the annoyance of parties and officials frequenting his Court, when there was a separate office available.
(7) Taking his concubines on circuit to the scandal of all respectable people, and occupying public chattrams when on circuit to the inconvenience of the public.
(8) Compelling pagoda servants to give unusual "prasâdhams."
(9) Taking supplies when on circuit without paying for them.
(10) Gross delays in the disposal of business of all kinds as shown by records.
(11) Improper appointments, such as that of *Venkoba Rau* and peon Rengasawmi, and unauthorized employment of taluk peons contrary to express orders.
(12) The Tahsildar is charged with actively aiding and abetting all these improper practices (except 10), and also with having collected money for the Deputy Collector's marriage and Jamabandi expenses, and with holding office in the Local Fund chattram for no good purpose.

I referred both officers to S.O., No. 245, Clause 14, and S.O., No. 276.

6. It will be seen from the above that I have confined my inquiry chiefly to the more salient points referred to in the complaint, viz., the collecting of supplies and the taking of presents on account of the marriage and on other occasions so as to avoid too great prolixity. The other items in the list of charges are of less importance, and I have not entered into the question of compulsory subscriptions for the new market at Srívilliputur (as to which also there is an abundance of evidence forthcoming), nor have I made any further inquiries as to the conduct of the Deputy Magistrate and Sub-Magistrate in the case of Velliyammal referred to in paragraph 9 of the memorial, though I know there is strong evidence to be had of gross misconduct in that case—evidence which at the time I rejected as incredible relying on the character and position of the Deputy Magistrate and the absence of any apparent motive for corruption, but which looked at in the light of subsequent events, I am now of opinion *may* have been quite true.

7. His way of conducting business, on which also much stress is laid by the complainants, is referred to incidentally throughout; but it matters little how a man does his work if his motives are corrupt. I have, however, collected* correspondence which will show that, even as a man of business, he has failed in all the essentials of punctuality and despatch, and will show also that his shortcomings have not escaped notice. That they were not openly attributed to any evil motive is owing to the fact mentioned above, viz., that I refused for a long time to believe such stories of a man in his position; and, indeed, it was not for some time that any such stories reached my ears, except in Velliyammal's case; and on that occasion I attributed them to the annoyance felt by the police at his interference, and did not pay as much attention to them as they propably deserved.

8. Ramachandra Rao was sent here (I believe as a special favor) to fill one of the most important and responsible offices in the district, an appointment where

* Appendix A.

an unsullied and blameless reputation is absolutely essential; and it was not my wish to listen to the many vague rumours against him in a district where false complaints are almost as common as true ones, and intrigue is the very life-blood of the people and the breath of their nostrils. Moreover, I always found him personally a most intelligent and apparently straightforward gentleman, and preferred his manners and society to that of many men I have known in the same position; so that I was not at all inclined to believe any serious evil of him, especially as I knew he had enemies, and that the Zemindar of Sivagiri in particular had good reason to dislike him for his conduct in two cases at least in which I thought Ramachandra Rao was right. I was (unfortunately) not aware of the circumstances connected with his removal from the Mannárgudi Division of the Tanjore District (*see* Board's Proceedings, No. 220, dated 12th January 1867), nor with the cause of his subsequent transfer to Kurnool; and even now I am not in possession of any details, though it is clear that his conduct was viewed with suspicion by Mr. Lee-Morris and the then Sessions Judge (Mr. Whiteside), Proceedings, No. 560, dated 17th August 1869 (submitted herewith as Appendix B).

9. Before discussing the evidence in detail I wish to make a few general remarks as to all evidence in cases of this kind, which have recurred to me over and over again during the course of this inquiry.

10. It often appears to me that some witnesses deliberately allow discrepancies and inconsistencies to creep into their own depositions, and deny statements they have made before with the very object of giving the accused a loophole of escape on failure of exact legal proof. But in this case it must be remembered that the witnesses are speaking of events, often very trivial, which happened long ago; and when once a witness has made a mistake he is often afraid to correct it for fear of prosecution for perjury. As for peons and the lower ranks of officials generally they depose only (as Mr. Thomas observed in his report in Sheshagiri Rau's case, Board's Proceedings, No. 902, dated 2nd April 1878,) to such points as they think are most likely to be discovered otherwise, and invariably conceal all they can and minimise their own share in any nefarious transaction unless actuated by personal enmity, in which case they are only too ready to embellish their depositions with a plentiful garniture of additions from their imaginations.

11. This habit of keeping back *some* of the truth and denying anything it seems inconvenient to admit is probably not confined to native witnesses; but it is certainly very conspicuous in their evidence on an occasion of this kind, and there never was a more extraordinary instance of what I mean than in the deposition of the Zemindar of Gollarpáti (No. 12). He is an oldish man who has always kept very much to himself, so much so that he had never seen the Deputy Collector, who lives within a mile or so of his house, till the occasion of this marriage; and, as it was represented to me that he would be extremely reluctant to come forward and give evidence, I resolved to pay him a visit without any formal notice to see what he would say. The Zemindar of Sivagiri (chief complainant in this case) went also, and I ordered Mr. Vengu Pillai, Acting Deputy Collector, to accompany me; but as it happened we went by different roads and the Sivagiri Zemindar had only just arrived and called the old gentleman when I reached his door. Mr. Vengu Pillai arrived some time later. We entered into conversation and after a few minutes I asked him about the presents he had made; whereupon he told me (*before Mr. Vengu Pillai's arrival*) exactly what he afterwards, the same afternoon, deposed to on oath; but when he was asked by the Deputy Collector in cross-examination whether I had asked him anything about these presents in the morning, he flatly denied it, though the Zemindar of Sivagiri and *Vengu Pillai* were both present, and we could not restrain our astonishment. I re-examined him on the point, but he persisted in denying it, apparently under the idea that I had been doing something highly irregular in asking him privately, and that he was bound to defend me even at the cost of a little perjury.*

* NOTE.—The Deputy Collector has a different explanation to offer, and I shall refer to this evidence again (paragraph 41).

12. Then as to the exact character of the offences complained of. As far as the evidence goes it does not appear that the money in this case was extorted by the fear of such immediate injury as in Seshagiri Rao's case; but that it was paid through fear of injury or hope of advantage (however remote), I have no doubt whatever; and considering the position of the parties, I am clearly of opinion that the offence (if, as I believe, there was an offence) is really much more closely allied to the spirit of "extortion" as defined in the Penal Code than to what it might at first sight appear to be, viz., an offence under Section 161.

13. It is the same fear of what may happen if the Deputy Collector escapes (and perhaps a certain amount of compassion also, as described by Mr. Thomas in paragraph 11 of his letter referred to above) that makes many of the witnesses unwilling to say more than they can help. They all wish to hedge in fact, and play as much as possible for safety, rather than follow the more dignified course of perfect plainspeaking: like the Inspector of Police in Srívilliputur who, while admitting that he had heard of all these extensive and questionable purchases, told me it was impossible for him to mention such facts even confidentially to his Superintendent for fear his statements should not be proved. Like the rest he said he was afraid to come forward with information till some one gave him a lead. I am not sure that he was not (like so many others) a sort of sleeping partner in the Deputy Collector's firm, but even his own explanation amounts to this that, if such a great man as a Deputy Collector commits offences, it is impossible for him to say anything unless some one comes forward and complains to him, so that he may have some one to fall back upon, and not run any risk!

14. At the beginning of my inquiry there was a good deal of confusion and difficulty about getting evidence, partly from the natural reluctance of the witnesses to be the first to come forward, and partly from the complainants not seeing exactly what was expected of them in the way of getting up the case for the prosecution. After a few days, however, when some positive evidence had been recorded the character of the evidence changed as the remaining witnesses saw there was no fear of the case being dropped or breaking down, and then became distinct and conclusive enough.

15. To come now to the facts of the case (the history of it having been sufficiently sketched in the memorial). The actual evidence as to the collecting of supplies for the marriage and the giving of marriage-presents is simple, and is, to a considerable extent, admitted to be accurate, at any rate as to the collection of supplies. When first asked, indeed, the Deputy Collector admitted, with some hesitation, that *some* supplies had been sent from this district for the marriage; but not knowing then how much I knew or might find out he said that only a "few things" had been sent, and tried to make me believe that the articles sent consisted largely of domestic articles, such has brass utensils, furniture, &c. When pressed for particulars he asked leave to reserve his replies to my questions, ostensibly until he could get accurate accounts, but really, of course, until he could find out how much was going to be proved. Moreover, when asked at first why the railway truck (hired for the conveyance of goods to Tanjore) was ordered to stop at Tirumangalam, he gave me to understand, though again in a very hesitating manner, that it was to pick up a few articles purchased *there*, saying nothing of the fact that two bandy-loads had been sent that way from the Srívilliputur Taluk; and even pretending that he did not know exactly why the railway truck had stopped at Tirumangalam (*see* his answer to my 6th question on the 12th October), though he now alleges that he had ordered 100 rupees' worth of ghee to be sent by Venkoba Rao (his 10th witness) to Tirumangalam, and could not possibly have forgotten the fact, if it had been a fact.

16. The Tahsildar, on the other hand, when first asked (on the 16th October) as to purchases made for the marriage, tried to make out that he had bought only about 400 rupees' worth of ghee and oil, and had received the money for it from the Deputy Collector. He also produced three receipts* for sums aggregating Rs. 280½, and said he had not taken receipts for the remainder. It now turns out

* Exhibits C, C-1, and C-2.

that at least 592 measures of ghee and 400 measures of oil were collected in his taluk, besides (in all probability) dholl and other grain, the value of which could not be less than Rs. 80, and much of it, according to evidence which I am inclined to believe, was never paid for at all, or only very partially.

17. The line of defence finally adopted as to these supplies by the Deputy Collector is to be found in paragraphs 11—25 of his statement. It is not, in my opinion, a valid defence, because I have no doubt that the Deputy Collector could have got some one to buy everything he wanted in Tanjore if he had been willing to pay a proper price; but he found it more advantageous to utilise the services of his subordinate making a collection in his own division. His final admission that he bought 550 rupees' worth of oil and ghee is in strong contrast to his first statement* to me that he bought a "few" things, or "very few" as he put it in the first instance. As to his alleged purchase of four dubbers of ghee in Madura, I do not believe it at all. It has been invented at the last moment to reduce the quantity proved to have been supplied from the Srívilliputur Taluk, and so to prove that the evidence of the prosecution as to the quantity sent is untrustworthy; and to make the quantity purchased in Srívilliputur square as nearly as possible with the 400 rupees alleged to have been spent by the Tahsildar.

* Dated 12th October 1880.

18. The rest of this charge the Deputy Collector disposes of by saying that he is not responsible if the Tahsildar did not pay his bills,—a plea which might be admitted if he could show that he had taken the least trouble to ascertain if the articles had been paid for; but, as a matter of fact, he can produce not a single receipt, and even those produced by the Tahsildar are almost certainly sham. In doubtful transactions of this kind public officials should be specially careful about receipts, and the promiscuous way in which these collections were made would make me doubt very much if any money was paid for the articles at all if it were not for the admission of one of the chief witnesses for the prosecution, Ramaiyangar (11th witness). Even as it is I think it is extremely doubtful how much was paid altogether.

19. I shall refer to this part of the case again in discussing the evidence for the defence (paragraph 88 *et seq.*)

20. The evidence as to the collecting of supplies is contained in the depositions of thirty-two witnesses, whose statements are corroborated in several cases by written evidence, and is briefly as follows:—

Alagirisami Nayudu, (9th witness,) the Deputy Collector's confidential peon, who was the principal agent engaged in all these nefarious transactions, and who was recommended for promotion by the Deputy Collector out of his turn evidently on account of his services in connection therewith, proves that the Deputy Collector ordered him to collect twenty-seven dubbers for oil and ghee, and deposes to the collection and measuring of 400 measures of ghee and 400 of oil at Srívilliputur. He also speaks to the arrival of goods from Virudupati at Sátúr, and says the ghee was sent from Srívilliputur by the Tirumangalam road in order to pick up what had been collected in the Vartirayiruppu valley and stored at Nattampati chuttram, ten miles north of Srívilliputur. This is fully corroborated in all kinds of ways by the evidence of the 6th, 7th,† 11th, 17th, 28th, 29th, 31st, 33rd, 34th, 35th,‡ 36th,§ 38th, 39th, 41st, 44th, 45th, 46th, 47th, 48th, 50th, 51st, 52nd, 53rd, 54th, 55th, 62nd, 63rd, 64th, 65th, 66th, 67th, and 69th witnesses and sundry chits‖ which (with translation) are attached to the depositions. All the Deputy Collector has to say to the evidence of this 9th witness is contained in paragraphs 101 and 102 and is extremely feeble. It is possible he has not told the whole truth, and it is true he has proved a traitor to his benefactor, no doubt with

† This witness is corroborated by *Exhibit D*, which bears every appearance of being genuine (*see* note on paragraph 23 of the Tahsildar's statement.)

‡ (Ulundu, Rs. 30).

§ (Do. „ 16).

‖ Exhibits J, J-1, J-2, J-3, and J-4, and K and K-1.

a view to secure the appointment he received from the Deputy Collector; but I don't think there can be any doubt as to the general truth of his evidence, and it is quite conclusive as to the quantities of oil and ghee.

