M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1347 Press ~~Mis.~~

125-126

Dated 3—10— 1859.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1347

No. 125. Read the following letter from W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department; dated 6th September 1859, No. 3552.

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit the report called for by Government on their proceedings of 11th June last, R. D., No. 775, on the memorial of Bandy Tiroomul Row, late Tahsildar of Chennoor, in the district of Cuddapah, seeking restoration to the service from which he was removed in 1857, and to the position from which he was reduced in 1856, or that he should be granted a full pension with all arrears of pay claimed.

In Con. 13th June 1859, No. 2757.

2. The following statement will afford some idea of Teroomul Row's conduct and character, and show how far his present application is deserving of consideration.

3. In 1850 the Collector of Cuddapah reported to the Board that he had suspended memorialist from his post of Tahsildar and Head of Police of Royachoty for 18 months, on account of numerous instances of gross misconduct and abuse of authority in the discharge of his police duties which were detailed at length, and in the conclusion of their proceedings disposing of the Collector's report, the Board stated that the conduct of the memorialist appeared to have been so culpable that had the Collector recommended his dismissal, they would not have hesitated to give their consent.

From Collector dated 21st November 1850, in Con. 16th December 1850, No. 3063.

Board's proceedings dated 16th December 1850, No. 2606.

4. Further instances of misconduct of a less serious character on the part of the memorialist who had resumed his post at Royachoty, were reported to the Board by the Collector in 1853, with a recommendation that he should be dismissed or degraded to a less responsible situation, but the Board were of opinion that the requirements of the case would be sufficiently met by a reprimand or fine.

From Cuddapah 3d November 1853, in Con. 8th December 1853, No. 2938.

Board's Proceedings 8th December 1853, No. 2557.

5. In 1856, the Collector again reported to the Board that, in consequence of memorialist's continued misconduct and systematic neglect of duty, it had been found necessary to remove him from Royachoty talook to that of Chennoor where he drew the same pay, but that, as no improvement was visible, as reprimands and fines failed of effect, as his neglect of duty was continued and his conduct was bringing himself and his office into disrepute, he had contemplated suspending him from his situation, but that in consideration of his length of service and being desirous not to deprive him altogether of pay, he had reduced him to the inferior post of Deputy Tahsildar of Poolivendlah, but that he did not intend the degradation to the permanent, and had intimated to the Tahsildar that on his showing more activity, and less disregard of orders he would be restored.

From Cuddapah dated 25th April in Con. 7th May 1856, No. 1453.

6. The Board approve the Collector's proceedings and instructed him to warn memorialist that his continuance in the service would depend on his giving proofs of diligence and obedience to orders, and discontinuing the use of abusive language in the conduct of public business.

Board's Proceedings dated 7th May 1856, No. 1354.

7. Memorialist subsequently addressed a petition, No. 3729 of 1856, to the Board complaining that he had been removed from his post of Deputy Tahsildar, which was sent to the Collector for report, and in his reply the Collector stated that memorialist having contumaciously refused to take up the post to which he had been reduced, and absented himself from the district for a long time, without leave sought or granted, he had been passed over when on the division of the Talook of Poolivendlah the post of Deputy Tahsildar was abolished.

From Cuddapah dated 5th February in Con. 11th March 1857, No. 591.

8. His complaints against the Head Serishtadar of the district were declared to be without foundation, and it was stated that when, in a previous petition to the Board, he brought serious charges of bribery against that officer and was required to substantiate them, he refused to give any deposition on the subject.

9. The Board declined to interfere on petitioner's behalf under the circumstances stated by the Collector, and of the review of his conduct now made they think that he has been treated with much forbearance, and that he is undeserving of further consideration.

Board's Proceedings dated 11th March 1857, No. 780.

No 126. ORDER THEREON, 3d October 1859, No. 1347.

Ordered that a copy of the Board's report be forwarded with the Memorial in question to the Home Authorities.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
dated 16th December 1850

Read Letter from Collector
of Cuddapah 21st November 1850
reporting the Suspension of the Head of
Police of Royachoty for one years from
that date Consequent on gross irregularities
in his Conduct.

In Consultation
16th December 1850
3063

(Here enter No 84)

The Head of Police of Roya
choty was suspended "until further orders"
by an order issued on the 10th July in
which the facts which had called for this
measure were set forth in Considerable
detail.

