Revenue Department

№ 430

Sarteg 20—3—1859

No. 79. Read the following Petition.

To the Right Honorable the Governor in Council Fort St. George.

The humble Petition of Dundamarazoo Naraharee late Curnum of Dooggry in the Talook of Toomoorcota in the Zillah of Guntoor, dated 8th March 1859.

SHEWETH,

In enclosing the appeal Petition to the Secretary of State for India regarding my dismissal from the office of Curnum. I humbly beg your goodness will be pleased to despatch the same to him as usual.

For which act of kindness I as in duty bound shall ever pray.

No. 80. ORDER THEREON, No. 430; dated 30th March 1859.

Petitioner is informed that Memorials to the Home Authorities must be submitted in triplicate.

(Signed) W. C. SIM,
Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

To

The Secretary of State for
India -

&c &c &c

Most Honored Sir

The humble memorial of
Dundamarazoo Narahare
late Curnum of the Village
of Dooegy in the Tomoorcotta
Talook in the District of Guntoor
under the Presidency of
Fort St George -

I beg leave to solicit briefly the injustice
I suffered by the following -

1 The Collector, the Board of Revenue and the Government
refused to enquire wither the misentry of Rs 5 in the Village
accounts which formed the principal ground of my dismissal
from the office of Curnum was willfull or oversight -

2 Had the misentry alluded to occured willfully, why did
the other Curnums Dundamarazoo Narsingum &c of the
Village as well as myself make instantly the report
of the same to the Tahuseeldar -

3 While I and the other Curnums were Equally Concerned
in the matter I was only dismissed from the office while the
others were fined at 3 Rs each -

4 The Amount of Rs 5 said to have misentered in the —

accounts was recovered from me. Moreover I was also dismissed from office -

4 Two punishments were inflicted on me for an over sight.

6 The Contents of the Collectors Order dismissing me finally differ from those of his Indorsement on my petition on the occasion -

7 When the Board of Revenue called upon the Collector for an explanation, the Collector did not report that the mistake had been reported to the Tahasildar previous to the Complaint having been preferred against me. but strenght ened the grounds of my dismissal -

8 In this Case another Curnum Janakeraunmoodoo who was in junnical terms with me, first prefered this Complaint against me. The Tahasildar having instituted regid Inquiry into the Complaint and finding that I was innocent, reported the same to the Collector on 1853. The Collector 3 years afterwards being influenced issued an Order dismissing me on suspecion by the intrigues of the Head Monkey, Altho there was no evidence than

9 The Board of Revenue have without sending for the original Record from the Collector Confirmed the Collectors decision and Indorsed the same on my petition -

10 Beg leave to give to your Honour certain instances as follows -

Previous to the Charge brought against me we the other Curnums and myself reported the mistake occured by oversight. While this is the Case the Collector stated in the decision that the Charge was Established. If I

has reported the mistake after the Charge being brought against me. it would have been Considered as my fault but this is the Case. and the Board took no notice of it

11 In his indorsement the Collector states that In the Khereej account of the fusly 1263 and in the account Called Ledger for fusly 1260 the papers were changed Beg to proceed as follows. In the accounts of the last fallies if any blank papers remain in Balance, the Talook Sherestadar examining the accounts every year put their Cross marks on them so that they may not be applied to other purposes, under the Circular Order. While such was the Case, it cannot be said that I have taken off part of the papers from the above accounts.

12 On my appeal the Government Indorsed on my petition saying that they do not Interfere in the Case of Servants below the grade of Head Servestadar

Casting all these unto the favourable Consideration Your Honour may be pleased to restore me to my hereditary Office as my suspension from the Office for 3 years would be sufficient punishment for the trifling oversight

For which act of knowledge I and my family shall ever be in duty bound

Ever pray -

Guntoor
8th March 1858

To which act of kindness
as in duty bound
shall ever pray.
Gudaloor
8th March 1849

[illegible]

without enquiring into

[illegible]

without enquiring into his case. — Declares himself perfectly innocent of the charge. —

Prays for personal enquiry and to be restored to his Caranum Service

Returned under P.7 and 8 of Rs Petn Rules

W. Norman
Dyer
Aug 14. 1858

№ 2239 of 1858.

