

ORDINARY, MS.

P. L. K.
DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED *24-3-92*
No. *192*
193.

INDEXED

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

Directing that the
govt of India be ad-
vised on the ques-
tion whether the
orders of 10000 re-
garding the for-
mation of money by
civil officers from their
subordinate supersede
all previous orders-

23/3/92
7-11-06

14-12-37

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
18, No. , MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No. 5028/91
5823/91
215

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 18

FURTHER PAPER, No.


1735/92

OF 18

1486/92

Ans 2870/92 1535 of 23-3-92 mis

25



Genl. Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper :—

C. 5028.

Memo.

The Insp. Genl of Regn. is
requested to forward copies of
his Proceedings No T 3038 of 14.
Mr H and another of about
the same date on the subject
of pecuniary transactions of
Officers Registering Officers with
their subordinates.

(By order)

J. J. Registration

- (vii.) (a) The petitioner has by the dismissal suffered a loss of pay and commission amounting to Rs. 2160 calculating from the date of dismissal ; (b) he has also lost promotion to the 4th and 3rd grades to which some of his colleagues (juniors) have since been promoted.

3. That the petitioner prays, that in consideration of the above facts and of his youth, his inexperience in matters official and bearing on the Public Service, his past satisfactory Service &c., His Excellency be graciously pleased to extend some *mercy* towards the petitioner and mercifully, regard, (a) the loss of his pay Rs. 2160, hitherto sustained as *fine* ; or (b) the period he has been out of employ as one of *suspension* ; or (c) even to *reduce* him a grade ; or (d) regard his past *nine* years' Service in the Department as *null and void for pension* ; or to inflict what other punishment soever His Excellency may please. The petitioner prays for the exercise of mercy and mercy alone.

"That power alone can pardon that can punish"
For this act of kindness, the petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

E. M. K. S.

Late Sub-Registrar of Notary Public ~~and~~ Periyakulam.

Now residing in Madanapalle, Cuddalore.

*6 Nov 1891
Madanapalle*

On

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
OF FORT ST. GEORGE IN COUNCIL,
MADRAS.

*The humble petition of E. J. STEPHENS, late Sub-Registrar
and Notary Public, Periyakulam, Madura District.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That His Excellency's humble petitioner was for over nine years Sub-Registrar of Assurances and Notary Public in the Taluk of Periyakulam Madura District; but that he has been dismissed from the Public Service on a charge of borrowing money to the extent of Rs. 50 in controvention of the "Public Service Rules" so called as *per* G. O. extracted in the margin.

2. That His Excellency's petitioner has since, ineffectually tried to be restored to his appointment, and now prays for *mercy* submitting as follows:—

- i. He has for nine long years rendered faithful and satisfactory service in the Dept., the state of his office being invariably always pronounced at the several annual inspections, "Satisfactory" and "Registration progressed considerably."
- ii. He was honestly and sincerely not aware of the application of the "Service Rules" to officers—Sub-Registrars of the petitioner's position and *Statute*. The petitioner swears that till 1888 to which year the charge of borrowing referred, there was no 'order' or 'proceeding' (Departmental) communicating copy of the "Service Rules" to officers but on the contrary the "rules" were regarded in-applicable and therefore, not communicated to them by the then Inspector General of Registration as *per* his Proceeding No. T. 3038 dated 14-10-88 and another Proceeding of about the same date. The petitioner prays His Excellency to be pleased to have this item verified by a necessary reference to the office of the Inspector General of Registration.
- iii. The punishment for the breach of the "Service Rules, varies in severity with the nature of each individual case and the official status of the defaulter concerned, *to wit*,—
 - (a) 'Warning'. (b) 'Fine'. (c) 'Suspension'. (d) 'Reduction'. (e) 'Dismissal from Dept.' (f) Dismissal from the Public Service, &c., &c.
- (iv.) "The sum borrowed was of small loans made at different times which once amounted to Rs. 80, of which Rs. 30 appears to have been repaid" as per charge.
- (v.) The charge against the petitioner is not of a grave or *moral* nature,
- (vi.) The petitioner is yet young and lacks experience.

[9]

From

Mr E. J. Stephens
late Sub-Registrar
of Periyakulam, Madras dt.

No

Dated

Received

Enclosures

SUBJECT

Requesting that the alternative
punishments suggested by the
Petitioner may be inflicted
upon him in lieu of the
dismissal from service ordered
by Govt.