2 On the 21st November the Collector
recommends to the Board of Revenue
the Suspension of the Head of Police for
a further term of one year, upon the same
grounds as detailed in the Takeed above
referred to, but no explanation is given
of the great delay which occurred of for
what

what purpose the final Consideration
of it was postponed until November,
when a judgment was given apparently
upon the Same information as the
Collector had before him at the prior
date.

3 Passing over the Mootana
Calvah Robbery / the record of which
has not been transmitted / and the case
No. 214 on the Criminal file / on which No. 4
the Head of Police was fined 10 Rupees
by the Magistrate / with the remark,
that the Conduct of the Head of Police
appears very reprehensible in both cases,
the Board proceed to the Consideration
of the other Cases reported.

4 In the case of Gang Robbery No. 5
at Neelacuntaroyapetta the Board
agree in the remarks recorded by the
Sessions Judge. The Curnum Nursiah
and 2 others appear to have instigated
the Robbery. They were in the house
at the time it took place. The former
had on his person valuables which were
left untouched by the robbers, and from
the

the Communications which passed
between these parties, it is more than
probable that the former were privy to
the attack. It is extraordinary that
though at first apprehended as prisoners
in the case, they were subsequently for-
warded to the Court as witnesses.

5 The Judge refusing to receive
their evidence, remanded the case to the
Magistracy and the further prosecution
of it would appear to have failed.

No. 6 6 In the case No. 148 of the Courts
file, the Board are satisfied that had
the Head of Police taken the most strin-
gent measures to elicit the real Cir-
cumstances of the case, the charge would
have been proved a fabrication and the
Defendant would have been spared the
dishonor of being committed to Court on
a serious Criminal charge.

7 The Conduct of the Head of
Police appears more especially negligent
and culpable in the case of the body
of a man found in a well at Mootaroo
Calvah. The enquiry into this matter was held
by the Head Assistant Magistrate and
detailed

detailed in his report to the Magistrate is full and satisfactory. No 3

8 From this report it appears that the proceedings originally held by the Head of Police were in pursuance of an attempt to prove that the deceased was Sooliadoo, a dependent of one Sanpareddy, though the latter, unaccused by any of Sooliadoo's relatives declared that his servant was still alive and produced him. He though able to write, is made to give a deposition, attested by his mark that he had never known Sanpareddy or had been to his house, but before the Head Assistant Magistrate both he and the witnesses in support of his previous declaration denied that they had ever given such evidence.

9 At the time of this enquiry the Head of Police was in possession of a Complaint of one Naghee of the disappearance and suspected murder of her son Chinnegadoo, at the instigation of a powerful family in the neighbourhood with a daughter of whom Chinnegadoo had eloped, and the disappearance of these two were also then reported to the Head

* 1st January by the Chinnacoontabunda Reddies

4

Head of Police. The body was disinterred on the 19th January but could not be recognised in its decomposed state by the relatives of Chinnegadoo.

10 No further Steps were then taken by the Head of Police to follow up an enquiry on these latter points, but 3 Months afterwards, he reported to the Magistrate that "from further evidence" (none in the least material having however been obtained subsequent to the first charge against Sanpareddy) he had come to the Conclusion that the body found in the well was that of the above named Chinnegadoo who had eloped with the sister of Narasinga Naid a pensioned Polligar, and that he had been made away with by the Naid's people Chinnegadoo has not since been found and his continued absence connected with his known intimacy with the Polligar's sister, tend to confirm the suspicion. Had the Head of Police actively pursued an enquiry into facts

placed

placed within his knowledge during the first investigation it is more than probable that proof of the murder would have been obtained.

A few only of the incidents in this case have been touched upon by the Board but the Conduct of the Head of Police appears, both in this, and in the other case referred to, so culpable that had the Collector recommended his dismissal the Board would have had no hesitation in giving their Consent. As it is they Confirm the Suspension of Firmul Rous for one year from the 21st November last and they desire that he may be informed that should his Conduct in future give further cause of dissatisfaction his final dismissal will be the result.

/True extract/

/Signed/ W. H. Bayley
Secretary

To The Collector of Cuddalore

/True Copy/

Secretary

5

6/12/2

Revenue Department

Extract from the Proceeding of the Board of Revenue dated 11th March 1857.