From Thundarma raujoo Narahary Meerassy Curnum of Doogee in Commacottah Ta

looks [illegible] Rs 435/89

Repeats the statement in his former petition dated 13 July, complaining that the Collector upon a false charge of embezzlement against him, dismissed him from the Caranum Service. — States that the Board of Revenue also [illegible] the Collector

అజీలనుగురించిన నిబంధనలు.

కలం - 2 — కల్కటరుపల్లనున్న - సబ్ కల్కటరుపల్లనున్న - ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగములలో
తోశిచేయబడిననౌకరులయొక్క ఫిర్యాదు విషయములలో - శిరస్తాదారులయొక్క ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగ
మునకుకిందిప్రభుత్వోద్యోగస్థులసంగతులనుగురించి - వివిన్నూతనాజ్ఞలు
యినదిగాపుండవలెనది.

కలల - 8 — గవర్నమెంటువారికిఅప్పీలుచేసుకొన్నంగట - ఆ అప్పీలునుగురించిగవర
న్మెంటువారువ్రాసిపంపిన ఉత్తరములుచేరినతర్వాతతిరిగిదాంతో అర్జీయిచ్చినంగట - ఆ అర్జీలో విశేష
మయినసూతనసంగతులుయేమయినాపుండెట్లు అగుపడితేనేతప్ప ఆసంగతినిగురించేయిచ్చు
కానేరెండోఅర్జీనిగవర్నమెంటువారుతిరిగిశిక్షలుచేసుకోరు - వేరులేకుండాప్రాసుకొనినఅర్జీ
లనిపయిసుయిబొత్తిగావిచారణచేయరు.

Endorsement of the Collector

There is reason to believe that alterations were made in the Peerthy for fusly 1260 and in the Pattah for fusly 1260 and the petitioner appropriated sum of Rs 6 paid by Theegoo-moorthy Pulliah for fusly 1263 and entered also in the receipt Book and subsequently brought to credit the Officer thus

On these grounds dismissed from the Post of the Curnum Merassy - 25th July 1856 Fasli confirmed

Signed W. Newill
Ag Collector

The signatures of the Native Officers are affixed.

Endorsement on Petitions Nos
XII-1295 and 1822 of 1857

"The Petitioner is shewn to have falsified the Kher & account. The receipts (bearing Petitioner's signature) produced by the complainant, and the Village Khata account, in which the payment is entered clearly establish the charge of embezzlement. The Board can see nothing in the circumstances of the case calling for a mitigation of the sentence, which they accordingly confirm".

Rev. Board Office, By order.
Fort St. George,
15th Sept. 1857. L. Dantes.

Asst. Sub Secretary.

A. D. Hills

To

The President and Members
of the Revenue Board
for Fort St. George

The Humble Petition of
Thundamarajoo Narahary
late a Cunnum of Doo884
in the Talook of Thoommerycota
in the Zillah of Goontoor

Sheweth,

That your poor and helpless Petitioner most respectfully and humbly beg to inform your honorable Board that he has come from 300 Miles with a hope that he will obtain justice from your Board. Petr requests that your Board will be graciously pleased to read the whole Petition, but not the purport and then Petr has no doubt to obtain the redress he seeks. If this is not done Petr will be put to great inconvenience and trouble. Petr therefore prays that your Honorable Board will take his humble prayer in consideration and render him justice.

Petr was discharged by the Collector under the following grounds.

