

Public (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 735

Dated 13 July 1896

1055
26-96

[Despatch Abstract.]

ATTEMPT AT FRAUD.

Regarding the use of a false horoscope by one Lakshminarayana Patnaik to obtain an age certificate from the Chief Secretary with a view to appear for the Civil Service Competitive Examination.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

[78]

~~Confidential No.~~

1896.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O. DATED 18-7-96.
No. 735
Series. 1110

~~Confidential.~~

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for Signature.

Despatched

[Despatch Abstract.]

Considering that Lakshmanarayana
Bhatnagar (or) ^{son of} Bhatnagar is prosecuted for using a
false horoscope to obtain an age
certificate signed by the Chief Secretary,
the Mr. M. S. Gajam being left to
decide as to what charges should be
preferred and whether the same should
be prosecuted or not.

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 18

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
18, No.

FURTHER PAPER, No. 1024 A B 21-9-13 96

Chos. { 1294 } 27
 { 1288 }

ENCLOSURE.

Spars Copies ..

Struck ..

Issued ..

Total ..

In hand ..

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDERS, &c., OF GOVERNMENT- A.

PAPERS KEPT OUT OF FILE FOR DRAWATCH IN ORIGINAL
(not paged).

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

N.B.—

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

Public sept

Memo. No. 1136 B 5/6

nos 1440, 161, 1630, 1810 & 1835

The Advocate General
Govt at m
is requested to advise, as to
whether there are sufficient
grounds for instituting a
prosecution against

Lakshmanarayana Patnaik and
if so the officers then the officers must
be stated the officers or officers
are to state the officers or officers
which should be charged
5/6/6.

The Govt. Solicitor, with papers
to be refd
5/6.

Meanwhile the
papers referred to in
C.S. note will be
looked up.
5/6

2 CURRENT No. 197

idea subject

Confidential

Registered

No. 296

Madras 15th June 1896.

From,

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor

Madras.

To,

The Chief Secretary to Government.

Ootacamund.

Sir,

With reference to your Memorandum No. 1136 dated 5th instant, Public Department, I forward herewith, in original, the opinion of the Advocate General on the questions referred to him, and I return the papers which accompanied your Memorandum.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Obedient Servant

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor.

*Not a
report
equivalent
not a*

CURRENT No. 1976

Public Dept

From.

The Govt. Solicitor

No. 296

June 96.
June 16
June 17

encl one and
C.O. 1440, 1611, 1630
1820 + 1885 with
encl ret

Subject.

Forwards the Advocate
General's opinion stating that
there are not sufficient grounds
for instituting a prosecution
against Lakshmanarayana Patnaik

CHIEF SECRETARY
16 JUN. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Confidential

CURRENT No. 2069

No.

Madras 25th June 1896.

From,

CHIEF SECRETARY
26 JUN. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor

Madras.

The Chief Secretary to Government.

Ootacamund.

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement dated 15th instant
No. 1220 I return herewith the papers forwarded therewith, together
with, in original, the opinion of the Advocate General on the matter
referred to him.

[G.
74]

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

For the Handwriting test fraud
case at Coimbatore please see
82, No. 885 957. 2-12-93 + back
papers - The result of the
prosecution has not been
reported to Govt. The Madras
High Court reports for 1894 &
1895 do not contain the
case.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Obedient Servant

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor.

S. d. h. M. M.
172-511
1824 157-153.

Pls. see 1824 157-153.
1824 157-153.

NS
28/6

CURRENT No. 1007

Public Dept.

From.

Govt. Solicitor

SI 25 } June 96
RI 26 }
R22

Encl one +

Eno. 1951 with 87 nos
ret'd.

Submits further opinion of the
Advocate General re false horoscope
used by Lakshmanarayana Patnaik.

CS

5

Public

Eno. 1460, 162, 1630, 1810, 1825, 1875

Refce

No 1309 82-

The papers will be referred
to the Advocate General and will
refer to the following cases
with the request that he will
will be requested to be so
to reconsider the matter:-

1. Queen-Empress v Appasa
H. R., 12 Madras
2. Queen-Empress v Gan
rao & Ganesh Dailat, 9
13 Bombay 506.
3. Queen-Empress v Sobhi
Bhushan - H. R., 15 All

CS.
20.6.96

20/6/96

Govt. Solicitor Deshpande
with papers to be ret'd.
CP 17

Confidential

CURREN

2186.

CHIEF SECRETARY
8 JUL 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Registered

No. 316

Madras 6th July 1896.

From,

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor

M a d r a s.

To,

The Chief Secretary to Government

O o t a c a m u n d.

Sir,

W i t h reference to your Memorandum No.1309 dated 2nd instant Public Department, I beg to return the papers forwarded therewith together with, in original, the opinion of the Advocate General on the case referred to him.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Yours Obedient Servant

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor.