24-3-91 557-58 Heri
26-1-91 - 137- Lady's
28-4-91 815- Wm
16-1-91 86-87 -
16-8-91 - 90 -
8-2-90 - 222-23-10
10-12-89 - 2102 -
16-11-89 - 1966 -
11-10-89 - 1735 -
15-7-89 - 1203 -
3-6-89 - 956 -
19-12-88 - 5356 -
2-4-88 - 375-00

We

Nov 7 bu

The Govt declines to accede
to the pretensions requested.

For order This is a new
of the ad misci
Ordian
166

There were orders in force forbidding the borrowing of money from subordinate long before 1888 vide plea entered in the Gazette of 1869 put up. The two Powers of the S. G. of Rep^{ts} referred to in para. 21st of petition are not available; shall they be got.

NOTE H.C. got these 6
I.L. like have them 1 Dec.

Please see G.O. No. 111/2/41
1735 of 89 & 87

for the facts of the petio case. As regards
para 2 (ii) of his present petn it will
be seen ^{from G. v. D. T. Appeal No 375, 25th April 1908} that the Resolution of the Council
of India on the subject of pecuniary
transactions was ~~published in the~~ published
in the Fort St George Gazette. This
Resolution was also cited by the J.
for the information of the Registering
officer Proceedings, T No 374, 25. April 1908, para
198 of the Registration Manual)

2 Feb.
 1880.
 The point at issue is whether
 the House in discussing the
 from a subordinate Committee
 a record of the Department
 and whether it should be
 put back in the office or
 whether the document should
 be destroyed.

Resolution? to the Hon. Mr. Stokes
 with reference to the Hon. Mr.
 Garrison's remarks.

66
 4 Feb.

A further petition on the same
 subject (C. 215) is also submitted. It
 contains nothing new.

66
 7 Feb.

The Reg. Manual is a compilation issued
 under the authority of the S. Ct. alone. In the
 order prefixed thereto.
 I cannot agree that the order of the S. Ct.
 of 1880 is in violation of the 10th of 1880.
 I understand all previous orders, if by their
 very terms they mean that it left no
 doubt as to the officers free to know as to
 the same. Being limited to forgotten officers
 could only supersede orders relating to
 them. The previous orders of 1869 & 1871
 are perfectly clear & are well known
 throughout the whole in all departments.
 I cannot accept the view that the law
 was improperly determined or should
 be restored.

15 Feb.
 P. 16/2
 1880

Let a reference be made to India -
but the facts of Mr. Stephens' case are
not to be mixed with reference to it
India is a separate matter & a man
of 1888 was intended to leave & did
leave ~~non-official~~ non-official
for 6 months. S.H.S.
16/3/32

I should state the case for India ^{directions}.
It certainly appears on the face of it, that
the Govt. of India in 1888 when reviewing
this subject, and having before it all the
correspondence on the subject, and not being
satisfied that proper and uniform orders
had gone out, deliberately set itself
de novo to clear up the situation.
It virtually said then: "So much confusion
and uncertainty prevails on this subject;
it is necessary to define and clear up
once for all what class of public
servants may not borrow money from
subordinates". It then proceeds to name
the classes - And to my mind, the inference
is clear: that uncommissioned officers
holding un gazetted appointments may
borrow money from subordinates. I do
not suppose this is intended, and I should
ask India for a direct ruling on this -
very important point. W

I do not object to India being asked 26 Feb.
whether the rules of 1888 superseded the previous ones
of 1869 & 1872 so as to leave non gazetted officers free
to borrow. H.C. Lyman.

Received by the Hon. Secy. Mr. H. C. Lyman
Sanction with reference to S.H.S. remarks

16
2 March.

Letter to H.E. the Governor.

The question at issue is whether
Mr. Stephens, the late Sub-Registrar,
committed a breach of Departmental
rules in borrowing money from a
subordinate & whether he should be
put back in the public service or
his disavowal be upheld.

20 Feb.

There were several charges against Mr. Stephens,
but that which led to his disavowal
was one of borrowing money from his
clerk.
That he did so is admitted.
The argument used is that the rule
is a non gazetted rule and that the
rules promulgated in 1888 (which with
white tape) apply only to gazetted
officers. But there were orders in 1869
- repeated in 1872 (which included both
white tape) which applied to all classes
of officers and of which due publication
was made.
The Hon. Secy. states that these orders are
still in force, he says he has seen the
orders of 1888 superseding all others which
preceded them and that being applicable
to gazetted officers only - the rule being
"non gazetted" the rule committed to
the borrowing from his subordinate

No.

From

Dated

189

FOR ORDERS.

Again G O., dated

'18 , No.

Again G.O., dated

18 , No.