21. When I had just decided to examine no more witnesses on this point some of the most satisfactory evidence produced was suddenly discovered in the persons of the Solapuram Village Munsif (No. 53) and two subordinate taluk officials (Nos. 54 and 55) a peon and a masâlchi. It was corroborated by evidence in writing as detailed below, and is, in my opinion, conclusive not only against the Tahsildar and Deputy Collector, but also as to the active complicity of the 1st Class Revenue Inspector, *Ambur Subbaiyar*.

22. The Munsif produced a chit* signed by this Revenue Inspector, and dated 28th *February* 1880, in which he directed the Munsif to send two kottais (224 measures) of dholl. The Munsif says he did not send it as directed, but that the Tahsildar shortly after gave him orders himself, and that a peon (54th witness) came for it. Whereupon he purchased it for Rs. 17-8-0 and sent. He says he was not paid for it, and adds that after sending it, he received another chit† purporting to come from the peon, but neither signed nor dated, informing him that there was a deficiency of 10¼ measures, and that it should be sent immediately as it was going to Sátúr. He says he took no notice of this demand as he was certain he had sent the full amount, and it is possible he thought the peon was trying to get something for himself.

* Exhibit G.

† Exhibit H.

23. The peon and the masâlchi (the writer) admit that the note‡ was written and sent by them, but, on cross-examination, they differed materially as to the place where it was written. I am inclined to think that the contradiction was intentionally introduced to mar the effect of their evidence; but it is *possible* the peon, (an old man,) has forgotten when he says it was written near the Tahsildar's house and that the masâlchi's account is correct that the peon brought him paper, &c., to the chuttram about a quarter of a mile off. It is evident from the chit itself that it was written and despatched in great haste, and the fact remains that it was received by the Munsif and had reference to some dholl he had sent which was to go to Sátúr, for which he was never paid.

‡ Exhibit H.

24. The Deputy Collector does not think it necessary to refer to this evidence in his defence, probably because it does not directly implicate him, and he has pleaded generally that he is not responsible for the misfeasance of the Tahsildar in his name.

25. The Tahsildar, however, devotes a paragraph (31) to this episode and makes much of the undoubted peculiarities of the evidence, and the contradictions in the accounts given by the peon and masâlchi. No doubt the masâlchi is a man of a bad character, but from the unusual eagerness displayed to cross-examine him in the afternoon of the very day he was first examined I am inclined to think he had been tampered with in the interval between his examination-in-chief and cross-examination.

26. It must be admitted, however, that the evidence as to the grain sent to Sátúr is not so satisfactory as that on other points, and it is made still more untrustworthy by the remarkable contradictions on minor points in the depositions of the 65th and 66th witnesses, bandymen who were supposed to have taken the grain to Sátúr, as detailed by the Deputy Collector in paragraph 25 of his defence statement. I cannot account for their altering the account they gave before the Acting Tahsildar, and am not sure they have not been gained over; but the result is the same; the evidence as to the grain having been sent is not so clear as it might have been, and necessarily some discredit is thrown on the whole story.

27. The Revenue Inspector who wrote for the dholl, admits the note§, but says he wanted it for himself, but never got it. He was examined as a witness

§ Exhibit G.

at an early stage as it was supposed he might give evidence; but he cast in his lot with the Deputy Collector and went so far as to say that he had never heard of anything being collected for the marriage until he came to give evidence!

28. Two Shanar witnesses (Nos. 40th and 42nd), one of them, at any rate, a man of respectability and considerable wealth, also broke down under cross-examination in a most extraordinary fashion. Evidently the account they now give of the way the money was forwarded to the Deputy Collector is not the true account, and no reliance can be placed on their evidence to the effect that they paid Rs. 100 at all; but I am nevertheless inclined to believe that money *was* sent from Sivagasi in some way, and the helpless stupid way they contradicted each other on points on which false witnesses would certainly have been prepared satisfies me at any rate that they had not been tutored for the prosecution and had some foundation for their story. It is only right to mention that they were *not* cited as witnesses by the complainants in this case, but came forward voluntarily to the Deputy Collector *Vengu Pillai*, with a story which however differed considerably from that deposed to on oath. I can offer no plausible explanation of their conduct; but, as already observed, I have little or no doubt money was given though not in the way deposed to.

29. Another witness whose evidence is doubtful is *Ramanuja Aiyangar* (the 68th).

30. The chief witnesses as to the taking of wedding-presents are the 6th (who is in fact a kind of approver, being the Tahsildar's confidential clerk specially employed in the Deputy Collector's private business), the 9th, the Deputy Collector's confidential peon (referred to in paragraph 20), the 10th the Sheristadar of Sátúr Taluk, a quiet respectable man, the 11th, a wealthy ryot of Srívilliputur and an Acting Village Munsif, who is, to my knowlege, a favorite of the Tahsildar's and an opponent of the Sivagiri Zemindar's in a case cited by the Tahsildar himself (Exhibit N of his list), the 12th, the Zemindar of Gollarpati referred to in paragraph 11 *supra*, the 13th, his servant, the 17th, the Tahsildar of Sátúr, the 28th, the Sheristadar of the Srívilliputur Taluk, the 29th, an influential and most respectable ryot, a member of the Local Fund Board, the 32nd, a member of the Vishnu Committee, Srívilliputur, the 35th, a Village Munsif, the 37th, another member of the Vishnu Committee (since dismissed, as pointed out by the Deputy Collector in paragraph 40*), the 43rd, a wealthy ryot of Vartirayiruppu, who is also said to have made advances to the Deputy Collector, the 40th and 42nd, Shanars whose evidence is discussed above (paragraph 28,) and the 61st, the late Deputy Tahsildar of Vartirayiruppu and a near relative of the Tahsildar.

* *See* paragraph 51 *infra*.

31. All these sixteen persons depose with wonderful unanimity and great circumstantiality to the fact of presents having been made; and up to the time when I received the explanations I felt persuaded that it was intended to admit the receipt of most of them. It is impossible even to read the cross-examination of the witnesses without seeing that the Deputy Collector's object was not to deny but to justify, or at any rate palliate, the practice of taking wedding presents. But apparently when it came to the point he found it impossible to defend the acceptance of such large gifts, and then suddenly resolved to deny the charge *in toto*, however hopeless such a line of defence must be when read in connection with his own cross-examination.

32. As to this point I would refer to the evidence of the 17th witness who was asked if it was not "usual" to make such presents, and whether the Deputy Collector did not make *his* child a present under similar circumstances; and again if there was any compulsion used (!) similar questions were put to the 28th witness, and he was made to say that the Deputy Collector objected to his giving anything, but that he insisted on doing so "for the children." So again with the 29th witness, *Dhrama Razu*, whose evidence was entirely unshaken on cross-examination and in fact was scarcely assailed at all. Then the 43rd witness (Vembaiyar) was made to say that such presents are "intended for the children".

33. The 61st witness, who is the most trustworthy of all those examined as to the wedding-presents, was cross-examined as to whether the Deputy Collector "asked him for a present," (!) and made to say that it was "intended for the children" and that there was no "compulsion". Itwas also elicited from him that he had made a present at a marriage in another Deputy Collector's family; but no attempt was made to prove that he had not paid anything at all, or that his evidence was unreliable on account of enmity or any other cause. It was not till the defence statements were submitted that the suggestion of deliberate perjury was ever raised against this witness.

34. The Deputy Collector's reasons for asserting that this witness has sworn falsely are contained in paragraphs 47—50. They are briefly that there is a discrepancy as to the day when the wedding-present was given between the statement of this witness and that of the 17th (Sátúr Tahsildar); and ample motive for the perjury is found in the fact that the Deputy Collector had severely reprimanded him in 1878 and 1879.

35. The discrepancy was cleared up by the 17th witness who admitted that he must have spoken forgetfully as to the day when the Srívilliputur ryots came to the swinging-cot festival, and that it must have been Sunday the 20th, as stated by the 61st witness and others. Saturday, I believe, is not a "good" day for making presents.

36. As to the official reprimands* it is childish to put them forward as sufficient cause for making a serious charge on oath, especially when the witness had been removed to another part of the district, and was no longer in danger from the Deputy Collector. As a matter of fact he was by no means eager to give evidence.

* One (dated 21st March 1879) is simply a remark to the following effect in an appeal judgment:—"Headings of depositions incomplete. Printed headings should be used. Depositions full of broken, incomplete, and meaningless sentences;" but it does not appear that this was communicated to the Sub-Magistrate, so that he may or may not be aware of the censure. The other reprimand (dated 30th September 1878) is to the effect that a report from his office had been carelessly written and that it did not appear that he had read it before signing it.

37. Then the Tahsildar following the Deputy Collector's lead also denies the giving of wedding presents, but ascribes the false evidence given by this witness to a different cause altogether, viz., his fear of the Sivagiri Zemindar.

38. The witness himself scouts this suggestion, with good reason, as he is far removed from the influence of the Zemindar, and says the Zemindar never spoke to him on the subject. Lastly, he is second cousin to the Tahsildar (2nd defendant), (their grandmothers having been sisters,) and yet when I asked the Tahsildar if this witness was not his cousin he answered that "he stands in the light of a cousin," meaning it to be inferred that he was quite a distant relation.

39. On the whole, I have no doubt that this witness's evidence is literally true, and it is quite sufficient to prove the charge, even if it had not been corroborated by other overwhelming evidence.

40. The Deputy Collector's general defence on this point is contained in paragraphs 35—65, and is ingenious enough in making the most of trivial matters and the many discrepancies and contradictions that are to be found in the evidence of some of the witnesses and in glossing over the really important parts of the evidence.

41. Three pages are devoted to the old Gollarpati Zemindar (12th witness), and the Deputy Collector pleads that he is not in a position to make any present at all, that he is not a friend of his, and does not even say he had received a formal invitation as usual. There is no doubt some force in this; and the evidence is seriously damaged by the deliberate perjury with which it closed; but I do not admit the Deputy Collector's explanation of this perjury, and believe my first conjecture to be the true one (paragraph 11). As to his not being intimate with the Deputy Collector it is in evidence at any rate that he was applied to for dubbers on account of oil and ghee to be collected for the wedding,—a fact which has not been challenged in any way.

42. Then the Deputy Collector argues that only Rs. 1,009 is proved to have been presented to him, and that mostly by persons not in a position to make presents at all. He assumes that no others paid, because they do not come forward to say so; but the fact is it is most difficult to get Zemindars to give evidence on such a subject. They consider it (not unnaturally) extremely bad taste to be talking about a present made on such an occasion (to say nothing of the danger of prosecution), and there can be very little doubt that many much larger presents were actually made as to which no evidence can be got. As to one witness indeed (the 16th, the Sevalpati Manager), I could prove by the most satisfactory evidence that he had actually said that he (or his brother, the Zemindar) had paid Rs. 300 as a wedding-present (in addition to the Rs. 200 which it is admitted he gave at the nautch), but nothing would induce him to repeat the statement in evidence; and he now denies having even said so as the simplest way out of the difficulty.

43. That a large number of Zemindars and other landholders were invited is quite certain, and is practically admitted. It is also admitted that wedding-presents are usual on such occasions; so that it is quite impossible to doubt that much larger sums were really paid than those of which evidence has been given. The real fact appears to be that a regular cess was levied on account of this marriage; for it is quite impossible to doubt the evidence as to the deduction* from the salaries of Taluk Gumastahs†; and if it went so low as that who could escape? It is also quite impossible to doubt that the Tahsildar was actively assisting in making these unholy collections and bringing his ryots to the ceremonies at Sátúr like sheep to the shearing house.

* The second head of the charge.

† *See* witnesses 18th to 28th (Taluk Sheristadar).

44. As to these subscriptions by Gumastahs, &c., the Deputy Collector would throw all the blame on the Tahsildar, and wishes to have it believed that he knew nothing of them and could not be responsible for what was going on. But this plea is quite inadmissible. If any such subscriptions were made on account of his marriage, it must have been not only with his connivance but with his express concurrence. He was in the taluk after the marriage celebrating the event, and nothing of the kind could have occurred without his knowledge. It is absurd for a man of his experience and ability to plead that he was blindly ignorant of what was going on under his eyes; for, if there is one thing for which he is more distinguished than another, it is his intimate knowledge of all the gossip of the Presidency, let alone his own division. The cross-examination of these Gumastahs was extremely feeble, and the reasons assigned for their giving deliberate false evidence were also very weak. One‡ witness, a Pound Gumastah, who is singled out as actuated by special malice towards the Tahsildar, having deposed that the Deputy Collector got supplies for nothing when on Jamabandi, was cross-examined at great length to show that he was always at work from morning to night and could not have *seen* whether the Deputy Collector paid his bills or not! as if such facts were not well known to all without actual information being given by the injured parties. Of course, the supplies *might* have been paid for without his knowledge; but, as a matter of fact, he *knew* they were not!

‡ The 19th.

45. The object of getting small subscriptions from so many may have been to keep them all quiet, by making them accomplices in the swindle; or it may be that the Tahsildar wished to show his zeal and good will, and that the Gumastahs also were quite willing (as the Tahsildar suggests) to purchase their Divisional officer's favor so cheaply.

46. As to the argument that *most* of those who are alleged to have paid are either "verging on insolvency or low-paid officials," it is simply not the case; and even if it was so, it would not prove that presents were not given, because it is well known that on such occasions natives will make presents to officials out of all proportion to their means. I have made a few remarks in the margin of the Deputy Collector's explanation and elsewhere so as to reduce the length of this report as

much as possible, to meet his observations as to the circumstances and *status* of the witnesses; but it is perhaps desirable that I should say something as to the character of the principal complainants and signatories of the memorial (as the Deputy Collector has assailed them all); and this may be a convenient place for the purpose.