In Con. 11th March 1857.

Read letter from the Collector of Cuddapah under date 6th February 1857 respecting upon petition 3729/1856.

(Here enter No. 10)

Ordered that the following endorsement be passed upon petition 3729/1856.

"From a report received from the Collector, the Board find that Petitioner contumaciously refused to join his appointment as Deputy Tahsildar and has absented himself for a long time without leave."

"It moreover appears that Petitioner's appointment was abolished when the new arrangements connected with the Subdivision of the Poolivendalum talook came into effect, under these circumstances the Board see no ground for interfering in his

Collr. in a letter dated 6th Octr. 1856. No. 53.

Enclosure No. 1 in a letter from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 6th September 1859 No. 13522.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 10th December 1856.

Respecting the suspension of the Head of Police.

P 15/59

3 Oct 1859
No 1317
12574/2

behalf.——

/True Extract/

To /Signed/ L. Forbes.—
The Collector
of Cuddapah. Acting Sub Secretary.

/True Copy/

Secretary

C. Burton

Copy of Letter to Govt dated 5th October 1859, No 53

Enclosure No 3 in a letter from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 5th September 1859 No 3522.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Collector of Cuddalore dated 3rd March 1855.

Passing Endorsement on Petition No 3129 of 1858 to the effect that the Board see no ground for interfering in Petitioners behalf.

Rejected

Revenue Department

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 8th December 1853.—

Read letter from the Collector of Cuddalore dated 3rd November 1853.

(Here Enter No 82)

In the foregoing letter the Collector has brought to the notice of the Board of Revenue, certain Complaints against Bundy Teroomul Row, Tahsildar of Royachoty, and requests authority to remove that individual from the Public Service, or to degrade him from the Office of Tahsildar to some other situation of little or no responsibility.—

2. The principal charge against Teroomul Row is that he permitted a Comety to remove Stones from the old Fort, and to cut wood in the Circar Jungles for the purpose of making additions to his house, in which the Tahsildar had taken up his residence—

and

and further that he allowed the Comoties of Royachoty to carry away the Bricks of the Fort to build a Pagoda.—

3. In a complaint of this nature the Board would be unable to act without having before them a full explanation from the Tahsildar as required by their Circular Order of 24th June 1851. They have however carefully perused Mr Blair's Proceedings as well as the Comments of the Collector and it does not seem to them that the Charge has been satisfactorily proved. nor if it had been that it would have called for any more severe punishment than a reprimand from the Collector, or a fine.—

4. The other matter referred to in paras 5. 7. and 8 appear to have occurred some time since and to have been already disposed of by the Collector. No further orders upon them therefore seem necessary.—

The

5. The value of the Stones and Bricks- and of the wood. removed. should be recovered from the parties who appropriated them; and carried to the credit of Government.—

/True extract/
/signed/ W H Bayley
Secretary

To
The Collector
of Cuddapah.

/True Copy/

Secretary

C Baston

Copy incl. a Letter to E
d/ 5 October 1859 No. 53

Enclosure No. 2 in a
letter from the Sy. Secretary
to the Board of Revenue
to the Secretary to Govt.
Revenue Department
d/ 6th September 1859 No.
3522.

Extract from the Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue to
the Collector of Cuddapah
d/ 8th December 1853.

Respecting the complaints
brought against the Tah-
-sildar.

R 1691/59

Pro. of Govt 17 June 59 N 7-8

Revenue 1859 Depart.
Pros. of Govt 4th Oct.
N: 1691.

From
The Ag Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

To The Secretary to
Government
Revenue Depart.

Dated 6th Septr 1859.
Recd 14 Do
Revd 15th Do
C 3 (& 5 Oct Collr)
N: 3522
7/6. Cycle
N: 1347. 3d Oct. 1859.

Submitting the report called for by Government on the Memorial of Bandy Tirumul Row late Tahsildar of Chennoor in the District of Cuddapah seeking restoration to the service from which he was removed for gross misconduct and abuse of authority in the discharge of his duties.

With an Order

N: 1347

Rdered that a copy of the 8th report be forwarded with the Memorial in question to the Home Authorities -

Fort St. Geo:
3d October 1859

Rd 13 Dec 17-11-59

N: 125 & 126.

C 21 Sep. R 28