Current No. 5720 of 1871, dated Nov from Mr. J. Stephens

Current No. 5723 of 1871, dated 22 Dec. from J. of N. Stephens
 215 - 92 - 16 Jan. " R. S. J. Stephens
 24 March 1872 letter be
 ordered that the following letter be
 addressed to the G. of S.
 (Reminders)

Letter N-193. 18 Mar
 to Secy of the Interior
 (Public)

IN M.S.
 I am directed to request that the
 following case may be laid before
 the G. of S. for decision.
 In a letter dated 20th Oct. 1869
 N^o 4952 (Public) the G. of S.
 declared that all unincorporated
 amounts of S. are prohibited for
 borrowing money from Natives
 in the Districts wherein they are
 employed & in a letter to the Chief
 Comr of Barb dated 25 Apr. 1872
 N^o 1899 (Publ) the G. of S. explained
 that the term "unincorporated officers"
 included all officers to whom the
 unincorporated service rules &
 Pension Rules are applicable
 But in the Resolution dated the
 10th Dec. 1870 N^o 637-2
 the G. of S. in C., remarking that
 there were no uniform Executive
 orders on the subject of the
 pecuniary relations of Govt. offrs
 with persons who are subject

and should therefore be restored
 to him the same as before with
 agree.

The matter is therefore submitted to Mr.
 the Gov.

In an account of the case please

see App^o N^o 955. 12.12.35
 3.6.89 4.10.89.

23 76.

Case No. 14
17th Jan.

His authority & considering that definite instructions should be issued with the object of making the liability of all officers ^{and} that same throughout India, decided that all Commissioned Civil servants, Statutory Civilian, Uncommissioned Officers who hold gazetted appointments & military officers in Civil employ are prohibited ~~from taking loans~~ from persons subject to their official authority, or residing, carrying on business or possessing property within the local limits for which they are appointed.

(under the following circumstances)
The question has now arisen whether these orders of 1888 are to be regarded as replacing those of 1869 & 1872.

~~Under the following circumstances~~
A letter dated the 16th Jan 1891 No. 87 S.D. a petition from one Mr. E. J. Stephens was forwarded by order of the J. of S. to the J. of S. It will be observed that Mr. Stephens was a Sub-Registrar at Periyakulam in the Madras M. & that he was dismissed by the J. of S. on the charge of having borrowed money from one of his subordinates.

A memorial to the J. of S. was presented & the fact reported in Mr. Melville's letter dated the 16th Apr. 1891 No. 720 (Sub.).

Mr. Stephens being a Sub-Registrar is not an "Uncommissioned Officer holding a gazetted appointment" & he argues that the orders of the J. of S. issued in 1888 do not therefore apply to him.

I am accordingly directed to enquire whether the orders of 1888 are to be regarded as cancelling all previous orders on the same subject, that is to say, whether Uncommissioned Officers holding non-gazetted appointments are free to borrow money at will from their subordinates.

The letter should come from the Public Secy.

16th January 1892,
The Madras Palace,
Cuddalore Dist. Cuddalore.

From

E. J. Stephens,

To

Deputy Sub Registrar, of Cuddalore
& Notary Public, Cuddalore.

The Chief Secretary to Government,

Fort St George,

Madras.

Sir,

On the 6th of November last, I submitted
to Government a petition, praying His Excellency
the Governor in Council, to be graciously pleased
to reconsider the Order of the Exchequer's Court
dismissing my claim for service for borrowing
Rs 50 in contribution of the Public Service Fund.

In continuation of that petition, is herewith
submitted a petition of extracts and
references to the notifications of the Govt of Madras
as well as the orders of the local Government,
which bear on the facts submitted in the
first petition, and I respectfully beg you
to be good enough to cause to have the former
petition taken into consideration along with that
of the 6th of Nov. referred to above.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

E. J. Stephens.

Sub Registrar of Cuddalore
& Notary Public.

Judicial Dept.

From E. J. Stephens
Late Sub Registrar,
Periakulam

Dated 16th } January 1892.
Recd 18th }
Encls. 2



Submits, in continuation of his
petition of 6th Nov^r last, certain
records bearing on his case.

STRATION DEPARTMENT.

G No. 6129

AGHAVAIYANGAR, AVARGAL,

DEWAN BAHADUR,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF REGISTRATION,

Madras,

able J. F. Prie

CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Fort St. George.

Madras, 22nd December 1891.

ing to Government reference
16th December 1891, I have the
d copies of the late Inspector
ndings J. No. 3038 dated
and J. No. 374 dated 25th.
the subject of Government
into pecuniary transactions
subject to their authority

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

Shree...

