

ORDINARY, MS.

<i>P. & Co.</i> DEPARTMENT.	
G.O., DATED	31 st Oct 1894
No.	216-17

INDEXED

When given for copying. 31/10

[Despatch Abstract.]

Forwarding to the Resident
in Mysore letter from the
Comptroller of Paper Currency
Bangalore touching the delay
on the part of Mr. M. S. S. S.
Shankar ali Khan D. C. S.
of Bangalore in reply
to certain official reference
regarding the claim pre-
ferred by one W. Appadurai
Mudali on two half-
notes, with the request
that the matter may be
laid before the District

In November 1892, W. Appadurai Mudali late Student Central College, Fort. Bangalore presented a claim on left half notes, $\text{Rs } 6349342$ and 28917 , for $\text{Rs } 10$ each, alleging as follows: that he received the notes in halves about April 1881 in exchange for cash. that he cannot remember whom he received them, as several notes received from many of his friends and relatives pass through his hands, that he kept them in his box, and that about two or three months after their receipt he found the right halves of the notes missing. He presumes that children must have meddled with them. He states that the missing halves bore the same series and numbers as the half notes forwarded to the office. He is unable to produce any evidence as to the possession of the entire notes or as to the circumstances under which the half notes were lost.

2. The right half of the first mentioned note $\text{Rs } 6349342$, was deposited in this office in June 1881 by V. Muthuswami Mudali of Madras, who claimed value thereon stating that the left half sent in an unregistered cover to the address of one V. Kroomooga Mudali at Vayalathoor, on or about 5th May 1881, was lost in transit by post, and after the usual enquiries payment was made to him on a Bond of Indemnity on the 14th September 1881.

3. The right half of the second note, $\text{Rs } 28917$, was received in this office from one Achari Sadagopal Chari of Chingleput, in February 1890, as half of a mismatched note, having for its counterpart, or left half, $\text{Rs } 6078331$ for Rupees 10. Claimant was informed that no value could be paid to him on the left half, as full value on the corresponding right half had already been

seen, and in June 1881 to one [redacted] Paraya [redacted]
of the Pay Examiner's Office, on a Bond of
Indemnity - that his claim to value on the right
half, B/63 28917, would be registered, and if the
other half were at any time presented, the fact
could be communicated to him.

For orders of A. G. and Commissioner.

It is clear that the present claimant -
Appadurai Mudali could not have held the entire
notes, B/63 49342 and 28917, in halves, in April 1891,
since the right halves of these notes were deposited
in this office in June 1881 and February 1890
respectively. He could not have held two mismatched
notes, as he states that the missing halves bore
the same series and numbers as the halves sent to
this office. The case seems apparently, one of
attempting to cheat. Orders solicited whether we may
address the Dy-Commissioner of Bangalore on the
subject.

1891 J. A. T. 30/1.

A. G. I recommend that the Deputy Commissioner
of Bangalore be addressed. The claim is a very
suspicious one, and claimant's explanation of the
delay - vide answer to Query No. 7 Form 4/6 - is
unsatisfactory.

1891 E. L. V. 30. 1. 93.

I agree.
1891 J. W. R. 3/2.

(True Copy)

In [redacted]
Accountant-General
in ch. Paper Currency Dept.

Encls.

C. No. 306-6.

CURRENT No. 317



No. 1954.

Fort St. George,
Accountant-General's Office,
Paper Currency Department,
19th October 1894.

From

THE COMMISSIONER OF PAPER CURRENCY,

Madras,

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Public Department

SIR,

I have the honor to bring the following to
the notice of Government.

1. The enclosed memos will explain the nature
of a claim prepared by W. Appadurai Mudali,
of Bangalore, for the payment of the value of two
left half notes for Rs 10 each, which was considered
suspicious enough to necessitate a reference to the
Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore. This was
accordingly made in my No. 3067 dated 8th February
1893, in which were enclosed the original declarations
furnished by Appadurai Mudali, and the
original papers connected with the cases of the
other two claimants, V. Muthuswami Mudali
and A. Shadagopala Charriar. To this letter,
notwithstanding three reminders sent on the 21st April
12th June and 26th July 1893, respectively, no reply was
received. On 1st September 1893 the Currency
Officer addressed a letter to Mr. Shijack Ali, C.S.,

the

the Deputy Commissioner, by name, to which three more reminders had to be sent on the 26th January, and the 9th and 27th February 1894, respectively, and eventually he was informed in a letter No. 2893 dated 27th February 1894, signed illegibly "for Dy Commissioner" that Appadurai Mudali had left Bangalore for Madras.

2. The Deputy Commissioner was then requested (on the 2nd March 1894) to return all the papers sent to him with the first letter, but he replied that the first letter had not been received in his office. This statement must be incorrect, for, in the reply sent to the letter addressed to Mr. Shujat Ali, by name, an acquaintance with the facts of the case is displayed that could not have been obtained from the reminders, which did not of course give the particulars of the case.

3. The Currency Officer then sent a registered letter No. 307 dated 1st May 1894, addressed to Mr. Mir Shujat Ali Khan, by name, asking him to look into the case once more. In answer he received a statement made by one of the Clerks of the Dy Commissioner saying nothing was known of the case, and asking for further particulars, which were furnished on 3rd May 1894.

4. To this letter, no [redacted] standing a reminder received, and 12th July 1894, no re [redacted]

Received
17/10
25/11
in the Dy Commr's
Office
17/11/94

and on the 3rd September, I addressed Mr. Shujat Ali Khan semi-officially, asking him to make personal enquiries into the facts of the case.

5. In reply to this Mr. Mir Shujat Ali Khan wrote on the 14th September stating that he had made very careful enquiry as to how the first letter could have been spirited away, but had not yet been able to get any clue; that Appadurai Mudali had relatives and friends who were employed in Government Offices - that he was "inclined to think that the first letter was received but not registered," and that he was "still continuing the enquiry regarding his subordinate." Since then I have neither received any further communication, nor have the papers forwarded by his Office with the letter of 8th February 1893 been returned, although a reminder, by telegram, was sent to the Dy Commissioner on the 13th October.

6. I am therefore compelled to lay the matter before Government with the request that they will make such a representation on the subject to the Mysore Government as may secure proper attention to my reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
J. Shankar
Commissioner of
Paper Currency

CU 1894 NO 2266
Department

From

The Commissioner of
Paper Currency
Madras

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Public Dept
Madras

Dated 17th October 1894
Received

No 1962

Enclosure One

CHIEF SECRETARY
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Subject

Bringing to notice of Government
the delay on the part of the Dy
Commissioner of Bangalore regarding
the reference made by the Office
regarding the claim prepared by
Appadurai Mudaliar of
Bangalore on 2 half notes

8731 25 Oct 1894 JF 8/6

Order

The Resident in
Mysore will be ad-
dressed.

JFB
23/10

28/10

To the Commr
of P. C.

DEPARTED

31 OCT 94

IN M.S.

30/10

in original - with one
enclo - requested to be
returned with reply -

JF 8/10

To

The Resident in Mysore

Sir,

I am directed to forward
a letter from the
Commr. of Paper Currency
bringing to notice the
delay on the part of the
Dy Commissioner, Bang-
alore, in replying to com-
official references, and
to request that the mat-
ter may be laid before
the Durbar for such
action as the circum-
stances of the case
may be deemed to
call for.

JFB
23/10

25/10/94

1. This is a matter of
importance when
we get a high che-
quered from the

This is a creditable business. In-
sufficient Ali's claims to have been
by high price.

25/10