

[illegible]

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 310

Press
~~Mis~~

Dated 12 - 5 - ~~19~~ 1860

Not to be folded or roughly handled

15/1/51

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
for the month of May 1860.*

No. 11. Read the following letter from H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner of Tanjore, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 28th April 1860, No. 1090.

In a communication which I had the honor to address to the Government on the 13th instant, No. 998, I submitted a statement of circumstances calling for the cancellation of a pension of Rupees 20, fraudulently secured by a son of the late Residency Sarishtadar Vekata Row.

2. I now beg to submit in regard to Visvanáth Rámáji, a nephew of that person, a similar recommendation, the pension in this case being of only Rupees 4.

3. The fraud practised by or for Visvanáth Rámáji was brought to my notice in an address from a Bramin residing in the Tanjore Fort, but I am free to acknowledge that without being able to secure any tangible data, I have long heard of floating rumours, that in the Tanjore Pension Lists, improper and uncalled for provision had been obtained by near and remote relatives of the aged Ex-Sarishtadar.

4. However this may be, the person to whom my present address has immediate reference, was entered in the Mahratta statement formerly laid before the Commissioner by the late Sirkele, as having served the Ráj for nineteen years, three months, five days, and his office was declared to be an ancient or hereditary one.

5. As the salary he was represented to have been in the enjoyment of at the time of the Rájá's demise (29th October 1855) was entered at Rupees 8, he became entitled under the rules of the Supreme Government, to half that amount as pension, which he has been enjoying up to the present period.

6. But, to secure this result, it had been necessary to exhibit him as a member of one of the three minor establishments; for when the Rájá died, Visvanáth Rámáji was of the Avusahiba's Dimmat, to which establishment, as belonging to the Ráj Villages and paid from their resources, not even gratuities have been assigned.

7. Accordingly in December 1856, that is, a short time subsequent to Mr. H. Forbes reaching Tanjore as Commissioner, Visvanáth Rámáji was newly employed by the late Sirkele as a servant in the Dowlat Pamlók and against his name in the list of that establishment, the period of service mentioned in paragraph 4 is specified, with the additional declaration that such service was ancient.

8. Visvanáth Rámáji has been personally examined by me and has delivered himself of numerous falsehoods. I have also examined one Visvanath Ananth, a quiet, steady man, who has been Gumásta in the Dowlat Pamlok Office for 20 years and has a very accurate knowledge of all its accounts. The latter, under my orders, has produced the original papers from which the late Sirkele's Mahratta statement was prepared, and I observe that, whereas in the original, Visvanáth Rámáji is shown in the appropriate column to have been drawing no salary at all at the date of the Rájá's death, yet, that in the Sirkele's report he is put down at Rupees 8 monthly.

9. The blank entry in the pay column of the original Dowlat Pamlók material is a clear proof that he did not then belong to that department.

10. But the Gumásta Visvanath has a perfect recollection, and the accounts show, that the Ex-Sarishtadar's nephew had received pay from the Dowlat Pamlók from December 1856 only, and as this and the other two minor establishments were abolished in March, April 1857, the said nephew had then served but for some three months; and that, two, subsequent to the demise of the Rájá, a circumstance that supplied no ground at all for even a gratuity.

11. Gumásta Visvanáth has added on being questioned, that the list of services of Visvanáth Rámáji was supplied by that person himself one day when Venkat Rau, the Ex-Sarishtadar, had come to the office of the late Sirkele and was seated by that officer; and that the result of the orders then issued by the Sirkele in communication with Vencat Rau, was the joining together

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
for the month of May 1860.*

of the three months passed by Visvanáth Rámáji in the Dowlat Pámlók with the period during which he had been attached to the Avu Sahibs Dimmat, an establishment which was not paid from the palace.

12. I have not deemed it advisable to call on Venkat Rau to attend and refute, if possible, the Gumastah's statement, because I have no powers of citation and he has just retired from the Public Service, his pension being now under consideration.

13. But, from my experience of Tanjore affairs, I am most fully satisfied that the late Sirkele was a mere puppet in Venkat Rau's hands, and seeing the relationship between the pensioner and Venkat Rau, I can but draw an inference unfavorable to the latter.