H. M. & Son Mrs. Gustav C.

Subd. with reference to Hon.
Mr. Garstin's remarks on the
Jrs orders under cover of the
Reference of 16. Dec. 91.

The transactions in question seem to have taken place in Nov. & Dec. 1858 i.e. after the issue of G.O.s of 7 Apr. 1850 & 17 Sept. 1850 Nos 375 & 909 Pub. which contain the latest orders on the subject ~~thereby~~ borrowing money from Subordinates. These orders are in so many words to gazettes unaccounted officers only but Sub-Registrars are not gazetted officers in the ordinary sense of the word (v. para. 1(a) of letter of 8 May 1859 at #11 Pub). Therefore the rules would not seem to apply to the case in question.

to the case in question.
The older orders published in the
of 1869 apply to all "superior"
of the U.S. in positions of
" & responsibility " but these terms
are not defined.

are not defined.
It seems best to ask the J. of the
to state definitely whether the
borrowing of money by a sub-
from a subordinate was reg-
as direct disobedience to rule
1855.

as much as
1888. counted up to June
The Reg^{on} - manual ~~manuscript~~
simply follows G.O. 7 ap. 1888
& therefore prohibits money-
bills subordinates in the case of
officers only. (page 198).

4 ⁴/₁₅ Jan
18 Jan

Registration Department.
Proceedings of the Inspector General.
Recd G.O. dated 17 September
1888, No. 909, Public.

J. No. 3038. 14. October 1888.

Coimbatore.

Although Registrars are not
considered " gazetted officers" the
Inspector General resolves to com-
-municate, for their information
and guidance, the rules and orders
of the Governor General in Council regu-
-lating the conduct of public servants
in respect to borrowing money, receipt
of complimentary addresses and
other matters.

(Signed) Geo. Hammett.
Inspector General of Regn.

To,
All Registrars.

1 True copy 1

Communicated per a/c
Inspector General of Regn.

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is arranged in several lines across the upper and middle portions of the page.]

Dep't of Int - Oct 23/91

Registration Department
Proceedings of the Inspector General.

Order G.O. dated 7 April
1888. No. 375. Public regarding the
pecuniary relations of Government officers
with persons subject to their authority
or influence.

720.374-25 April 1888.

Obtained.

Communicated to all Registrars
for information and guidance.

1 Signed, Geo. Hammett.

Inspector General of Regn.

To,

All Registrars.

Tracey,

Stannard & Hargrave
Inspector General of Regn.

Eyd
m

[Faint handwritten notes on the left margin, mostly illegible.]

[Faint handwritten notes in the center, mostly illegible.]

In per C. H. 162379

"REGISTRATION."

Ref on Cn 5028/91 Paper

From

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF

REGISTRATION,

Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY

TO GOVERNMENT,

Fort St. George.

RECEIVED
GOVERNMENT
CHIEF SECRETARY
MADRAS
22 DEC 91

December 1891.

G No. 6129.

ENCLOSURE. 5. Two.

No.

Forwarding copies of
certain Proceedings called
for in Government reference
on No. 5028 of 1891. regarding
necessary transactions
registering officers with their
subordinates -

see inside
LH

571 The order of 1869 are quite enough
have been acted on in all departments. See
No. 13 May 72 Pub. which republished these orders
declared that "Unconvenanted Officers" meant
them to whom the leave of absence rules were appli-
cable, including even ministerial Officers. There
was no doubt that Sub Reg. an "Unconvenanted Officers"
definition of trust & responsibility.
consider that the prohibition of borrowing from salary
as a rule of the service quite independently
of 1869 or of the order referred to therein.
the 1869 order were quite sufficient covering

I think there is much to be
said for the Pet. He and I
entered the service about 9
years ago & naturally look
to the Departmental Channel
for information & guidance on
all matters relating to his
conduct. That Channel
in this case was the Registration
Channel & that there was clear
(as pointed out in the Under
Secy's ^{note} ~~note~~) that the wrong
- bidding & borrowing of money
from outlandish applied by
Government officers who
had forgotten Art 6. Pet.
has not forgotten Art 6. so he
only did what Art 6. ^{which}
The Home Secy of 7th April/88
of communication to each Dep
the Secy of the for India
for bidding Government Civil
Service, ~~the~~ Mandatory Civil
& the Government officers who
had forgotten Art 6. & that
Officers - Civil employ
from borrowing money from
their outlandish - & as
known the Government
it expressed the others.
The Home Secy (the then Secy
of Registration) came to the
- the Home Secy & the for India
Resolution to the Registration
for this information & guidance
although he admitted they
have not forgotten officers
from the Home Secy & could
his former - He has not

His Excellency, the Governor

H

The humble petition of
E. J. Stephens
of

Most Respectfully Sheweth

That the petitioner
prays that His Excellency
to consider the following &
the orders of His Excellency
Notifications of the Gover-
-nment with the petition
November last.

