

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

Pub DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 22nd Sep 1894
No. 702

INDEXED.

First copy sent to Press. 24/9

Returned for signature. 3/10

Despatched in print. 4/10



[Despatch Abstract.]

Conduct of Divisional Officer.

Resuming Mr V. K. Kene
got the letter from
Ass^t Collector of Nanded
for his conduct in having
given a high testimonial
to a Tahsildar who was
leaving his taluk under
orders of reduction from
the Collector

[Signature]

23.5.94 27.5.94
27-5-821

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

From C. M. MULLALY, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Pyáali, 19th August 1894, R. on Current No. 1950-Ver.

I have the honour to forward herewith copy of a testimonial granted by the Head Assistant Collector Mr. V. Venugopaul Chetty to a Tahsildar whom I had occasion to reduce. Apart from the justness or otherwise of my order of reduction, I consider it most improper that a testimonial in such terms should be granted just when the Tahsildar was leaving his taluk under my orders of reduction.

2. I also forward the explanation of the Head Assistant Collector for granting such a testimonial and an extract from my letter on the appeal petition of the Tahsildar in question so far as it relates to this point.

ENCLOSURES.

Testimonial given by V. Venugopaul Chetty, Esq., C.S., at the time of Tahsildar's leaving Nandyal.

Mr. S. V. Gurusawmy Naidu has been working under me as Tahsildar of Nandyal since April 1893. I have invariably found him attentive to his duties, hardworking and willing to please me. He is a very active, energetic and intelligent Revenue officer and I am very sorry he leaves my division now. I hope to see him one day a Divisional officer.

NANDYAL,
6th July 1894.

(Signed) V. VENUGOPAUL CHETTY,
Acting Head Assistant Collector.

From V. VENUGOPAUL CHETTY, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector of Nandyal, to the Collector of Kurnool, dated Chagalmurry, 14th August 1894, Dis. No. 1965-Rev.

With reference to your C. No. 1950-Ver. of 1894, dated 7th August 1894, I have the honour to state as M.R.Ry. S. V. Gurusawmy Naidu asked me for a certificate when he was leaving Nandyal, I gave him one. I did not think that there was any objection to my doing so. As far as I remember, I only gave expression to my opinion of his work.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 21st August 1894, Mis. No. 4651.

Read—the following letter from C. M. MULLALY, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 6th August 1894, Petn. Begr. No. 1508-Rev. :—

I have the honour to forward herewith the appeal petition of M.R.Ry. S. V. Gurusawmy Naidu, Tahsildar of Nandyal, against my order reducing him one grade. In doing so, the first point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Board is the high testimonial granted to him by the Head Assistant Collector Mr. V. Venugopaul Chetty just when he was leaving his taluk under my order of reduction in which he expresses a hope that he will see him one day a Divisional officer. The

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.
R = Print, but not for monthly volume.

impropriety of this conduct is manifest. A Collector reduces a Tahsildar and straightway his Divisional officer gives him a high testimonial hoping to see him one day a Divisional officer; this is not conducive to discipline, but rather savours of insubordination or is indicative of ignorance and foolish weakness. The last is, perhaps, the correct view to take, for, in all this inquiry, the Head Assistant Collector has shown a bias in favour of the Tahsildar as will be seen from the following quotation from Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 2957, dated 30th May 1894:—

"In addition to this the following extract from the Head Assistant Collector's letter of the 17th July 1893 calls for notice as illustrating the manner in which that officer went about the inquiry. In paragraph 5 he writes with reference to Ranga Row's statement that the appellant had concealed the records, 'I was quite diffident of getting evidence to corroborate the above statement of Ranga Row, but I am happy to say that I succeeded in persuading the union chairman yesterday to tell me everything he might know on the subject. After a great deal of evasive answers he told me the truth. His statement completely corroborates that of Ranga Row.' Ranga Row is a pound gumastah who, while admitting that he originally pretended to join in the conspiracy against the Tahsildar, alleges that he did so to get a clue and give information to the Tahsildar. Whatever may have been Ranga Row's real position originally, it is clear that while the inquiry was being held a conspiracy existed to shield the Tahsildar by getting the Head Accountant into trouble, and the officer who conducted the inquiry displayed an absence of judicial spirit which could not fail to have encouraged those hostile to the appellant."

Special attention is drawn to the concluding paragraph printed in italics. In almost every one of their petitions Rama Row and Yerragunta Subbayya complained of the Head Assistant Collector's partiality to the Tahsildar and of his head clerk's intimacy with him, in consequence of which he was kept informed of everything which passed in connection with their petitions. The testimonial and the manner of the inquiry bear out these allegations.