47. I have already alluded to the fact that the Zemindar of Sivagiri had good reason for wishing to get rid of the Deputy Collector, and it may be admitted that the memorial would never have been presented if it had not been for his animosity against Ramachandra Rau; but I think it is clear that he only worked up an existing case, and that it would be in the highest degree absurd to suppose that he had invented all the stories of all these witnesses; or that the evidence was in any sense of the term got up and absolutely false. It would have been quite impossible, even for a much more influential man, to have contrived such an elaborate conspiracy, though I would not, of course, deny that he may have attempted to improve the case occasionally by a little false evidence. All I say is that there is ample evidence to satisfy any one that the allegations of the witnesses are substantially true. The Deputy Collector's cross-examination of this witness struck me as being in extremely bad taste and great part of it was, by his own admission, only intended to disgrace the Zemindar by connecting him with some dancing girls who had nothing whatever to do with this case.

48. Then as to the 1st and 3rd witnesses who, with the Zemindar, are no doubt the prime movers in the matter; the first is a Christian schoolmaster on 60 rupees a-month (with a house), and is a man of considerable independence of character and a constant correspondent of the Press. He admits that he wrote the article* in the *Mail* which was published just before this complaint was made, and was no doubt intended to prepare the public for this case. The Deputy Collector endeavours to show that he is a paid hireling of the Zemindar's, and it is clear that the Zemindar did undertake most of the expenses connected with the memorial; but that is not at all unnatural, and does not prove that the statements of the first witness are unworthy of credit; although, therefore, his evidence is more or less hearsay, that is, what all evidence to character must be; and in a case of this kind general reputation, if good evidence can be got of it, is surely relevant. I see no reason to doubt that his evidence as to the Deputy Collector's reputation is reliable, though by itself it would not, of course, go far.

*Exhibit O.

49. The 3rd witness is a Vakil of the District Court, though he lives at Srívilliputur and does not practise. He was selected by the late Deputy Collector, Mr. H. Subbaraiya Aiyar, an officer who knows that part of the country very well, and specially recommended to me, so lately as 1878, to be made a Member of the Local Fund Board, as a man of particularly good character. He has since, in January 1880, been chosen by the Vishnu Committee (though himself a follower of Siva) as Trustee of the Vishnu temple. The Deputy Collector describes this man as an enemy of his (paragraph 182); but the only foundation for this remark that appears to be alleged is the fact that the Deputy Collector did not take the witness in his carriage on the occasion of his visit to Srívilliputur last July; and the witness himself says that he has no ill-feeling towards the Deputy Collector on that account, and has been entertained by him since the incident occurred. I must say, I think, the reasons assigned for enmity both by the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar are most trivial.

50. The others who signed are probably people of no particular account, and it may even be admitted that these three may have induced them to sign the memorial.

51. A great deal is made* of the fact that *Sellamaiyangar* (the 37th witness) has been dismissed (since this inquiry began) for malversation of temple property, and has been stigmatised as a perjurer in the District Court. This may be a very good reason for cancelling the certificate of honor which was given him on the 1st of January 1877 (certainly not

* Paragraph 40 of the Deputy Collector's defence.

74. There are far worse stories as to his conduct with reference to women than this; but I have not thought it necessary or desirable to enter into such a disagreeable subject, especially as it is one on which trustworthy evidence is hardly to be got.

75. Another subject to which I wish to invite special attention is the evil that results from native officials occupying rest-houses (chattrams) intended for travellers as offices and dwelling-houses whenever they go on circuit. I have had more than one serious complaint against Mr. Ramachandra Rau on this score; and I am inclined to believe now that the chattrams are most improperly occupied by officials to the very great inconvenience of travellers. It is pretty certain from the evidence in this case and from inquiries I have made that the Tahsildar habitually made use of one verandah of the Local Fund Chattram as a Cutcherry, and probably kept women inside for his occasional delectation during the fatigues of office, besides using it as a godown for the storing of oil and ghee for his superior's marriage.

76. In my letter, No. 216, dated 2nd April 1879, I strongly recommended that the higher officials who travel much, such as Deputy Collectors and Tahsildars, at any rate should be compelled to use tents like European officers and should not be allowed to occupy chattrams and rich ryots' houses wherever they go; and I beg to be allowed to repeat that recommendation more strongly as one result of my experience in this case. If a private house is occupied they should be required to pay rent for it, and should submit the owner's receipt as a voucher before being allowed to draw their travelling allowance.

77. *Point No.* 8.—I shall say very little about what are called "prasâdhams." The Deputy Collector has explained the meaning of the term, and it appears to be true that such offerings of articles already offered to the idol are sent round to respectable officials so that they may be satisfied that proper offerings have been made. No objection, of course, could be made to this practice, but the grievance complained of is that the Deputy Collector compelled the pagoda officials to send him *fresh* food, &c. This is what the 3rd witness and others complained of; and that it was a real cause of heart-burning and annoyance to both parties is clear from the evidence of the Police Inspector, the 14th witness, who is *not*, as the Deputy Collector would have* it, hostile to him. He says the Deputy Collector complained to him that Muttusami (the 3rd witness who had just been made Trustee) did not send prasâdhams as usual, and that he went and advised Muttusami to "do the usual thing" *lest he should incur displeasure.*

* Paragraph 132 of his defence statement.

78. As to the failure to pay for supplies on circuit (Point No. 9) there is a good deal of evidence which I am inclined to think is true, some of the witnesses (*e.g.*, the 29th and 62nd) being respectable straightforward sort of men who did not appear to be telling lies and whose evidence was unaffected by cross-examination, though it is possible there was no actual intention *not* to pay on every occasion; and I should not have been disposed to make much of this particular charge if it had not been for the other more serious cases with which it is more or less connected and which seem to show a confirmed spirit of corruption.

79. *Point No.* 10.—With reference to delays in the disposal of business, I speak from personal experience when I say that I have never known anything like it; and I believe it to have been the Deputy Collector's own fault, because he so frequently failed to pass any orders on ordinary reports received without any apparent reason. It is impossible to go into details on such a point, and it will be enough to refer to the enclosed abstract* showing the disposal of criminal appeals during the time he was in charge of the office, his dilatory conduct in this particular having attracted the attention of the High Court (Proceedings, No. 390, dated 11th May 1880).

* Appendix C.

80. I may also refer to the enclosed copies† of correspondence with my office on the same subject as specimens of the difficulty there has been in getting information from his office. In commenting on this point I am not speaking from memory only; I have had the correspondence and business returns carefully analysed, and they prove the most unaccountable delays in almost every branch of work.

† Appendix D.

81. He never complained of the addition of the Sankaranainárkoil Taluk, and even with it has probably not much more than half the Head Assistant's work, though he is an officer of much longer experience, and is familiar with the language and country.

See comparative statement (Appendix J).

82. The last charge requires some explanation.

83. The Venkoba Rau referred to came with the Deputy Collector from Kurnool where he said to have been employed as dufterbund in his office. He is, in fact, a private is servant, and probably a relative (*see* the Deputy Collector's own admission); at any rate he appears to have lived in the house and went by the name of "măchănan" (perhaps "kinsman"). He was evidently employed by the Deputy Collector chiefly on his private affairs, and he took the ghee to Tirumangalam. I wished to examine him as a witness on several points, but he disappeared after the inquiry began (having taken leave at once), and though summoned to appear has never turned up. He applied in writing for extension of leave, but gave no address.

84. He is not a passed man, and as the Deputy Collector was well aware of my objection to the employment of unpassed men, and he certainly had no claim to employment in this district, his appointing him to act in his office on the very first opportunity was objectionable. But not satisfied with this he must needs enter this kinsman of his as one of those who had strong claims to be included in the list of persons selected for promotion to appointments on Rs. 15 even though not passed, such as dufterbunds of long and approved service; and, when I asked him to explain why, said he had been an attender for four years in Kurnool. I replied that he ought to pass before he could be entered in the list in this district; but notwithstanding my objections he was confirmed as attender, no doubt with the idea of promoting him. Neither appointment was either reported or gazetted as is usual.

85. The case of Rengasami was even worse, and it is the height of audacity to say the Tahsildar recommended him. The Tahsildar himself says he knew nothing about him as he had come from Tanjore with the Deputy Collector, and that he only recommended him because the Deputy Collector ordered him to do so. He was the peon specially in charge of the concubine, and has gone with her, I believe, to Tanjore, of course vacating his appointment.

86. As to his employing taluk peons, it was contrary to my express orders as will be seen clearly from the correspondence.* His defence on this point is mere quibbling.

* Appendix E.

87. One of the minor matters complained of—and I think with reason—is the Deputy Collector's practice of holding office in his house, but unfortunately the offices up-country are often so unsuitable that the practice is much more common than it ought to be, and in this particular instance the mantapam occupied by the office is (as the Deputy Collector pleads) quite unsuited to the purpose, and the house used as an office by the Deputy Collector is conveniently near and suitable enough except for the harem next door.

88. *The witnesses for the defence.*—The oral evidence for the defence is intended to prove that no presents were given at the marriage, witnesses 1—3 affirming that they were present and not only gave nothing, but were asked *not* to do so by the Deputy Collector, which may possibly be true; (2) that it is usual to give

without the concurrence of the Tahsildar), but does not very much affect the facts of this case; for it is proved by independent evidence that he gave a wedding-present, and the fact that he had incurred the Deputy Collector's displeasure and had been removed from his appointment of Village Munsif would not make him less but more willing to pay. It is admitted at any rate that he went to meet the Deputy Collector on his return from leave, and, as it does not appear there was any friendship between them, it must have been with the idea of getting into the Deputy Collector's good graces again, as he says it was. Whatever his character may be it is certain he is a man of considerable property and has been chosen by the Travancore Government as their Agent for the protection of the Cardamom revenue.

52. I come now to the story of *Ahamad Pillai Ravuther* (30th witness), (at one time Village Munsif of Virudupati,) which is quite distinct from the charges brought by the complainants, and is peculiarly valuable as having come to light by pure accident in the following way. Immediately after Mr. Ramachandra Rau was relieved by Vengu Pillai (viz., on the 11th of October, he having taken charge on the 9th), a registered letter† was received to the address of Mr. Ramachandra Rau, which being taken for a tappal petition was opened by Mr. Vengu Pillai and proved to be a letter from this Ahamad Pillai Ravuther demanding certain money due to him. He deposes that it was "borrowed" in August 1879 and produces a copy of an account‡ (cash-book and ledger) made in the regular course of business in which it is formally entered as paid on 1st Avani Piramadi (15th August 1879). He explains why the cadjan leaves produced (which leaves, it must be observed, contain many entries besides this) are only copies§ of the original accounts by saying that the Deputy Collector's man (one Venkoba Rau, who, the Deputy Collector admits, is a creature of his own and appointed dufterbund of his office soon after his arrival in the division) came and asked him for the originals on the ground that "it would not do for the Deputy Collector's name to appear in his accounts." This, he says, was so lately as the 12th October when this inquiry was just commencing, and he accordingly *made copies* of the leaves and gave up the originals, so checkmating the Deputy Collector entirely.

† Exhibit E.

‡ Exhibit F.

§ Exhibit F.

53. This evidence is very circumstantial and has all the appearance of being true. There was no hesitation about giving dates though there was evidently great danger in doing so if the claim was unfounded; and the only discrepancy which the Deputy Collector could discover was shown on re-examination to be no discrepancy at all. The Deputy Collector tried to make out that the witness said he (Deputy Collector) had asked for the money some ten days before it was paid *while at Virudupati*; but the witness explains that he never said so, and that it was *at Sátúr* the money was asked for by the Deputy Collector; and from the fact that the witness was not cross-examined at all on this point, I am inclined to think that the Deputy Collector has wilfully misunderstood the statement of the witness and knew quite well what he really meant.

54. I re-examined him on this point as I did not myself clearly understand on reading over his deposition again what he meant, and the Deputy Collector then refused to cross-examine him because, he says, such re-examination is unprecedented and, in his opinion, grossly unfair to him after he had given in his defence. I hope it will be considered that I was right in deciding that it was my duty to examine *any* witness at *any* stage of the inquiry, especially where there was a conflict of opinion as to his meaning. It would be so in a criminal case, and it could not be intended that I should have less liberty in this departmental inquiry than is allowed by Section 192 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

55. The only doubt I felt as to the evidence of Ahamad Pillai Ravuther arose from the fact of the letter* being sent in so immediately after the Deputy Collector's suspension; but he explains that he had heard the Deputy Collector was

* Exhibit E.

going to be suspended, and it is not unlikely that that fact induced him to put in his claim. I do not think it likely that the idea of sending in a registered letter would have occurred to the witness if the claim had been quite unfounded; and he was by no means willing to give evidence: in fact, if the letter had not been intercepted I doubt if he would have done so at all. It is much in his favor, I think, that he says his accounts† are *copies*. If the complaint had been a false one he would certainly have sworn that the accounts were originals. I do not understand the Deputy Collector's statement that the witness was not in a position to pay the money: he is evidently a very considerable merchant, and has extensive transactions. It is true he was suspended by the Deputy Collector in the notorious Virudupati murder case, but I do not think it is at all likely he would have invented this elaborate false charge out of revenge when he could not be at all sure the Deputy Collector would not come back, and when mereover he had actually been restored to office. His letter‡ reads to me like a genuine *bonâ fide* claim for money due.