That the following papers
to please His Excellency to be
His Excellency's unfortunate

To wit:

(i). G.O. (Macao) No. 375

(ii). " " No. 850

(iii). " " No. 909

(iv). " " No. 375

(v). Govt. of India's letter No. 30

(vi). Prods of the Govt. of

(vii). " " " "

That these papers, the petitioner
tend to determine whether
borrowing and Insolvency, will
in Council to be graciously
and lenient view of the humane
disposition.

That for this act of
humble petitioner will, as

E

(Last)

Now residing

Govt. of India Resolutions re In

Govt. of India Resolutions re In

(B.) That further, the amount alleged to be paid by the defendant is \$5 at the most, and

*The clerk-complainant who first claimed for Rs. 60, confessed under cross-examination at the ultimate enquiry held by the Insp.-Genl., that the sum due to him was but 9! (Vide the clerk's statement, dated 12-8-89.)

38. Abstract of G. O. No. 2679
17-11-85: "the case and circum-
stances of an officer who is in a
chronic state of insolvency or who
could not be reasonably expected to
pay off his debts, will be reported
for the consideration and orders
of Government."

(c) Action of Government in part of service rules.—That in the case of—

- (a) Mr. Muthuswami Aiyar of Madras
1st class Magisterial powers, 74
- (b) Mr. Breek-Atkinson, C. S., late Co
- (c) Mr. Beames, C. S., Bengal ;
- (d) Mr. Warburton, C. S., Amritsar ;

the Government of Madras as well as their
concerned with justice more than tempered with
the offence though fully brought home to them
were men exercising enormous power over
their official jurisdiction, and in whose case the
The petitioner prays, your Excellency for but
who by virtue of his office and position as
none) or no powers and influence for abuse, to
intention of the service rules re officers' borrow

Advs
on 5028 dark
hours to form
Generals Pro
14' October 1880

April 1888 or
officers enters
with persons
or influen

examined
G. George. Madras

[illegible]

To The Chief Secretary to

Sir, On the 6th of Nov. last, the G.O. no. despatching me to work on the Service rules. I am glad to be good enough to work for you. I read along with the G.O. no. 1000 of 1911, the local Govt. of the S. India.

That the following ^{is} a true
 & correct copy of the
 petition ^{of} the ^{people} of the ^{County} of ^{York} ^{to} the ^{Legislature} of ^{the} ^{State} of ^{South} ^{Carolina} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁶⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁷⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁸⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁸⁹⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁰⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹¹⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹²⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹³⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁴⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁵⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁶⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁷⁹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸⁰ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸¹ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸² ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸³ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸⁴ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸⁵ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸⁶ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸⁷ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year} ¹⁹⁸⁸ ^{and} ^{the} ^{year}

for the prosecution, will show that
 at the Brahmin Mahzardhars in

...ted—"I had previously informed
...ut the money transaction." (ii) The Regis-
y held by him has left a ⁽³²⁾note with his
-"enon" mention and record has been
sh c ...y, &c." [Thus has this officer
ace b ...g, ...ted under cross-examination.]
and the ...pector-General admitted on
e present inquiry—⁽³³⁾ "there is a very
ation against the petitioner;" (iv) ³³ "the
gist or do not pull on well;" (v) in the
ainst the petitioner about December 1888
' to the clerk's allegations against the peti-

of that nature. I respectfully
~~request~~ ^{request} to have the section ^{of the} ~~section~~
 election rollmits extracts and orders
 as the question of the applicant.

there was combination, concert of measures
whose hands the clerk-complainant and

(i) The clerk-complainant wh

(31.) This was the person who was about the time Taluq Sheristadar of Periyakulam, and was under suspension and enquiry for bribery, &c., and who in vain, would have the petitioner as witness in his favour. It was in this man's house that the entertainment and dinner was given the Registrar by the Mahzardhars on the night of 15th January 1889. (Vide Note No. XIII (d) and (e) of Appendix of evidence.)

(32.) *Vide* Note No. VIII (a) and (b) of Appendix of evidence.

(33.) *Vide* letter of report of the Registrar, dated 22-1-89, No. 21.

which is nothing less than a social disaster, yet not been given the benefit of the general law.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Government has decided to take action.

In these circumstances, the petitioner co his large family with no hopes of life and living in struggle for existence, and where honesty and pr and thrive, committing himself and his cause, to t cency-in-Council, the petitioner humbly prays th

For this act of kind

For this act of kindness, as in duty be