Resolution—dated 21st August 1894, Mis. No. 4651.

As Mr. Venugopaul Chetty was aware that the Tahsildar's conduct had been investigated by the Collector and that the Collector had considered it necessary to transfer and punish him, the Board is surprised that Mr. Venugopaul Chetty, at such a juncture, should have been guilty of the impropriety of furnishing the Tahsildar with a testimonial so worded as to show that Mr. Venugopaul Chetty's opinion (whatever it may be worth) was at variance with that of his Collector.

2. If Mr. Venugopaul Chetty had anything relevant to urge on the Tahsildar's behalf, he was at liberty to make a representation to the Collector, but to furnish the Tahsildar with a testimonial with the apparent object of its being used as a protest in appeal against the Collector's proceedings was a grave breach of discipline and official etiquette, which Mr. Venugopaul Chetty should have known better than to commit. The Collector will communicate the foregoing censure to Mr. Venugopaul Chetty.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) L. M. WYNCH,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

No. 1637.

Transferred to the Public Department.

OOTACAMUND,
28th August 1894.

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

ORDER—dated 22nd September 1894, No. 702, Public.

Mr. Venugopaul Chetty will be informed that the Government views his conduct with the gravest displeasure.

2. These proceedings will be communicated by the Board of Revenue to all Collectors for communication to their Divisional officers.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
" Revenue Department.

Ed. C. A. Mankawny.

Gobt. of {1894} Madras.
PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 22nd September 1894, No. 702.

SEPTEMBER.

Conduct of Divisional Officers.

Censuring Mr. V. Venugopal Chetty, Head Assistant Collector of Nandyal, for his conduct in having given a high testimonial to a Tahsildar who was leaving his taluk under orders of reduction from the Collector.

here is a copy of
this letter to C. N. D. and
2457

Entered for the...
Collector of Nandyal to the Secretary to the Commissioners, of...
No 4508 of 1894
Rev

In doing so the first point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Board is the high testimonial granted to him by the Head Assistant Collector Mr. Venugopal Chetty just when he was leaving his Taluk under my order of reduction in which he expresses a hope that he will see him one day a Divisional Officer. The impropriety of this conduct is manifest. Also for reduce a Tahsildar straightway his Divisional Officer gives him a high testimonial hoping to see him one day a Divisional Officer; this is not conducive

to discipline but rather shadows
of insult and indignation is a
view of ignorance and foolish weakness.
The last is perhaps the correct
view to take, for in all this en-
quiry the Head Assistant Col-
lector has shown a bias in favour
of the Tahsildar as will be seen
from the following quotation
from B.O. No 2957 dtd. 30.5.94.

"In addition to this the follow-
ing extract from the Head As-
sistant Collector's letter of the 27th
July 1893 calls for notice as illus-
trating the manner in which
that officer went about the en-
quiry. In para 5 he writes with
reference to Ranga Row's state-
ment that the appellant had
concealed the records. "I was
quite diffident of getting evidence
to corroborate the above state-
ment of Ranga Row but I am

~~happy to say that I succeeded in~~
~~obtaining the necessary change~~
"may to tell me everything he
might know on the subject."
"For a great deal of evasive
answers he told me the truth."
"His statement completely
corroborates that of Ranga
Row". Ranga Row is a poused
gumastah who while admitting
that he originally pretended to
join in the conspiracy against
the Tahsildar alleges that he did
so to get a clue and give informa-
tion to the Tahsildar. Whatever
may have been Ranga Row's real
position originally it is clear
that while the enquiry was being
held, a conspiracy existed to shield
the Tahsildar by getting the Head
Accountant into trouble, and
the officer who conducted the
enquiry displayed an absence
of judicial spirit which could

those hostile to the appellant."

Special attention is drawn to the concluding para underlined.

In almost every one of their petitions Rama Row and Gerra-guntla Subbappa complained of the Head Assistant Collector's partiality to the Tahsildar and of his Head Clerk's intimacy with him in consequence of which he was kept informed of everything which passed in connection with their petitions. The testimonial and the manner of the enquiry bear out these allegations.

x x x
(True extract)

B. M. S.
Ag Collector

From

C. A. Munnally Esq

to Collector of

Munroo

Enclosure no I. II. 1894

Letter No. 19894

G. S. 22-9-94

24

Pub

24/2

Ency. 1894

True copy of testimonial
granted by the Head
Assistant Collector
to Tahsildar of Mandya

Requires to be at the time of presentation

leaving Mandya

Mr S. V. Gurusamy Tahsildar

has been working under me

as Tahsildar of Mandya since

April 1893. I have invariably

found him attentive to his duties

hardworking and willing

please me. He is a very active

energetic and intelligent Revenue

officer and I am very sorry he

leaves my division now. I hope

to see him one day a divisional

of fees.