† Exhibit F.

‡ Exhibit E.

56. The evidence of Vembaiyar (43rd witness) as to his loan transactions was equally clear, though it was not supported in the same way by documentary evidence of any kind.

57. It is certain he was a friend of the Deputy Collector's as it is admitted he was present at the ceremonies on his return from Tanjore; and though taken by itself this evidence might not have been convincing, it is difficult to doubt it when there is so much of the same kind, and there is no apparent motive for perjury in this man's case, though it is true he is not a man of good character.

58. The difficulty of getting any written evidence in a case like this being about in proportion to its extreme value, I had no hesitation in issuing a search warrant for the accounts of the Sétúr Zemindar in which I was credibly informed certain damnatory entries would be found. Sundry original accounts were therefore produced containing various suspicious entries (extracts§ and translations of the most important are annexed) and the Zemindar and his Accountants were examined.

§ Marked I, I-1, I-2, and I-3.

59. As I had reason to believe that the Zemindar (59th witness) would not give evidence against the Deputy Collector, I called him in beforehand and asked him as to two entries in particular of Rs. 500 on the 8th May 1880 and 300 on the 25th of June. As I expected he said he "did not know for what the Rs. 500 had been sent to Sátúr," and that "his Peishcar must be asked:" that it "might be for jewels," &c.; and all this though he countersigned this account every evening with his own hand. Is it likely he would have forgotten all about an item like Rs. 500? It is not much more likely it was a bribe which he dared not mention because it was not a mere wedding-present, but also a reward for services rendered in an irrigation dispute lately decided in his favor? As to the Rs. 300‖ he said it was for his personal expenses when he went to the nautch, and that he only gave Rs. 70 to the dancing girl, and nothing at all as a wedding-present. Now considering that the same account shows a payment of Rs. 50* as a wedding-present to Mr. Ganapati Pillai (Salt Deputy Collector), it is not to be believed that he made no present of the kind to his own Deputy Collector, or that he would give less than such very much smaller fry as Ramaiyangar (11th witness), Muthuvaiyangar (32nd witness), &c.

‖ Exhibit I-1.

* Exhibit I-3.

* This fact is also good evidence of the fact that wedding-presents *are* usual on such occasions amongst some classes, whatever the witnesses for the defence may say to the contrary.

60. By the time he came to be examined they had arranged the following story to account for the sending of Rs. 500 to Sátúr on the 8th May. They say it was sent to buy cows and certain ironware. I must state my reasons for entirely

disbelieving this story at some length, both because the charge is the most serious of all, and also because it is supported by what appear to me to be the most exceptionally convincing proofs.

61. It will be seen from the account† that there where three entries made that day as follows:—Rs. 500 "sent for Sátúr expense," Rs. 5 "batta to the Stanadipathi *going* to Sátúr," and Rs. 5 "as a present to peon Gurusami" (on the Deputy Collector's establishment).

† Exhibit I.

62. Now such a general entry as "for Sátúr expense" or "expense at Sátúr" is most unusual in these accounts which go into the smallest detail; and the Rs. 5 batta to the Stanadipathi "going" to Sátúr can only mean (as the Zemindar himself was at last reluctantly compelled to admit) that the Stanadipathi in question was either going *then* or *at some future time*. Such an expression could not have been used of a man *who had gone before* as is now pretended in order to get rid of the inevitable inference that the Stanadipathi (Manager), 56th witness, now called Peishcar for the same reason, had himself gone with the money on that day, the fact being that the man who, as it is now pretended, spent the Rs. 500 in the purchase of these goods is *not* a Stanadipathi at all, but only a Samprati.

63. In order to make sure that there was no evidence of these alleged purchases I sent for this *quasi*-Stanadipathi, and his evidence alone is sufficient to show the fictitious nature of the whole transaction. He says that he went to Kanniseri fair (or festival) to make the purchases *the day after he received the Rs.* 505 and that the fair *had been going on for some days when he arrived*, yet we know from the accounts‡ that the money was sent on or about the 8th, and we also know that the fair did not begin till the 21st. Then he says he does not know the name of the persons from whom he purchased cows or iron, nor the name of their villages; nor does he know the name of the shopkeeper who supplied him with food during his stay. He took no receipt for the money paid, and there is, in fact, not a particle of evidence worthy of the name that it was ever paid at all.

‡ Exhibit I.

64. The Stanadipathi (56th witness), now called Peishcar for the purposes of this inquiry, accounts for these extraordinary entries by saying that they were all mistakes of the writer, and that he ought not to have written "pogira" or "Sátúr Shelavu." But the writer is much more reliable than the witness, and has made the explanation as to the expenditure hopelessly absurd. If the money had been sent for the purposes now alleged the Accountant would certainly have entered the facts correctly. The so-called Peishcar's evidence is a tissue of absurdities, because the accounts are unintelligible and inexplicable on his newly-devised theory.

65. It is true, of course, that this kind of negative evidence could not be admitted as proof of the payment of a bribe in any criminal trial; but it is, I think, morally far more convincing than much of what is readily accepted as evidence; and I do not think there can be any reasonable doubt as to the real destination of the Rs. 500, or that much more than Rs. 70 (probably Rs. 200 at least) was paid by this Zemindar for the nautch.

66. Then again as to the payment of Rs. 5 to the Deputy Collector's peon (who appears to have gone to remind the Zemindar about the wedding-present), they explain that he came to give betel on account of a ceremony *in his own house* and got the present in consequence. He himself declared that he had never been there at all; and, as he was a hopeless witness, he was not examined.

67. It is at least an extraordinary coincidence that he should have gone on the very day when Rs. 500 was sent "for expenses at Sátúr." His own brother, Ponnan (the 60th witness), when first examined by me admitted that he had been sent to hasten Gurusami, as he, Gurusami, did not return from Sétúr; but when put on oath he promptly repudiated that statement and said he did not know what he was saying when he made it, as he was sick at the time!

68. The Deputy Collector's explanation on this point is extremely weak. In fact, it simply amounts to a plea that the evidence given is not such as would support a criminal conviction which I admit. Whether the circumstances described and the direct evidence of the 9th witness, the Deputy Collector's own confidential peon, as to the sending of Gurusami to Sétúr at the very time when these payments were made is not sufficient to convince any one as to the real truth of the matter it is for the Government to decide. The very fact that there is no direct evidence of the money having been paid is much in favor of the prosecution theory. If the 9th and 17th witnesses (aided by the Acting Deputy Collector Vengu Pillai) had been anxious to concoct a good case, it would have been easy enough for the former at any rate to swear that he actually saw the money paid. But, in truth, the suggestion that Mr. Vengu Pillai got up false evidence at all is, to any one who knows him, the weakest thing that could have been alleged for the defence.

69. There are other entries in the same accounts of sundry presents to other officials which show that such payments are usual, and amongst them paddy worth Rs. 19-8-0* to one "Rajapaliyam Subbaiyar," who, the Zemindar was obliged to admit after much prevarication, was "most likely" the Revenue Inspector, 5th witness, who has been suspended in connection with this inquiry, and whose case will be disposed on receipt of the orders of Government. I must add, however, that no others of any great importance were discovered.

* Exhibit 1-2.

70. This Zemindar was asked if he would swear to his present account by an oath binding on his conscience, but declined with much perturbation; and I am sorry to say I have no doubt he deliberately perjured himself and caused his dependants to do so also for the sake of the Deputy Collector, and perhaps partly for his own sake.

71. *Points* 6 *and* 7.—After the inquiry had gone on for some days and a good deal of disagreeable evidence had been given on the subject, I thought it best to ask the Deputy Collector as to the dancing girls he was supposed to keep, so that there might be no further need to refer to them. He then admitted that he kept *one*, and that she lived in the house next his Cutcherry bungalow and went with him on circuit *when the rest of his family went*. He also stated that she was *half*-sister of the dancing girl who came for the nautches held at Sátúr after the marriage; and some hours afterwards thought it prudent to correct the *half* into *whole*; meaning, I suppose, that she was as much the sister of the other as one dancing girl can be of another.

72. This is important with reference to the presents alleged to have been given to the dancing girl herself by some of the witnesses and to the Deputy Collector by others at the various nautches held. The dancing girl in question being own sister to his concubine whom he himself describes as quite a member of the family, it is not, probably, of much importance who actually received the cash; and the amount admitted to have been given by various individuals, such as the Zemindars of Etaiyápuram and Sevalpati, in my opinion quite precludes the idea of its having been intended for the personal benefit of the dancing party alone. Of course, it was well known to the donors that the dancing girl was the sister of the concubine.

73. Though entirely ignorant of Ramachandra Rau's previous history when he came to this district I very soon found that his moral charactor had always been notoriously bad. I do not, of course, go so far as to say that the keeping of concubines (even in addition to a wife) should disqualify an officer (especially a native officer) for the public service—public feeling as to the practice of keeping concubines varies at different times in all countries; but I certainly think there is a whole-some prejudice growing up against the open practice of what is now-a-days generally called vice, at any rate amongst educated natives, which is deserving of every encouragement; and it must, one would think, be offensive to any respectable person to have to do with a public official who keeps a concubine in a private room next to his office, and occasionally leaves his business for her society.

dubbers and took the trouble to count the dubbers that had come from Srivilliputur, but cannot say why he did so; he has no written note or evidence of any kind to show that he went to Tirumangalam at all; he took no food there and did not see any one he knew though he knows the Tahsildar and several other people, and in fact no one seems to have seen him there, except the 11th witness for the defence and the Deputy Collector's own man, the other Venkoba Rau, who has disappeared. He admits that he came to see the Deputy Collector at Sátúr after this inquiry began (simply out of friendship), but declares that nothing was said then about this ghee question and that he never knew he would have to give evidence on the point until he got my summons. Lastly, there was a most extraordinary coincidence about the ghee collected at Tirumangalam, for it would appear from his evidence that two of the dubbers collected there by his servant must have been got ready exactly at the time the other arrived from Srivilliputur, quite by accident!

96. This statement is confirmed by the 11th defence witness, who is now Storekeeper at the Tirumangalam chattram, where the ghee was stored, but who was at that time occasionally employed as a pujári only and had nothing to do with stores. He says he saw the Srivilliputur dubbers when they came *in the bandy*, and not in the chattram itself, and asked the man in charge how much there was. It does not appear that he had any reasons for asking the question. He says the last witness stayed *two days* at Tirumangalam, but does not know if he got his meals at the chattram. Venkoba Rau evidently knew it would not do to say he had stayed at Tirumangalam and denied having taken any meal there at all, because, if he had, his name must have been entered in the chattram books. It will be seen from the confidential reports* of the Inspector of Police that he found direct evidence to prove that Venkoba Rau never went to Tirumangalam at all and that all the ghee came from Srivilliputur only, and it may be desirable to prosecute him (Venkoba Rau) and his accomplices for perjury if the witnesses can be got to give evidence.

* Appendix G.

97. The other defence witnesses may be disposed of very briefly. Possibly the first three did not give any presents, but they are not men of any particular mark and are not residents within the Deputy Collector's jurisdiction. The first has been stigmatised as a perjurer in a revenue case quite recently, and the third (a money-lender) was nominated by Mr. Ramachendra Rau himself as a Member of the Tinnevelly Municipal Commission. The 4th really proves nothing, and his brother is evidently another of the Deputy Collector's favorites. The 5th, 6th, and 7th are equally useless. The 8th is called to disprove a statement of the Mannárkóta Zemindar (71st witness) on which no stress has been laid by the prosecution (though it may be quite true) and also to prove that the Gollarpati Zemindar (12th witness) is in debt, which is well known, though the witness appears to exaggerate his indebtedness. This witness is a close relation of one *Nanmeni Subba Rau* who is referred to throughout as another of the Deputy Collector's agents and who has also disappeared since the inquiry began though he is a Member of the Local Fund Board. His evidence must be viewed with suspicion. The 9th is a still more useless witness.

98. It may be convenient to enumerate here the principal persons who appear to have acted as the Deputy Collector's chief agents throughout. They are the Srivilliputur Tahsildar, the Sátúr Tahsildar (17th witness), (it is not at all clear how far he acted honestly in the matter); the first-class Revenue Inspector of Srivilliputur, Ambur Subbaiyar (5th witness); the Taluk Gumastah, Subramania Pillay, the Tahsildar's jackal (6th witness); two other Revenue Inspectors (33rd and 62nd witnesses); and a peon (67th witness), these five acting under the Tahsildar, *Nanmeni Subba Rau*, and the Deputy Collector's dufterbund and kinsman *Venkoba Rau*.

99. The Deputy Collector's refusal, even after he had given in his defence, to answer any questions *vivâ voce* cannot but produce a bad impression of his case. It was to see how he would fare under such *vivâ voce* cross-examination that I

wished to ask him a few questions on points where his defence seemed unsatisfactory, and it is not the same thing to frame written interrogatories to which carefully-worded, and more or less ambiguous, replies can be framed by some clever Vakil.

100. In this particular the Tahsildar, though his explanations are feeble and shifty enough, was at any rate more straightforward. At one time, indeed, I was in the hopes that he would have deserted the Deputy Collector and give more positive evidence against him, but apparently their friendship has been cemented by too many questionable transactions for him to venture on such a course.