Petitioners Cousin by name of Thundamarajoo Sanakapramoodoo being his enmy preferred a complaint that the Petr has misapplied 15 Rupees in the fusly 63 in behalf of Theegoomurthy Lutchiah in the Keerthy Book of that fusly. The Tasildar receiving an order from the Huzzoor entered into investigation and made his report stating that there was no proof whatsoever to the Head Assistant Collector Mr George Wylie. After the elapse of 4 years Petrs cousin obtained the influences of the Moosseahs of the present Collector and misrepresented by stating that the Stamps of the fusly 63 in the Keerthy of 42-43-44-45 were not properly stamped in the other numbers by a supposition that the Petr erassed in the above said numbers. In fusly 60 in the Book Kaitha from the numbers of 190 to 198 the Corners of the pages were cut off and fixed in the number of 199 at the middle of the papers where stitching appears and in the number 200 the bottom of it were scratched. In the Book of

2

Inam 1940 of 1858

Keerthy and Katha the Collector supposed
that the Petr must have done being in his
possession although there was no proof and dismissed
him inconsequence in the fusly 66 on the 21st June
of 1856 in the number 211 of the order to the Tasildar from
the acting Collector.

By this Hookum it will be perceived that
there was no proof either by document or by witness
but by a supposition Petr was dismissed and not
being satisfied Petr was obliged to write to the
Collector to grant him an endorsement for the
purpose of appealing to your Honorable Board. The
Collector instead of confining himself to the original
order brought a fresh charge stating that the Petr
has not entered into the Books 6 Rupees paid by
Theegoomoorthy Lutchiah in the fusly 63 which although
entered into the receipt Book was not appeared
in the Keerthy Book. The Collector supposed that the
Petr paid that amount and gave an endorsement
to that effect in Number 15 of 1856.

Petr begs to represent by the following
grounds that he was unjustly removed from his
post and without any cause whatsoever.

1. It is no fault of the Petr for appearing
properly the Stamp in the Keerthy Book of the
fusly 63 in numbers 42-43-44 and 45 and
other following numbers which did not appear
well according to the statement of the Collector.
Your Board will know that it is usual that the
Servants of the Talook do this and in some cases
the stamps are entered well and not in others
which will be proved by several Books both in
the Keerthy and Katha and receipts. How and in
what manner Petr will supply the stamped papers
which are given by the Circars. The Tasildar when
made enquiry received whole of the papers which
were in the possession of the Petr and found every
thing correct. The Collector should not take into
his consideration any thing as the circular orders
issued from time to time by your Honorable
Board is to put a cross line to the papers that
remain in the hands in the end of each fusly
which are brought into operation by order of the
Tasildar of the Talook.

2. The Mistake happened in the Petr
entering the six Rupees paid by Theegoomoorthy
Lutchiah in fusly 63 of the 11th February 1854 in the
Keerthy Number 73 how and in what manner
could your Petr be charged that he had
written in the month of December 1853 in

42-43-44 and 45.

2. Petr has no business to make alteration
in the numbers above said and would not
scratch and make new ones through the ink
according to the statement of the Collector. The
Talook persons usually make numbers and if they
find any mistake they scratch them away in the
Keerthy and Katha Books and the Petr is ready
to prove by the said Keerthy and Katha Books
that there are alterations besides the above said
4 items in his Village in the fusly 63 and the same
mistakes are also to be found in the Books of
other Villages and if it be in the judicial Books
the entry is made on the bottom of each page that
there are so many mistakes but it is not a
practice to do so in the other places and therefore
it will be evident that it not the mistake of the Petr

3. The Collector mentions also in the
Takeed by which he was removed that in fusly
66 in the Katha Books that the corners of the pages
are cut off and in the end of the page the
alteration was made. The Circular Orders
empowers a person to Keep the Books in each
year and write in the Keerthy Books the receipt
of the money thereof from the ryots and the other
Curnums to do the other business and those
whose turn it is for that year the Books are
Kept by them. In the fusly 1260 it was the turn
of Thundaniarajoo Sreeramooloo the 4th Curnum
and if any mistake happened it was his duty
to answer and not the Petr as stated by the
Collector and the Books also were not in his
possession in that fusly.