Nandyal } (Signed) V. Venugopal Reddy
6.7.94 } Ag. Head Assistant Collector.

(True copy)

Business.

Sam P. R. a party } Ag. Collector
19.8.94

I

ENCLOSURE

1894

Camp Chazalmangy

From

Head Assistant Collector of

NANDYAL,

To

The

Collector

Sir,

With reference to your No. 1750 of 94 dated 7th August 1894 I have the honor to state as Mr. R. P. S. V. Garudwami Naidu asked me for a certificate where he was learning Nandyal. I gave him one. I did not think that there was any objection to my doing so. As far as I remember only gave expressions to my opinion of his work.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Yours most obedient servant

V. Venugopal Reddy

Ag. Head Collector.

Kurnool, Dated 19th August 1894

Paul P. P. P. P.

B. C. C. C. C.
COLLECTOR OF KURNOOL.

To
The Secretary to Government
Chadwick

Sir,
I have the honor to
forward herewith copy of a
testimonial granted by the Head
Assistant Collector *Ch. V. Venkatesh*
- Paul only to a *Tapaswami*
whom I had occasion to reduce
apart from the goodness or
otherwise of my order of reduction
I consider it most improper

6/22/94

HEAD ASSISTANT COLLECTOR OF
NANDYAL.

To

THE *Collector*
Kurnool

DATED 14
RECEIVED August 1894

DISPATCHED
ENCLOSURES
SUBJECT
... that it was only an ...
... of his opinion ...
... that this was ...
... objection ...

that a testimonial in such cases
should be granted just when
the Tahsildar was leaving his
charge under my orders of reduction.
I also forward the explanation
the Head Assistant Collector
for granting such a testimonial,
and an extract from my letter
on the appeal petition of the
Tahsildar in question, so far
as it relates to this point.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant

Yours,

J. G. Bowler

Public DEPARTMENT

C. No. 2412 + 2457

FOR ORDERS.

think the B^s have let him off
a bit too lightly - I should be in-
clined to reduce him to about the
same - B^s

1219194

They should have certainly known
my business, but I don't think
a doctor is the case any

25 14/9

This is about the greatest piece of impudence
misconduct I ever came across - but
I hardly believe Mr. V. Chetty can have
realized what his conduct really amounted
to. Anyhow I think Govt. should
intimate to Mr. V. C. that they view
his conduct with the gravest displeasure.
If this G.O. were sent to all Collectors, &
from them to divisional officers - the same
thing will not recur. It is impossible
to put in an order that such a thing
sh^d. not be done - at least it would look
very foolish. I have had great difficulty
in not agreeing with the hon. Mr. Dhill
that he ought to be reduced. w
15 Sep

Mr. Mulhaly writes officially
- regard to the matter alluded to in
D.O. of 3.8.94, No. 292

C.B.
31's
SL4

The 3d appear to have let the
thing down by lighting. If he is to
please Kenneth when Phoebe has gone
leave perhaps Elmore when he will be to
him at Supr? Le James and Ross who
reminded.
It is not keep him in order of any one case
a paradise.

1/9/94

I detained the papers in order to obtain the
orders regarding the funds of Outpost. And
the office has sent me 9.00 pounds dated
17th Sept. 1888. It is a [redacted] and
Mr D. Claff did not inform him that
the year had at the time that he paid.
The certificate issued to be [redacted]
~~disposition of the money~~. I feel
sure however that there is an order bearing on
the subject in connection with the keeping of
dues books and that it is like the order
of 1883 but it seems unnecessary to
keep these papers any longer in order to
make search for it.

Mr. Venugopal Chetti

FOR ORDERS.

Mr. & Circ

I saw a day or two ago in the papers
- the Hindu - a paragraph saying that
this Tahsildar had on appeal been
restored by the Bd. to his former position
but it did not say whether he had
returned to the Taluq from which
he had been deposed.

2d
11/9/94

~~11/9/94~~ The Hon'ble
Mr. B. C. 9.5
C. No. 2412 + 2457
P.S.

At 2205 P.M. 9/4
N.P. 702 Mr. Venugopal Chetti will
be informed that the Government
views his conduct with the gravest
displeasure.

2. These proceedings will be commd.
by the Bd. of Rev. to all Colle
for communication to Divisional
Officers.

(From order)
19/9/94

Cb
11.9.