101. It is not unimportant to observe here (as showing the intimate connection between the two) that the Deputy Collector very early selected *Saravanamuttu Pillai* for specially delicate service under him in the Virudupati murder case; and if it is true, as was openly alleged, that evidence in that case was concocted and that witnesses were compelled to make statements (which they certainly repudiated in the Sessions Court), it would probably be impossible for the Tahsildar to give evidence against the Deputy Collector without seriously criminating himself. That the Deputy Collector has been closely associated with Saravanamuttu Pillai all throughout his career as Deputy Collector is quite notorious, and this fact makes his attempt to repudiate what Saravanamuttu Pillai did in his name the more hopeless.

102. It is impossible to enumerate all the minor points which go to prove the substantial truth of this case, but I may mention one more circumstance which impressed me very unfavorably. When I first examined the Deputy Collector as to the marriage I asked him amongst other things how much it cost him and how he raised the money, both very simple questions which might have been answered at once if there had been nothing to conceal.

103. Instead of answering them, however, he said he would see his accounts and let me know.

104. After about a month he gave me an account* of expenditure amounting to Rs. 6,500, but no information as to the source from which he drew the money that he said should be furnished with his explanation, but it was not, and, when his attention was called to the omission, he wrote as follows in his supplemental defence statement dated 8th February :—"I have simply to submit that I met the cost of the marriages out of my own money (!) I have landed property of my own and have had savings from the rents of the same and from my salary. For the purposes of this case, I submit, it is needless for me to enter into any detail of the whole of my assets and savings."

* Exhibit N.

105. Now it is obvious that this is no answer at all to my question, and that the Deputy Collector might as well have simply declined to answer it. I therefore asked him again to explain exactly how the savings had been invested from which the expenditure of Rs. 6,500 was met, and after about two weeks he produced the reply, dated 23rd idem, which forms the last of his defence statements. It will speak for itself. Rs. 6,500 is not such a trifling sum that a man, even in the position of the Deputy Collector, is likely to carry it about on his person. It must have been either hoarded in his house or invested in some way, and why should he make so much difficulty about it? His paragraphs 2 and 3 prove nothing except, I suppose, that this money was *not* drawn from any of the funds therein referred to, for, if it was, why could he not say so? I never doubted that he had means enough to defray a much larger expenditure than 6,500 rupees; my only doubt was whether *any* of his own money was really devoted to that purpose at all, the theory of the prosecution being that Rs. 7,000 at least was collected for the marriage (exclusive of what was paid subsequently at the "Maruvidu" ceremonies and nautches) and that, as a matter of common talk, the Deputy Collector must have really made money by the marriages even though they cost him (as they probably did) more than 6,500 rupees.

106. Many other witnesses might have been called, and some I have examined verbally, but it seems useless accumulating instances if, as I believe, there is

sufficient proof of those referred to in the record. Moreover some of those concerned are extremely unwilling to come forward, as is natural enough, both on account of the provisions of the Penal Code applying to them also and because they have given receipts for money which they say they have not received and cannot expect to be believed when they say so. This was notably the case with a Shanar merchant of Virudupati, who undoubtedly sent supplies, and says he gave a receipt for Rs. 120 though he was only paid Rs. 30. He was so terribly alarmed at the prospect of having to give evidence that I thought it better to let him alone. Traders in his position are naturally afraid of incurring the indignation of other officials in the same position if they come forward in such cases, and would much prefer the loss of 100 rupees or so to the risk of losing favor.

107. The Sátúr Zemindar is in the same predicament, and one inevitable result of these nefarious transactions will be a perpetual feud between the neighbouring Zemindars of Sátúr and Sivagiri.

108. Not the least objectionable feature in this system of collecting supplies from the villagers under his jurisdiction instead of by means of one large contractor (of another district for choice as, for instance, Tanjore, where the supplies were actually required,) is the extent to which the time of subordinate officials was occupied over his private business. It is not perhaps so much matter that one peon was exclusively engaged in collecting oil for a week, but it is evident that the peon who has since been recommended for the appointment of Taluk Dafadar (Alagirisami Naick, 9th witness,) was almost exclusively engaged in such private business, and was recommended for promotion for no other reason than his utter unscrupulousness in carrying out these schemes of private aggrandisement. Another peon was in charge of the harem, and from the Tahsildars downwards all the officials must have been greatly occupied in collecting supplies to the detriment of their public business and their own great personal risk and inconvenience. The mere idea of collecting such things in his own division instead of buying everything in Tanjore in the open market is tainted with corruption, but to compel these unfortunate subordinates to become the instruments of his cupidity at the imminent risk of ruining them, and so prevent them from complaining, was a monstrous thing to do.

109. Ramachandra Rau is an old servant of Government and, to judge from his testimonials, must at one time have been a honest man (though the omission of Mr. Lee-Morris' name against the officials, &c., who thought well of him in Tanjore, where he served seven years, is very conspicuous). Even now he is capable of doing useful work, and it is quite true that he exerted himself very successfully, and with much ability, in the boundary dispute between the Sivagiri Zemindar (the chief complainant in this case) and the Government so lately as March last year. It is, therefore, the more discouraging to find that he has been for some time at any rate one of the most conspicuous offenders in his own jurisdiction. When the fountain of justice is so corrupt as in this unfortunate division, what can be expected of the subsidiary streams?

110. Neverthless (although I am perhaps not called upon for an opinion on the point) I may be allowed to say that I should not be inclined to recommend his prosecution. Not by any means, because I think there are extenuating circumstances in his case, for no punishment can be too severe for an officer in his position who so scandalously prostitutes the name of justice and brings disgrace upon all honest men in his position; but because I think the witnesses in such a case are entitled to some consideration, and also because it is, of course, likely enough that we might fail to prove anything actually criminal in a Court of Justice. In case of a trial, of course, much would depend on the idiosyncrasies of the presiding Judge. The witnesses would certainly be unwilling to be put to the trouble of giving evidence again, and many of them might possibly be tampered with or might be bamboozled by a clever Barrister and so break down.

111. As to the Tahsildar if the Government are of opinion that in these particular instances he was led astray by his superior officer, he might perhaps be allowed

to resign the service, though I think he should be dismissed as a warning to others. There are other serious charges still pending against him with which the Deputy Collector is not (apparently) connected, and even in this case it is clear that he collected ghee in Vartirayiruppu and elsewhere* for which he does not even pretend to have paid anything, and his desperate attempt to shield the Deputy Collector in the matter of receiving wedding presents, even at the risk of making out his own cousin (who has always been on the best terms with him) a shameless perjurer makes him fully deserving of the same fate as the Deputy Collector whose right-hand man he has been ever since the Virudupati murder case.

* *See* especially the evidence of the 7th and 31st witnesses.

112. It is perhaps desirable that I should refer to the Deputy Collector's frequent complaints throughout his defence that evidence was taken, as he puts it, *behind his back*. As a matter of fact, of course, no evidence was ever taken in that way; it was all recorded in his presence on oath, but it was necessary to ascertain beforehand whether a witness had anything worth recording to communicate, and I employed Vengu Pillai and the Officiating Tahsildar, Chithambaram Pillai, as persons in whose judgment and honesty I had reason to confide, to ascertain this, and sometimes (as in the case of the Sátúr and Gollarpati Zemindars, &c.,) had a witness in and examined him myself, but *not* of course on oath, nor was any detailed statement taken from him as a rule. In fact, this preliminary inquiry was precisely analogous to the police inquiry in a magisterial case.

113. As to pressure being put upon the witnesses to give evidence (paragraph 186 of the Deputy Collector's defence), it is rather remarkable that the only instance cited is a letter† from the Acting Deputy Collector, Vengu Pillai, asking the Sevalpati Manager to come as he had something important to say to him, and the only result of this "pressure" was to make the witness say he had paid a certain sum which the Deputy Collector himself admits was paid! Notwithstanding Mr. Vengu Pillai's "pressure," he could not be induced to admit that 300 rupees had also been paid as a wedding present, though he had actually said so in the presence of several people quite spontaneously. I think it is pretty clear that pressure was more successfully applied from the side of the defence.

† Exhibit M.

114. The suspensions and transfers of certain witnesses are easily explained. Subbramania Pillai, the 6th witness, was the Tahsildar's most active agent throughout this business and was quite a confidential clerk, so that he had to be taken as a kind of approver, and it was necessary to suspend him as an accomplice. The same was the case with the first-class Revenue Inspector who was also an abettor and was proved to have received grain worth Rs. 19-8-0 from the Zemindar of Sétúr no doubt as a retaining fee. With regard to the Police Inspector, his conduct, as described in paragraph 13 *supra* was so questionable that I was inclined to believe he was exerting himself to suppress evidence and thought it best to have him removed; he was not suspended or degraded in any way.

115. It can hardly be considered unreasonable that the complainants should be allowed an opportunity of hearing the evidence, seeing how deeply they are interested in the event. It would have been most unsatisfactory if the inquiry had been made behind *their* backs, and I have intentionally given them all reasonable opportunity of proving their case, believing that to be the intention of Government.

116. I have the honor to request that the defence statements may be read with my notes thereon (*Appendices H and I*).

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—List of witnesses for the prosecution, with seventy-four depositions.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—List of witnesses for the defence, with eleven depositions.

"prasâdhams" from the Srivilliputur temple to the higher officials, which is not denied; (3) that money given for a nautch goes to the nautch party, which is probably true, at any rate as a general rule; (4) that neither the Mannárkóta nor the Gollarpati Zemindar is in a position† to make presents, which is also true to a certain extent; (5) that only sixteen dubbers in all were loaded at Tirumangalam which agrees pretty well with the evidence for the prosecution; (6) that four of those dubbers were collected about Madura and Tirumangalam; and (7) that the Etaiyápuram Zemindar is in the habit of making large presents at nautches to which he is invited, and gave Rs. 100 on a particular occasion in a Vakil's house and Rs. 200 on another occasion. The only material point in all this is the contention that four dubbers of ghee had been collected by a "friend" of the Deputy Collector's at Madura. I have already‡ stated my opinion that this evidence is false, and I will now show more fully that it is so, and that it is consequently ruinous to the Deputy Collector's case.

† But as to this, *see* notes on Deputy Collector's defence statement (paragraph 42). It does not follow because a man is in bad circumstances that he will not give presents.

‡ Paragraph 17.

89. When first examined on the 16th of October, being taken by suprise at his sudden suspension, and not having had time to ascertain what the case was going to be, the Tahsildar said that he had purchased ghee and gingelly-oil to the value of "about Rs. 400" and produced receipts§ for Rs. 280½, saying that he could not remember whether he took receipts for everything. He probably had not time to secure receipts from Vartirayiruppu. In framing their defence therefore they were compelled to account for "about 400 rupees," worth of oil and ghee from Srivilliputur and thought it best to deny everything else. The Tahsildar's account is that 260 measures of ghee and 250 measures of oil were purchased; and he *now* says the Deputy Collector ordered him to get 250 measures of each, though when first asked he could not at all remember how much. Nor can he yet remember how the Deputy Collector sent him the money for these purchases or what became of a 100-rupee currency note that figures largely in the transaction.

§ Exhibits C, C-1, and C-2.

90. Then, as there is much evidence to show that 592 measures of ghee alone were collected, and that *only* ghee was sent to Tirumangalam (in 16 dubbers), evidently on account of the large collections (192 measures) in the valley of Vartirayiruppu for which Tirumangalam was the most convenient railway station (and probably also to avoid the too great publicity that would have ensued had so much ghee been despatched from Sátúr) and *also* to prove that 400 measures of oil had been sent to Sátúr, 28 *dubbers having been collected altogether*, according to the unchallenged evidence of Alagirisami (9th witness), who accounts for 27, and Govinda Rau (73rd witness), who shows how another was required, it was incumbent on the defence to account for 16 dubbers sent to Tirumangalam, and this may have been done in the following manner.

91. Two hundred and sixty measures of ghee would cost about 260 rupees and be contained in 6 dubbers, and 250 measures of oil would cost 125 rupees and go in the same number of dubbers, making 12 in all valued at 385 rupees. So their argument is that *all* the oil and ghee went together to *Tirumangalam*, and that the 4 dubbers collected by the "Madura friend" being added made the total of 16, which the prosecution vainly tried to make out were all full of ghee alone.

92. Now this explanation takes no account of the fact that 27 dubbers altogether were collected by Alagirisami (9th witness) and one procured subsequently, and quietly ignores the statement of Alagirisami and Subbramania Pillai (6th witness) that the oil was sent to Sátúr [what became of it there does not clearly appear, but it may have been stored there, or it may have gone to Tanjore in the brass vessels sent. The Deputy Collector's suggestion (paragraph 4 of his second statement dated 8th February 1881) that search might be made in his houses for it

is rather too absurd]. It also requires that the purchase of large quantities of ghee in the valley of Vartirayiruppu which is proved by quite* overwhelming evidence should be denied *in toto*, and has compelled the Deputy Collector to call to his assistance this Madura friend who was so very kind as to collect four dubbers of ghee (110 measures) and send some of it *from Madura to Tirumangalam* (!) at his own expense.

* The Deputy Collector's own man Govinda Rau (a most unwilling witness) clearly proves that ghee was collected and stored at Nattampatti, a chattram on the Tirumangalam road near Vartirayiruppu.