14. Without, however, mooted that point, it becomes my duty to recommend that the Government will order the cancelment of Visvanáth Rámáji's pension of Rupees 4. He stands No. 1,452, on the Dowlat Pámlók list.

15. I beg to enclose a copy of my notes of the examination of Visvanath Rámáji and Visvanath Ananth.

21st April 1860.

Visvanáth Rámáji examined.

I belonged to the Dowlat Pámlók, my father also belonged to it. When he died I did not succeed him and I do not know what became of his Asámi after his death, my age was then 33 or 34 years. I had been doing work with him in his office of Padakanavis in the Huzur Mahal. My father's office was an hereditary one, it came to him hereditarily. Being so, I don't know why it did not descend to me, some people requested the Rájá to confer it on me, but he did not do so, owing to powerful recommendations from other parties. I have heard it was granted to a son of Venkat Rau, late Residency Sarishtadar 4 months after the Rájá died (October 1855), my father died about six years before the Rájá. I do not know the name of the son of Venkat Rau to whom I refer. Yes: Venkat Rau is my maternal uncle. Nevertheless I do not know the name of his son in question.

I am in receipt of a pension of Rupees 4. I obtained it because originally I was entertained in the Arsenal Store department. Thence I was transferred to the Avusahib's Dimmat, I do not know when I was so transferred. Thence, again, was transferred to the Ráj Daftar. This was when Rájá was alive, 10 or 11 years ago. When Rájá died I was employed in the Daftar. I used to receive my pay from Dowlat Pámlók. I began to receive it thence only after the death of the Rájá. Before that event when I was employed in the Arsenal Store room, I got my pay from the Treasury. When I was transferred to the Dimmat, I drew it from that Department.

Question.—What change occurred to cause your wages to be paid from the Dowlat Pámlók after the Raja's demise?

Answer.—The Sirkele so ordered, 4 or 5 months after Rájá died and I drew it from the Dowlat Pámlók.

At present, I have no brother. One has demised. This was when my father was alive. If my father's office was an hereditary one, I ought to have succeeded to it according to the custom of the Ráj, although the Rájá was willing I should have it, the Sirkele said he would ask Venkat Rau about it.

Question.—Being so asked, is it likely that your uncle would have advised, contrary to what would be natural and obvious, that the Sirkele should not give you the vacant office?

Answer.—My uncle is not an ordinary man.

Visvanáth Ananth examined.

I have been Dowlat Pámlók Gumasta for 20 years and upwards and am thoroughly acquainted with all its accounts. Visvanath Ramaji received pay as a Kárkún in the Dowlat Pámlók department from only December 1856. He was then newly appointed to that situation by the late Sirkele. In the Dowlat Pámlók list he is shown to have served 19 years, 3 months, 5 days, we

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
for the month of May 1860.*

included in this all his years of service. That service had been in the Dimmat. I knew nothing of his having served in the Arsenal nor of the precise period in the Dimmat. We were ordered to enter it as above stated by Venkat Rau who was seated by the Sirkele. I was told to receive from Visvanath Ramaji his list of services and did so as ordered. The entry was made accordingly. The Dimmat servants were not paid in the Palace. They have not had pensions assigned to them, although there are many servants belonging to it of very old standing. When Visvanath Ramaji was mustered at the Government Agency, the system of getting "Rocca chits" (identification certificates) from the Sirkele's office had not been established. The original accounts prepared in the Dowlat Pámlók shows in the proper column that at the date of the Rájá's demise Visvanath Rámáji was not in receipt of pay and there is a note put against his name to the effect that "he has been paid in the Dimmat."

No. 12.

ORDER THEREON, 12th May 1860, No. 310.

Under the circumstances represented in the foregoing letter, the Government resolve, as recommended by the Commissioner, that the monthly pension of four Rupees assigned to Visvanath Ramaji, No 1452 in the Dowlat Pámlók list, be cancelled from the date to which last payment was made.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Order thereon. 12 May 1860. No 310.

Under the circum-
stances represented in the foregoing
letter, the Govd. resolve, as trans-
mitted by the Commissioners, that
the monthly pension of Hon Ramesh
assigned to Divan Ramaji, No
1162 in the Court Pankho list,
be cancelled from the date to
which last payment was made

W M

J P

To the Commr at Tanjore
- Col: & Govt Agent - do } Dir: 18
- Asst Commr
- Civil Auditor