1 no copy is available

Forwards the further opinion
of the Advocate General in regard
to the false horoscope used by
Lakshmananarayana Patnaik.

$$\frac{10}{10} \overline{) 397}$$

* Rule 2. N. B. of
Noting: on page 1332
of Part I of Gazette of
1895.
C.B.

FOR ORDERS.

... who wishes to forward the application under the patronage of the Government of Baraburdi to compete for the Indian Civil Service application for an ^{of nationality} certificate which is the rules of the Government of Baraburdi. The application was long on the 12th of the month in support of the foundation of the horoscope. The application was forwarded to the Baraburdi Government for inquiry and report, and the Baraburdi report is as follows (1)

The inquiry of the Baraburdi Government shows:-

(1) that the horoscope forwarded by the petitioner is false & that it was written by the family Astrologer some five or six months ago on application of the

furnished by the father of the petitioner (this is the astrologer's own statement).

(2) that the horoscope of Lakshmanarayana Patnaik's younger brother shows that the latter was born on the 12th June 1875 whilst the horoscope H. M. forwarded by the former shows that he (L. Patnaik) was born on the 14th June 1875 (& not 12 June 1875 as stated in eno 1440).

(3) The family astrologer states that, as L. Patnaik's younger brother is 21 years of age & that as a boy born between these two brothers died some years ago, L. Patnaik must be now at least 24 years of age.

On the other hand the school registers show:-

(1) that on the 11 March 1889 he was 13 years of age

(2) that during 1891 & 1892 his age was 16 & 17 respectively

(3) that when he appeared for the middle school examination in August 1886 he gave his

all 2012

FOR ORDERS.

But (1) & (2) Montague.
of 13th March 1889, he was
born 15th not 16th in 1891
by

He was born on 15th March 1891

I should certainly prosecute, if the adv. Genl. advises that prosecution will stand

by
4/6/96

W
(1) and (2) heard out the statement that he was born in June 1875 but he makes him all year older than the horoscope. The collector is making further enquiries, but it is submitted that there is sufficient proof to show that L. Patnaik was not born in June 1875 & that he is much older than the horoscope.

25/6/96 In other words he is

born on 15th March 1891. I have looked up the school books but the only change which would apparently hold is an attempt to cheat. I submit that if possible this man should be prosecuted by the District Judge to be convicted? There was I think a case of something of this kind up in Bengal and the High Court there held that it was cheating. There was the case of

not in the file

of the
to the
Laksh

15 ✓

৷৷৷

of the
to 1
La

44-38861-1000

R.

No

C. No's 1440, 1611, 1630, 1810, 1835, 1951,
1976, 2069 & 2186.

(The name of the
person who is
the subject of the
document is written
in the margin.)

The D.M. should instruct the Public Prosr. to appear in the case, so that we may have competent legal points.

11/7/96

The Advocate General's opinion is by no means decisive and perhaps the D.W. Sangam might be furnished with the papers and instructed to prosecute Lakshminarayana Patnaik.

C.S.
9-7-96

See please the concluding
portion of A. Q.'s opinion

It is a nice point whether there
is a case against this man: he
ought certainly be if possible
for even if he eventually got off
the prosecution would be a
sufficient advertisement of his
lawless and a warning to

May 29, 1944

troubled himself but little about
the case at first and it was
not until being brought
some cases and his attention
being drawn to these and one
or two others that he looked
matter up with the result that
he has produced a very
useful set of opinions

9/7/96

H. M.

FOR ORDERS.

The opinions of the
Advocate Genl. will
be commd. to
Mr. D. M. Gangam
with the
intimation that

18
Crs 1440, 1611, 1830, 1810, 1835,
1976, 2069 & 2186.

Order No. 735 dated 13th July 96

The Govt. considers that
Lakshmanarayana Patnaik
should be prosecuted and the
Mr. Magt. Gangam will be
requested to take the necessary
action ^{at an early date} - It will be left to him
^{to decide} ~~Mr. Magt. Gangam's discretion~~ as to what
charges should be preferred
against Lakshmanarayana
Patnaik and also whether
^{the} ~~this~~ man's father and the
astrologer should be proceeded
against.

2. The Public Prosecutor should
be instructed to conduct the case
and the result should be
reported to Govt.

(From orders)

11.7.96

11/7/96

Copy of papers sent to D.M., Gangam.
Three opinions of Advocate Genl. in orig. to be
ret'd; Pub Crs 1440 & 1611 to be returned,
two horoscopes, Encl No. 3 to Crs 1810 &
Encl Nos. 8 & 15 to Crs 1951.

D.M. Gangam (all Crs)
with Encl Nos. 3 & 2186 in orig.
Govt. Solicitor (Q).