93. If there was any truth in this story, why did the Deputy Collector tell me when first examined that he would have to *inquire* and find out what things had been bought about Tirumangalam? why could he not mention his friend Venkoba Rau in October instead of springing him upon us at the end of January? But there could be no object whatever in sending oil and ghee from Srivilliputur to Tirumangalam, a distance of more than 30 miles, great part of it over a bad road, when Sátúr was only 24 miles distant by a comparatively speaking excellent road. It could only be because of purchases in the Vartirayiruppu valley that the goods were sent to Tirumangalam, and these purchases they both deny.

94. I doubted this Venkoba Rau's story from the very first, but now, when it turns out that he was convicted of taking bribes and dismissed from his appointment of Manager of the Madura Municipality in 1868; that he is the man referred to in G.O., No. 1340, dated 5th April 1877 (copy† enclosed for ready reference); and that he was fined for assaulting a Vakil by a Sub-Magistrate, and is evidently one of the most notorious characters in the Madura District, I am amazed at the Deputy Collector's folly in citing him as his chief witness. He says, indeed, that he was unaware of the man's character and antecedents, and was only introduced to him by Mr. Rama Rau, Deputy Collector, Madura, when he came down to this district in 1878, but I am sorry to say I could not possibly believe in such ignorance (the Deputy Collector not being the man to be ignorant of gossip affecting his friends), and prefer to believe that he was selected as a friend on account of his unscrupulous character, like so many other agents of his in this business.

† Appendix F.

95. Now it is clear that this man was selected by the Deputy Collector either to buy ghee for him in Madura, or to swear falsely that he had done so. I cannot believe that he was chosen to buy ghee for the reasons stated above; for, if any ghee was to be bought outside the district at all, why should not the Deputy Collector's numerous friends and relations in Tanjore have bought all that was required? He has only known the Deputy Collector (he says) since he came to Tinnevelly and cannot be such a particular friend of his (unless it be for his well-known and notorious unscrupulousness), and yet the Deputy Collector must needs *send for him* all the way from Madura to ask him to buy Rs. 100 worth of ghee. How absurd to collect ghee in Madura and send it 10 or 11 miles *south* to Tirumangalam in order to send it to Tanjore! Why could it not have been put into the train at Madura? But the whole story of this ghee transaction is incredible, and it is only supported by one witness, whose evidence is equally false. Venkoba Rau recollects being "sent for" to Sátúr (to avoid the inconvenience of being called upon to produce any letter from the Deputy Collector in corroboration of his story), and says that the Deputy Collector's people used frequently to come to Madura, but he cannot recollect the name of a single person who ever came, much less the man who came to fetch him on this occasion. If the Deputy Collector had wanted a friend to buy Rs. 100 worth of ghee, he would surely have written and asked him. Why so much mystery about the purchase? and why send for his friend all the way from Madura to Sátúr (putting him to considerable expense and inconvenience) in order to give him Rs. 100 and ask him to buy ghee? Then this friend, the convicted bribe-taker, who gets his living by touting for Vakils, has no record of any kind whatever of any of the purchases, cannot specify a single person who sold ghee or dubbers, kept no account, and never reported to the Deputy Collector that he had bought it. He says he went to Tirumangalam *himself* to look after these precious

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Statement taken from Deputy Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Statement taken from Tahsildar.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—List of Exhibits for the prosecution, with twenty-six exhibits.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 6 to 15.—Appendices A to J.

ENCLOSURE No. 16.—Defence Statement of Deputy Collector with its enclosures as specified in his lists marked A, B, and C.

ENCLOSURE No. 17.—Defence Statement of Tahsildar, with its enclosures.

Read—the following petition from A. RAMACHENDRA RAU, Deputy Collector of Tinnevelly, to the Honorable the MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 17th March 1881.

That, with reference to the inquiry ordered by Government (G.O., No. 3348, dated 1st October 1880) into the complant preferred against him by the Sivagiri Zemindar and others, your petitioner is constrained, however unwillingly, to submit, for your kind consideration, the following lines, particularly in respect of a few of the irregularities relating to the conduct of his case before the Collector, and some of which have been passingly touched in the defence.

2. That the petitioner regrets to state that several of the witnesses for the prosecution were examined by Acting Tahsildar Chithambaram Pillai, Acting Deputy Collector Vengu Pillai, or by the Collector himself, at the *back* of the petitioner, *prior* to their regular examination, as is fully set forth in paragraphs 55 and 186 of the defence. It will be apparent, from a perusal of the documents alluded to in the said paragraphs, that undue pressure had been used, and that the witnesses themselves have admitted the fact of their examination at his back, before the said officials. It is needless for him to comment upon the fairness or otherwise of such a procedure. In a departmental inquiry like the present, one would naturally suppose that the record would consist of the spontaneous statements of the parties voluntarily coming forward with their grievances, if any, for which every facility was afforded by the suspension of your petitioner.

3. Your petitioner humbly submits that, as he understands the Government Order directing the inquiry, the Collector was required to do no more than judge of the truthfulness or otherwise of the grievances complained of upon such evidence as may be adduced before him by the complainants and report thereon.

4. There was no necessity for the Collector to examine any witnessses *behind* the back of your petitioner. At any rate your petitioner craves leave to state that the employment of the Acting Tahsildar and the Acting Deputy Collector, who hope to profit by the ruin of your petitioner, in actively collecting evidence was not only irregular, but also prejudicial to your petitioner, in no small degree. That these officers used undue pressure upon people to come forward to testify against your petitioner; that they first, by using their own authority, secured the attendance of such persons as they liked; that they served the formal summons only upon such of them as they found convenient and rejected others would be evident from the portion of the defence already alluded to.

5. The encouragement offered by these proceedings to the people to come forward to attack and to suggest plans for attacking your petitioner was so great that the Sivagiri Zemindar and his companions thought it fit, and apparently with

impunity, to address a letter* to the Collector suggesting that for facilitating the inquiry Magistrate's Clerk Subbramania Pillai and three other Village Munsifs be suspended and Police Inspector Kathaperumal Pillay, Revenue Inspector Amboor Subbier, and Head Constable Masilamani Nadan be transferred.† Whether acting upon this letter or otherwise, your petitioner grieves to say that within three days, *i.e.*, on the 14th October 1880, the said Subbramania Pillay (6th witness for the prosecution) was suspended; on the 20th Amboor Subbier (5th witness for the prosecution) was transferred‡ to Nangunéri Taluk and subsequently on the 30th idem suspended§ from his post, and just about the same time Kathaperumal Pillai, Police Inspector (14th witness for the prosecution), was transferred to another Taluk. This is not all. The 60th witness, Ponnan, in the course of his examination, was visited with immediate punishment. He was summarily dismissed and was required to give up his belt on the spot. Need your petitioner say that such a procedure struck terror into the minds of the people and induced them to appear against him, willingly or unwillingly, knowing or not knowing any fact connected with the case.

6. The evidence taken on such pressure from such witnesses under such circumstances could not be expected to be made stronger; but, when their innate weakness was pointed out in the defence, some‖ of the witnesses were again called for and examined and their former statements rectified in spite of your petitioner's repeated prayers to the Collector, oral and written,¶ to take his defence *after* recording the evidence for the prosecution had *closed*.

7. Your petitioner need not observe that this course is not only opposed to all principles of justice and humanity, but calculated to be injurious to the interests of the person under inquiry. The evidence, even in its *rectified* form, has not, the petitioner humbly submits, improved the case for the prosecution.

8. Your petitioner, acting under the impression that such an examination for rectifying the former statements would not be legitimately recognised as evidence for the prosecution, declined, in respectful terms, to again cross-examine such witnesses. For your petitioner may not only have to cross-examine them, but also may be under the necessity of tendering fresh explanation, which explanation in its turn may induce the Collector to call for the witnesses again—a process which may never terminate, and a procedure which is opposed to all principles of justice and equity. Your petitioner, therefore, entered his humble protest against such a course through his petition to the Collector dated the 23rd ultimo.

9. Your petitioner begs further to submit that the defence witnesses were not cross-examined by the Collector *before* the defence was put in, whereby the petitioner lost the opportunity of commenting upon their evidence, *after* such cross-examination, although, even in its present form, their evidence remains unshaken. In spite of such exceptional procedure adopted in your petitioner's case, he begs to submit, and humbly hopes that your Honorable Board will be of the same opinion, that the charges urged against your petitioner and the grievances which were complained of have no foundation, notwithstanding that the inquiry was conducted most minutely from taluk to taluk, which extended over a period of nearly five months, subjecting your petitioner to great humiliation and annoyance.

10. Under these circumstances your petitioner humbly and hopefully prays that your Honorable Board will be pleased to recommend to Government the cancelment of their order suspending your petitioner from office, for which act of grace and justice your petitioner shall ever pray.

N.B.—For facility of reference a printed copy of the defence, containing also an abstract of some of the exhibits referred to in the manuscript copy, is herewith humbly submitted.

* *Vide* Exhibit VI, dated 11th October 1880, filed with the defence.
† All of Srivilliputur Taluk.
‡ *Vide* Exhibit VII.
§ *Vide* Exhibit VIII.
‖ Nos. 6, 9, 17, 51, and 30.
¶ Petitions to Collector, dated 18th and 25th November 1880.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Deputy Collector's letter to Collector, dated 31st January 1881.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copies of Testimonials.

Resolution—dated 12th July 1881, No. 1341.

The Board submit to Government the report called for from the Collector in this case, as also a petition subsequently received from the accused Deputy Collector.

2. The charges against the Deputy Collector arise out of circumstances which have been ranged by the Collector in paragraph 5 of his letter under eleven different heads. The twelfth head refers to the Tahsildar of Srivilliputur Taluk.

3. Of the charges against the Deputy Collector, Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 do not appear to be of a nature calling for the notice of Government. The two first, Nos. 6 and 7, refer to matters which appear to the Board to be domestic rather than official. The Collector probably thought it necessary to enter into this subject because it was referred to in the petition presented to Government, but the Board consider that his remarks on this head in paragraphs 73 and 74 and a portion of 75 might well have been omitted. The evidence regarding No. 8 is meagre, and what has been elicited on the subject of "prasâdhams" appears to be trivial. As regards No. 9, the evidence is not satisfactory, though the Collector, in paragraph 73, is inclined to think that the charge is true.

4. The subject of charge 1, namely, that the Deputy Collector obtained large supplies of oil and ghee gratuitously, or for a low price, is referred to by the Collector in paragraphs 15 to 27, 88 to 96, 102 to 105, and 108. The evidence of the witnesses mentioned in paragraph 20 on this point appears to the Board to be of a very convincing nature, and it is in some cases supported by documentary evidence (*see* paragraphs 20, 22, and 23). The charge is met in a very incomplete manner by the Deputy Collector. He admits having made the purchases through the Tahsildar of Srivilliputur. He says in paragraphs 19 and 20 of his defence that he paid the Tahsildar for the articles, but "it is beyond the sphere of his knowledge what he did with the money." This endeavour to shift responsibility on to a subordinate who obtained the supplies under his express orders appears to the Board a lame excuse. It would argue at the very least a great and reprehensible laxity on the part of the Deputy Collector. That there was something eminently irregular in the transaction which was known to the Deputy Collector is apparent from the manner in which he first met the inquiries of the Collector (paragraph 15 of his letter). Making every allowance for the necessity of caution on the part of the Deputy Collector with reference to the position in which he was placed, the fact that he tried to mislead the Collector as to the extent and character of these purchases is an unfavorable feature in the case. Dismissing, however, from consideration the evidence of witnesses on the one side and the replies of the accused on the other, there remains still one fact which is almost sufficient by itself to criminate the Deputy Collector. There were two marriages in his family to be celebrated in Tanjore. For this supplies of ghee and oil, amounting to 992 measures or more, besides dholl and grains, were admittedly purchased in Tinnevelly. The question naturally arises, why should these supplies be purchased in Tinnevelly and conveyed at some cost by rail to Tanjore, 200 miles distant? They could as readily, perhaps more readily, have been procured on the spot at Tanjore itself. This question is very imperfectly answered at paragraph 11 of the defence. The Deputy Collector says that owing to want of a proper agent at Tanjore, he was compelled to make the purchases at the place where he himself was resident, and that he was obliged to purchase in advance and not wait till he himself went to Tanjore, because the articles in question were such as could not be procured at short notice. The Board do not think that the plea about want of an agent is worthy of attention, and they doubt the importance of the second argument. The

primâ facie assumption in such a case would be that the supplies were procured in Tinnevelly because there the Deputy Collector could procure them "gratuitously or for a low price;" a third assumption is converted into proof by the evidence. The Deputy Collector endeavours to put the amount of purchases in Tinnevelly at a lower figure than would otherwise appear by saying that he obtained some ghee from a friend at Madura. The Collector is at some pains to show that this was false, and it probably was false, but the Board think it is hardly necessary to go into the case with so much minuteness. A consideration of the broad facts of this charge has left no doubt in the minds of the Board, and the Government will possibly regard the matter in the same light, that the Deputy Collector greatly abused his position in the matter of obtaining these supplies.

5. The second point is that the Deputy Collector levied a blackmail on the salaries of a number of officials. Regarding this the Collector says in paragraph 43 that it is impossible to doubt the evidence. The fact is deposed to by the Taluk Gumastahs, a Shroff, a Copyist, and a Taluk Sheristadar. In his defence the Deputy Collector denies all knowledge of the matter and holds the Tahsildar answerable for the impropriety if it took place. A matter of this kind could not take place without the knowledge of the Deputy Collector, and, considering the position and intelligence of the subscribers, it is not likely that, if they paid the money, it did not reach the person for whom they paid it. Such persons would take care not only that the money was paid to the Deputy Collector, but that he was also informed whence it came.