Bd of Rev. (L. R) 25/9/94
Rev. Dept. 7 } 25/9/94



48

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue)

Dated 21 August 1894,

No. 4651 Mm

READ the following letter from L. M. Muthaly Engineer, Ag. Collector of
Kannur dated 6 August 1894 Petn. Reg. No. 1528 of 1894
to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue
Madras.

I have the honor to forward herewith
the appeal petition of Mr. P. V. Gurusamy
Naion, Tahsildar of Nandyal against my
order reducing him one grade. In doing so,
the first point to which I wish to draw
the attention of the Board is the high
testimonial granted to him by the
Head Assistant Collector Mr. V. Venu-
gopal Chetty just when he was leaving
his Taluq under my order of reduction in
which he expresses a hope that he will
see him one day a Divisional officer. The
impropriety of this conduct is manifest.
A collector rescues a Tahsildar and

Straightway

him a high testimonial hoping to see him one day a Divisional officer, this is not conducive to discipline but rather savours of insubordination or is indicative of ignorance and foolish weakness.

The last is, perhaps, the correct view to take, for in all this enquiry, the Head Assistant Collector has shown a bias in favor of the Tahsildar as will be seen from the following quotation from Board's Proceedings No 2957 Mm dated 30 May 1894.

" In addition to this the following extract from the Head Assistant Collector's letter of the 17 July 1893 calls for notice as illustrating the manner in which that officer went about the enquiry. In para 5 he writes with reference to Ranga Row's statement that the appellant had concealed the records "I was quite diffident of getting evidence to corroborate the above statement of Ranga Row, but I am happy to say that I succeeded in persuading the union chairman yesterday to tell me everything he might know on the subject. After a great

great deal of evasive answers, he told me the truth. His statement completely corroborates that of Ranga Row." Ranga Row is a poor Gumastah who while admitting that he originally pretended to join in the conspiracy against the Tahsildar alleges that he did so to get a clue and give information to the Tahsildar. Whatever may have been Ranga Row's real position, originally, it is clear that while the enquiry was being held a conspiracy existed to shield the Tahsildar by getting the Head Assistant into trouble, and the officer who conducted the enquiry displayed an absence of judicial spirit, which could not fail to have encouraged those hostile to the appellant."

Special attention is drawn to the concluding para underlined. In almost every one of their petitions Rama Row and Yerra Gunta Subbayya complain of the Head Assistant Collector's partiality to the Tahsildar, and

him in consequence of which he was kept informed of everything which passed in connection with their petitions. The testimonial and the manner of the enquiry bear out these allegations.

Resolution

As Mr. Venugopal Chetti was aware that the Tahsildar's conduct had been investigated by the Collector and that the Collector had considered it necessary to transfer & punish him, the Board is surprised that Mr. Venugopal Chetti, at such a juncture, should have been guilty of the impropriety of furnishing the Tahsildar with a testimonial so worded as to show that Mr. Venugopal Chetti's opinion (whatever it may be worth) was at variance with that of his Collector.

If Mr. Venugopal Chetti had anything relevant to urge on the Tahsildar's behalf he was at liberty to make a representation to the Collector, but to furnish the Tahsildar with a testimonial with the apparent object of it being

being used as a protest in appeal against the Collector's Proceedings was a grave breach of discipline & official etiquette, which Mr. Venugopal Chetti should have known better than to commit. The Collector will communicate the foregoing censure to Mr. Venugopal Chetti.

(True Copy & Extract)

L. M. V. N. Chetti
Secretary.

To

The Secretary to
Government Rev. Dept.

2457
 Public 1894. Dept
 Board of Revenue
 (Land Revenue),
 MADRAS.

Current Number 6245.

To
 The Secretary
 to Govt. Rd.

2457

Received
 Proceedings, dated 21-8-1894
 No. 4657, Mis. Routine. Enclosures.

Subject.

Passing remarks on the
 conduct of Mr. V. Venugopal
 Chetti, H.S. Asst Collector
 of Kurnool, in connection
 with the Anandya -
 Jahodani case.

6. See a request recently
 for a seller certificate -
 I hope that the same has.

15417
 Please see later file
 which refers to this case.

Case. The question appears
 to have been dis-
 missed in Council. Submis-
 sionment may be trans-
 ferred to the Public Dept.

Dist. R. No. 1637
 Transferred to the
 Public Department.

Dist. R. No. 1637
 ag. & Co. to Govt.
 28 Aug 94.

Order passed -
 28 August 1894