6. The third charge is that the Deputy Collector took large sums of money as wedding presents from Zemindars and others. The Collector refers to this in paragraphs 30 to 43. The witnesses are men of all classes, official and non-official. Though there are discrepancies in the evidence, it appears to the Board to be on the whole credible. The Deputy Collector meets this charge by bringing to notice the discrepancies just noted, by attributing ill-feeling to the witnesses, and by declaring that some of them are without means and therefore unable to make the presents alleged. The money known to have been received is Rs. 1,009, and in addition to this money is also said to have been paid over to dancing girls. It is evidently immaterial to whom the money was paid, provided it was paid with the knowledge of the Deputy Collector, and the Board see no reason to doubt the evidence on that point. The evidence of the 17th witness, the Tahsildar of Sátúr, is valuable and is corroborated by the 37th witness.

7. As a fourth charge the 30th and 43rd witnesses, who were persons having official dealings with the Deputy Collector, are said to have lent money to him. The story of the 30th witness is supported by documentary evidence. This witness is a merchant and a suspended village official. He lent the Deputy Collector Rs. 300, and the latter is said to have endeavoured to suppress the fact. After the Deputy Collector was suspended, this witness demanded repayment from him. The demand was sent in a registered letter to the address of the Deputy Collector, and his *locum tenens*, Vengu Pillay, opened the letter thinking it was an ordinary tappâl petition. In this way the fact of the loan became known. The Deputy Collector endeavours to show by his diary that the witness has made false statements as to the date and place where the money was demanded, but this has been satisfactorily explained by the witness (paragraphs 53 and 54 of the Collector's letter). The affair connected with the 43rd witness is not so clear as that just mentioned. The Collector, however, considers it difficult to doubt it (paragraphs 56 and 57), and the reply of the Deputy Collector is weak.

8. The circumstance of the fifth head of charge cannot be said to be directly proved, but this appears to be mainly owing to the unwillingness of the persons who were cognizant of the facts to state what they knew. The facts are fully gone into by the Collector in paragraphs 58 to 68, and the Board regard them as quite sufficient to establish a moral certainty as to the truth of the charge. The Zemindar's accounts show items of "Rs. 500, Satúr expense," "Rs. 5, batta to the Stanâdipathi going to Sátúr," and "Rs. 5, present to a peon on the Deputy Collector's establishment." But for the mention of the Deputy Collector's peon, these

entries are seemingly innocent. The explanation, however, tendered is of itself of so incredible a nature (paragraphs 62 to 67) as to throw suspicion on the whole transaction.

9. By the side of the matters just mentioned, charge 10 is not perhaps of sufficient importance to merit notice on the present occasion.

10. The same may be said regarding the eleventh charge, except that the failure of Venkoba Rau to attend on summons at the inquiry is a suspicious circumstance.

11. The Board consider that it is distinctly proved in the departmental inquiry which has been so carefully conducted by the Collector that Deputy Collector A. Ramachendra Rau (*a*) obtained supplies for the marriages in his family without payment or on payment of considerably less than their proper value; (*b*) levied a cess on officials' salaries, &c.; (*c*) borrowed money from a person with whom he had official dealings, &c.; (*d*) they consider also that it is sufficiently proved in the inquiry that he received large sums as wedding presents from Zemindars, officials, and ryots, these sums being not altogether willingly given; and (*e*) received Rs. 500 as a present from the Sétúr Zemindar. The Board consider that Deputy Collector Ramachendra Rau should be dismissed from the public service. It is to be regretted that the proper performance of his duty should have made for the Deputy Collector an enemy in the Sivagiri Zemindar, but the Board cannot take this as a point in any way diminishing his guilt or operating as a plea for mitigation of punishment. The punishment which the Board propose for Ramachendra Rao will, the Board think, have an important effect in advancing the purity of the administration in Tinnevelly and other districts.

12. As to the case of Tahsildar Saravanamuttu Pillai, the Board are abundantly satisfied that he made use of his official influence to collect gratuitous or inadequately-paid supplies and to obtain subscriptions from subordinates for the benefit of the Deputy Collector. The Collector in paragraph 111 recommends apparently that the Tahsildar should be dismissed. The Board direct that he be suspended for a twelvemonth from date of first suspension, and request the sanction of Government to degrade him then to the post of Taluk Sheristadar.

13. The Board request a special report from the Collector as regards the Sétúr Tahsildar (paragraph 98).

14. The Board leave it to the Collector to deal with the conduct of the minor officials concerned in this matter.

15. For the information of Government the Board submit as an appendix a précis of the evidence taken at the inquiry.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. D. MACLEAN,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with nineteen enclosures in original.
To the Collector of Tinnevelly.

APPENDIX I.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE GIVEN BY WITNESSES.

1. The evidence of Peter, 1st witness for prosecution, is hearsay regarding the taking of money, &c. The Zemindar forced him to go to Madras, but for what purpose is not clear.

2. Second witness, Sivagiri Zemindar, was asked for nothing and paid nothing. Explains the term "living in princely style," which amounts to nothing but hearsay; the Deputy Collector's expenditure is Rs. 700 a-month according to his estimate. Admits having paid 1st witness' expenses to the Hills. Paid 3rd witness' expenses in Madras when 3rd witness went to get memorial printed.

3. Third witness had a good deal to do with the petition. Saw a quantity of ghee and oil-seed at the Deputy Collector's house which he was told was required for the marriage. Mentions the prasâdhams, he being Pagoda Trustee, and about paying trifling expenses for dancing girls. He received hints that prasâdhams were insufficient.

4. Fourth witness, Pagoda Manager, was told by a Taluk Peon that the Tahsildar wanted 300 measures of lamp-oil for the marriage at Tanjore at a low price and refused to give it. Was asked to send other things from the temple for the procession and refused. Did not send prasâdhams on one occasion and was told to do so by Police Inspector. Made arrangements for dancing girls. Cost of procession to meet Deputy Collector cost Rs. 1-8-0. The prasâdham sent to Deputy Collector was food not offered to the idol; its value trifling.

5. Fifth witness, Revenue Inspector, knows nothing of collections having been made. Heard that supplies had been purchased.

6. Sixth witness, Gumastah of Srívilliputur Taluk, was present at the marriage festivities. Saw money given to Deputy Collector by 11th, 32nd, 37th, 61st, and 43rd witnesses in Deputy Collector's house. Saw the Raja of Etaiyápuram give about Rs. 50. Deputy Collector asked Tahsildar to get ghee, who told certain Munsifs and ryots to collect 200 measures and gave each Rs. 2 advance; one of them 46th witness; also 38th, 11th witnesses. The former was told to supply 100 measures. A Peon brought ghee to the Local Fund chuttrum where cutcherry was held. Ninth witness, Alagiri Naik, brought oil, and also gave money to Tahsildar who gave it to two Revenue Inspectors, also to some Munsifs, to get oil which was brought to the Local Fund chuttrum, whence it was taken to Tirumangalam. Does not know if receipts were taken for money or if balance due was paid. Does not know how much the ryots paid. Witness paid Rs. 2-4-0 on account of the marriage. The Gumastahs agreed to pay at the rate paid by the Sátúr Gumastahs, viz., Rs. 3 for Rs. 20 salary. This fact was mentioned by Tahsildar; so Gumastahs agreed. They were not asked. It was deducted from the pay at the beginning of the month. Does not know what became of it, but the Shroff said it was sent to the Deputy Collector through the Tahsildar. The collections on the tray at the nautch were placed with the tray before the Deputy Collector.

7. Seventh witness heard by letter from his brother, 31st witness, that ghee had been given to Deputy Collector for marriage.

8. Eighth witness, Clerk in Deputy Collector's Office, saw money put on a tray at the nautch by a man sitting near the Zemindar. It might be between Rs. 50 and 100. It was paid to a musician. Cannot say for whom the money was intended.

9. Ninth witness, Alagiri Naik, Duffadar, Sátúr Taluk, received from Deputy Collector Rs. 100 to get 400 measures of oil. Gave money to the Tahsildar. Tahsildar had ghee. Zemindar, 12th witness, sent twelve dubbers. The owners asked 2 pies per day for each; 42nd witness gave fifteen dubbers. Does not know if any money was paid for them. The ghee, 400 measures, taken to Deputy Collector's house at Sátúr. Ghee sent to Tirumangalum, oil sent to Sátúr. Saw other articles said to have been collected. Half a bandy-load. At marriage festivities 17th, 10th, 32nd, 11th, 37th, 61st witnesses presented cloths, property of Ramachendra Rau. Rs. 100 not enough for 400 measures of oil. Deputy Collector said he would send more money. Lamp-oil, two casks, bought through the Sátúr Tahsildar, 17th witness; 42nd witness who gave dubbers was connected with some case. Does not know whether Sátúr Tahsildar got cummin-seed and turup for nothing or not.

10. Tenth witness, Taluk Sheristadar of Sátúr, was told by a relative of the Deputy Collector to pay something. Borrowed Rs. 20 and paid it as a nuzzar. Saw Zemindar, Etaiyápuram, pay some money. It was put on a plate before Deputy Collector. May have been Rs. 200. To whom ultimately given not known. Had no wish to pay the money, but thought he was obliged to do so when asked for it.

11. Eleventh witness, Acting Village Munsif, bought ghee at a low rate for the Tahsildar and was paid for it. Bought again thirty measures of ghee. Not paid for it. He was asked by Revenue Inspector to get it for Deputy Collector; gave Rs. 65 as a marriage nuzzar; was asked Rs. 100; such large presents are unusual; he gave it to avoid incurring ill-will.

12. Twelfth witness, Zemindar of Gollapati, received notice of the marriage. Sent Rs. 300 to the Deputy Collector. After marriage went to a nautch and put down Rs. 100 before the Deputy Collector. (This is the witness referred to in paragraph 11 of Collector's letter).

13. Thirteenth witness, cultivator and servant of the 12th witness, carried and paid the money to the Deputy Collector.

14. Fourteenth witness, Police Inspector, speaks of Deputy Collector being dissatisfied with the small amount of prasadams. The rest is hearsay.

15. Fifteenth witness, Karnam, was asked to pay money, but refused. Agreed to supply flowers to Deputy for eleven months at 3 and 4 rupees a-month. Was not paid. The flowerman was paid Rs. 7 by Deputy; witness paid Rs. 19 to flowerman, and a Monegar paid Rs. 7.

16. Sixteenth witness, Manager and uncle of Sevalpatti Zemindar, gave Rs. 200 to the Deputy Collector at the nautch. Has no account to prove payment.

17. Seventeenth witness, Tahsildar of Sátúr, knows that 11th, 32nd, and 37th came to see Deputy Collector and brought nuzzars with them; 11th and 32nd brought money on trays and put it before Deputy Collector. At the Etaiyápuram nautch Zemindar gave about Rs. 150. A dancing girl took it away. Bought 320 measures lamp-oil for Deputy Collector. This was apparently paid for. On the day on which nuzzars were presented 37th witness borrowed from witness Rs. 100 and repaid it. Why witness does not know.

18. Eighteenth witness, Taluk Shroff, stopped Rs. 22-8-0 from the pay of Clerks. Put money in a box and 6th witness gave box to Srívilliputur Tahsildar; 6th witness said money was wanted for Deputy Collector's marriage expenses.

19. Nineteenth witness paid Rs. 2, or rather had it stopped from his pay. This was for the marriage.

20. Twentieth witness, Srívilliputur Gumastah, similarly paid Rs. 2-4-0.

21. Twenty-first witness, Head Gumastah, paid Rs. 3 because he was ordered to do so by Tahsildar.

22. Twenty-second witness, also a Gumastah, paid Rs. 2-4-0.

23. Twenty-third witness, a Gumastah, paid Rs. 2-4-0 according to Tahsildar's order.

24. Twenty-fourth witness, a Gumastah, paid Rs. 3.

25. Twenty-fifth witness, a Gumastah, paid Rs. 2-4-0. He objected as he was in receipt of only half pay at the time. Sixth witness said it was a strict order, and he must pay it.

26. Twenty-sixth witness, a Copyist. His name was down for As. 12, but owing to some mistake his pay that month was not passed, and next month his contribution was not asked for so in the end he escaped payment.

27. Twenty-seventh witness, Taluk Dufterbund, paid Rs. 1.

28. Twenty-eighth witness, Srívilliputur Taluk Sheristadar, gave Rs. 30 as a token of respect. Deputy Collector was unwilling to take it, but received it when pressed to do so. Knows of a list of subscriptions by Gumastahs. Two Monegars wanted their pay from Taluk Treasury; when told to deduct it from village collections, they objected, as they said there would be no collections that month; and they wanted the money for ghee for a marriage. Fifth witness, Revenue Inspector, said he had been occupied collecting ghee, &c. Tahsildar told him to say he had seen money paid for ghee, &c., but witness had not so seen. One of the village officials who came for his pay was 34th witness.

29. Twenty-ninth witness, a private person, Local Fund Member, gave Rs. 70 for nautch and marriage. It is usual to give such presents, though at a upanayanam at another Deputy's house he gave nothing.

30. Thirtieth witness is a merchant and suspended village official. He lent the Deputy Rs. 300, but has not been repaid. He was restored to office after expiry of suspension and after loan was made. He can only produce copies of his account of this loan, because he gave the originals to Venkoba Rao who asked for them after witness had asked by letter, Exhibit E, for repayment.

31. Thirty-first witness, apparently an Agraharamdar, gave thirty measures of ghee to the Tahsildar, for which he was not repaid.

32. Thirty-second witness, apparently a wealthy ryot, paid Deputy Collector Rs. 65 by order of the Tahsildar. He saw 11th, 37th, 43rd witnesses pay; 37th borrowed a note for Rs. 100 from 17th witness and paid it. The Tahsildar paid Rs. 50; 61st witness paid Rs. 25. Deputy objected to take it, but 17th witness persuaded him to do so. Witness gave Rs. 30 for Jamabandi supplies. Saw Etaiyápuram Zemindar pay money, about Rs. 200, at nautch.

33. Thirty-third witness, Revenue Inspector, collected ghee for the marriage through Village Munsifs who complained they were not paid. Witness paid Rs. 10 from his salary for marriage. He was asked for Rs. 20.

34. Thirty-fourth witness, a Monegar, gave Rs. 50 for ghee to 6th witness. He usually drew his pay at the taluk, but Sheristadar told him he must take it out of the collections. Witness told 6th witness he could not pay the money till he went to his village; 6th witness sent a Peon to Sheristadar to make payment, and 6th witness took the money; 33rd witness, Revenue Inspector, asked him for fifty measures of ghee, but witness preferred to pay money. Witness helped his nephew, 50th witness, to collect 100 measures of ghee. So far as witness knows he has not been paid.

35. Thirty-fifth witness, Village Munsif, gave Rs. 35 as a marriage present; Rs. 30 of ulandu, for which he has not been paid. The money was given to Deputy Collector; the ulandu to 6th witness.

36. Thirty-sixth witness, a Munsif, gave Rs. 60 or 64 worth of ulandu to 5th witness; received Rs. 4 advance from 6th witness; received nothing more, and gave a receipt for full amount.

37. Thirty-seventh witness, a dismissed Munsif, was told by Tahsildar to give Rs. 300 to gain favor. Paid Rs. 200, obtained a note for Rs. 100 from 17th witness; 50th witness sent 100 measures of ghee for the marriage to the Tahsildar. Supplies were being obtained from several villages. Rs. 50 was paid from the common fund of a village for oil. Paid to 5th witness. He gave Rs. 200 unwillingly and by order; 43rd, 17th, 61st, 32nd, 11th, and 6th witnesses were present at the payment of the first Rs. 100; 17th witness did not pay in witnesses' presence, but he said he would give Rs. 60; 6th witness only present when second Rs. 100 paid. Witness was not restored to his post which was given to his brother.

38. Thirty-eighth witness, a ryot, sent 100 measures of ghee to the Tahsildar. For this he gave Rs. 50 out of his own pocket and took Rs. 50 from the fish-rent money. Witness gave receipt for money but was not paid; Tahsildar said Sheristadar was present when the money was paid. Sheristadar denied this. The Tahsildar ordered the witness to procure the ghee.

39. Thirty-ninth witness, Village Munsif, paid Rs. 10 to 6th witness for Jamabandi supplies. His brother-in-law, since dead, paid to 6th witness Rs. 50 for ghee. Tahsildar with witness saw the money paid.

40. Fortieth witness received betel-nut from the Deputy Collector by 9th witness and N. Subba Rao who said respect must be paid. This meant that rupees must be paid. He collected Rs. 100 in the village and gave it to the Police Gumastah, Gopalaswamy Aiyer, who took it to Deputy Collector. Witness, 42nd witness, and another went to Sátúr with the money.

41. Forty-first witness, a ryot, sent, by order of the Tahsildar, thirty measures of ghee, for which witness paid 14 annas per measure; received only Rs. 1 from 6th witness; 67th witness took away the ghee. The Tahsildar asked for the ghee for the Deputy Collector's marriage. Witness received no remissions, has been fined, and was not granted permission to construct a tank on his land.

42. Forty-second witness, a merchant, with 40th witness and another, collected and took Rs. 100 to Sátúr and paid it to Gopalaswamy Aiyer, because N. Subba Rao and 9th witness brought them betel.

43. Forty-third witness, a ryot and money-dealer, gave Rs. 100 as a marriage present to the Deputy Collector; 46th witness borrowed Rs. 17 from witness, and gave Rs. 50 to 6th witness who asked for it on account of the nautch and a marriage present. In March or April 1879 witness brought for Deputy Collector cloths to the value of Rs. 200, but has not been repaid. Witness gave the present out of friendship.

44. Forty-fourth witness, Acting Munsif, was told by Tahsildar to give 50 measures of ghee for the marriage. Purchased at the rate of Annas 14 per measure; received 1 rupee from 6th witness: received no more; 67th witness took away the ghee. The latter contradicts this and says his Taliaries took it.

45. Forty-fifth witness, Village Munsif, bought 12 measures of ghee at Annas 14 per measure and sent it to a certain chuttrum for Deputy Collector's marriage; speaks to correspondence and receipts produced on the subject; has been suspended for remissness of collections; received Annas 8 advance from 6th witness; received no more.

46. Forty-sixth witness, a ryot, was told by 6th witness to supply 100 measures of ghee; paid for it at the rate of Annas 12 per measure; received advance Rs. 1-8-0 and no more; sent the ghee to a chuttrum to the charge of Village Munsif, 63rd witness; paid Rs. 50 for the nautch as requested by 6th witness; had only Rs. 35 and borrowed Rs. 17 from 43rd witness. Tahsildar was present when 6th witness ordered the ghee.

47. Forty-seventh witness, Village Munsif, was asked by 6th witness for ghee, but paid Rs. 25 instead. Has not been repaid.

48. Forty-eighth witness, Village Munsif, supplied 15 measures of oil for Deputy Collector's marriage by order of 33rd witness; was not paid for it.

49. Forty-ninth witness, a Vakil and a Pagoda Trustee, gives a long statement about pra-sâdhams and flowers, of no consequence.

50. Fiftieth witness, Village Munsif, was told by 6th witness that it was the Tahsildar's order that witness should supply 100 measures of ghee for the marriage; supplied 70 measures, and was not paid.

51. Fifty-first witness, Village Munsif, was asked by 33rd witness for 10 or 20 measures of oil, but being a poor man supplied 15 measures, and has not been repaid. He delivered it to 6th witness at the chuttrum, and gave it as a present for the marriage.

52. Fifty-second witness, Village Munsif, was told by 5th witness to supply 100 measures of ghee. Witness, 38th witness, and others collected the ghee and paid on an average Re. 1 per measure which has not been repaid. The ghee was sent to Srívilliputur. He resigned his appointment owing to some trouble in the supply of coolies; has been fined twice; Rs. 70 were paid from the fish-rents.

53. Fifty-third witness sent, by order of the Tahsildar, two kottais of dholl, for which he paid Rs. 17-8-0; has not been paid; refers to notes received from 5th and 54th witnesses, produced.

54. Fifty-fourth witness, a Taluk Peon, was sent by Tahsildar to 5th witness to procure dholl, two kottais, from 53rd witness; went to 53rd, procured it, and took it to Tahsildar's house. It being short when measured, he got 55th witness to write the note (alluded to by 53rd witness). The grain was sent to Deputy Collector; has been told by Tahsildar that he is too old and should take pension.

55. Fifty-fifth witness, a Masalchi, admits writing the above note; has been dismissed for forging a signature to a summons.

56. Fifty-sixth witness, Peshkar under Zemindar of Sátúr, says an item of Rs. 500 "sent for Sátúr expenditure" was for the purchase of cows and iron things. It was sent to 74th witness who was at Sátúr to make collections which he did not collect. He spent exactly Rs. 500 including his batta. There is an entry of Rs. 5 paid to a peon in Deputy Collector's Office. There are other entries of payments to 5th witness, Revenue Inspector; cannot explain an entry of Rs. 100 to "Ba Sahib," though he checked the account.

57. Fifty-seventh witness, a sort of Writer under the above, deposes to the same effect.

58. Fifty-eighth witness, Samprati, refers to the entry in which 5th witness is mentioned.

59. Fifty-ninth witness, Zemindar of Sátúr, admits paying Rs. 70 to a dancing girl at the nautch; denies or pleads ignorance regarding the entries in his accounts.

60. Sixtieth witness, a Batta Peon, apparently denies a previous statement made to the Collector that he had gone to Sátúr.

61. Sixty-first witness, a Sub-Magistrate, paid Rs. 25 as a wedding present to the Deputy Collector; 11th, 32nd, and 37th witnesses also paid; 43rd witness consented to a deduction from what the Deputy Collector owed him. Tahsildar also paid Rs. 50. He paid willingly because he thought it right to pay, but shows that the amount he paid was excessive.

62. Sixty-second witness, Revenue Inspector of Srívilliputur, received Rs. 20 from the Tahsildar to buy 100 measures of oil for the Deputy Collector. He bought 40 measures and the remaining 60 were supplied by Village Munsifs, who were not paid.

63. Sixty-third witness produces a number of chits on the subject of supplying ghee. They are addressed to the witness, but by whom is not clear from the translations. The last is addressed by a village official and refers to an order of the Tahsildar regarding 12 measures of ghee. Witness says 192 measures were sent; 41st witness sent 30 measures; 46th witness 41½ measures; 45th witness sent 12; 46th witness sent 100 measures altogether.

64. Sixty-fourth witness, a Volunteer, wrote one of the chits in the Tahsildar's verandah at the request of a peon. It is unsigned and bears only the day of the week.

65. Sixty-fifth witness, a ryot, carried on his and another bandy seven kottais of dholl and two of ulandu from the chuttrum at Srívilliputur to the Deputy Collector's house at Sátúr.

66. Sixty-sixth witness was the second bandyman and speaks to the same effect.

67. Sixty-seventh witness, a Peon of Srívilliputur Taluk. Two of the chits produced were written by him—one forwarding 58 measures of ghee to 63rd witness and the other sending 50 measures. These were supplied by 43rd and 46th witnesses. The Tahsildar ordered 280 measures for the Deputy Collector's marriage. Witness collected 192 measures, exclusive of 50 measures sent by 44th witness. Witness paid nothing and does not know if any payment was made. The ghee was delivered to 63rd and 73rd witnesses, and they went north with it. The village officials said they had received advance and the Tahsildar said the same.

68. Sixty-eighth witness, a ryot, was ordered by Tahsildar to give eight kottais of paddy to few Brahmins at the Deputy Collector's maravidu. He was afraid he would get into trouble if he did not give it. Apparently there was no feeding of Brahmins.

69. Sixty-ninth witness, Acting Village Munsif, gave the Tahsildar a receipt for Rs. 200, the value of 200 measures of ghee collected by 46th witness. The money was not paid. The Tahsildar said he would pay for the ghee.

70. Seventieth witness, a Revenue Inspector, was told by the Tahsildar to collect for the Deputy Collector's wedding, but he refused. Witness was told by Tahsildar that every one had given something, so witness gave Rs. 9 to 6th witness as a wedding present.

71. Seventy-first witness, a Zemindar, was asked by two men, as they said, at the request of the Deputy Collector, to give Rs. 50 for the nautch. Witness paid the money to Subba Rau, who said he had paid it to the Deputy Collector. This was in December 1879. Witness is a bankrupt.

72. Seventy-second witness, a Station Master, sent five tons of luggage of various descriptions, such as cots, pots, and grain, for the Deputy Collector to Tanjore. The charge was Rs. 35-3-0. The truck was ordered to stop at Tirumangalam for more things.

73. Seventy-third witness, an Amin, was ordered by Tahsildar to take some ghee from Nattampati to Tirumangalam, where it was put on a truck. Witness does not know if the few dubbers were empty or not. There were two bandies. The Collector remarks that this is really evidence for the defence.

74. Seventy-fourth witness is the servant of the 59th witness, Zemindar. This was the man who received Rs. 505 from the 56th witness, which money he spent on cows and iron things. He cannot say from whom he bought the things and cows. The Collector remarks that there is no written evidence of these extensive purchases.

(Signed) C. D. MACLEAN,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

ORDER—dated 9th May 1882, No. 479, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

After very careful consideration of the facts of this case, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council is pleased to direct that Deputy Collector A. Ramachendra Rau be transferred to the Pension List. The Accountant-General will report what pension he is entitled to under the rules.

2. As regards Tahsildar Sarvanamuttu Pillay, final orders will be passed after the result of his prosecution, sanctioned in the Board's Proceedings, dated G.O., 10th December 1881, No. 3581, Mis. 23rd November 1881, No. 1021, Miscellaneous, is known.

(True Extract.)

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, with nineteen Enclosures.
" Accountant-General.
" Pension Department.

Exd W. H. French, J. W. Fischer, W. J. Lewis and F. R. Bantleman.

60 Copies.

Govt. of (1882) Madras.

REVENUE.

F. 164

Zl. 2. 12 Sept. 82

Order, dated 9th May 1882, *No.* 479.

A. Ramachendra Rau, Deputy Collector, Tinnevelly, transferred to the Pension List, and Accountant-General requested to report the pension he is entitled to under the rules.

Order thereon 15 June/82 a F. 532

430 Recorded.

T.W. 15.6.82.