4. The Collector in his endorsement
states newly that the Petr has written in the
receipt Book that 6 Rupees are entered in
the name of Lutchiah in the fusly 63 which will
be proved to your Satisfaction that it has
been done in the Keerthy Books that the Petr
has paid that amount is by mistake and will
be known by the following grounds. In fusly
63 the turn of writing the Keerthy and Katha
Books and the collection of money from the
ryots fell on your Petr among the 4 Curnums
on the 11th February 1854. One Theegoomoorthy
Basavaiah one of the ryots of the Village of the
Petr paid 6 Rupees which Petr has given
credit in the Keerthy Book and in the

Book of Katha instead of placing to his
credit and the house name of another
individual being of the same with that of
Basaviah Petr. made a mistake by entering
the said 6 Rupees to the credit of Lutchiah and
in the same way the entry also was made in
the name of Lutchiah in the receipt Book. In the
end of July 63 Petr. found out the mistake
through the accounts and made his report of
the same to the Tasildar and upon which the
Lutchiah was sent for and entered into the
investigation who having failed to pay the
amount and being entered in the receipt Book
to his name by mistake Petr. paid the amount
from his pocket by the directions of the Tasildar
without just cause and the Tasildar found
out by several accounts Books that it happened
actually by mistake he reported the circum-
stance to the Kurzoor and the other 3 Curzoors
also some deposition to that effect. After the
elapse of 4 months Petr's cousin and enemy
by name of Ganakaram made a complaint
but not done it first and the investigation
was not taken place after preferred the
complaint. The Collector took this mistake
a very great one.

Your Honorable Board should take
into consideration that the Petr has entered
in the Katha Books in the name of Lutchiah
and granted a receipt and the Petr. could
intended to take the said 6 Rupees Petr. could
not make such entry and when such entry
is made in so many documents and on
account of not wanting only in the Keerthy
Book by mistake how could the Collector
think that the Petr. wished to apply the said
6 Rupees to his own purpose and use.
If the Petr. intended to apply the
said 6 Rupees to his own use he should
have done so without entering the same
in so many Books.

If your Honorable Board will send for
those Books and inspect them your Board
will find that in the entry made in the
Keerthy Book in the name of Basaviah and
Lutchiah the diver sums agreed both to the
same to the Keerthy and Kurza numbers
written ... ...

by a mistake.

How could the Petr. enter the said Diver sums
in the Keerthy Books which has been entered in
the receipt Books as stated by the Collector and if
any ryots bring money it is entered at first in
the Keerthy Book and afterwards the diver
sums are entered in the Keerthy page number
and Kurza numbers and enter in the receipt
Book of those ryots and cannot apply to his
use the money which are entered in the Keerthy
Books and in the receipt Books.

Not only this the entry of 6 Rupees
in the Keerthy Book in the name of Basaviah
were not entered in the Katha Book and the
said mistake happened to the name of
Lutchiah and the entry appeared in the Katha
Book and receipt Book and not entered in
the Keerthy Book and if your Honorable Board
will send for those Books and see them your
Board will find that the entries were happened
only by a mistake.

The 6 Rupees which were collected
from Basaviah are entered in
Book and in the page number 70 in the
Katha Book wherein Basaviah's name was
entered should have been entered the number
in the Keerthy Book to the credit of Basaviah
and the mistake happened by entering in
the Katha Book to the name of Lutchiah
and the page number in the Katha Book
of 57 wherein Lutchiah's name appeared
was entered in the Keerthy Book in the
name of Basaviah's credit.

If the Petr. is personally interrogated
he would satisfy your Honorable Board
fully on all the points above mentioned.

Petr. has already addressed one
Petition and not having entered fully in
the said Petition Petr. is obliged to trouble your
Board with this Petition.

Under these circumstance Petr. begs
to ask your Honorable Board to send for
the report given by the Tasildar and the
record of the Writes and the Keerthy and

Kotha and receipt Book Co wherein the
mistake was entered and the deposition
of the other 3 Curnums on account of the
mistake of 6 Rupees and requests that your
Honorable Board will be graciously pleased
to render him justice by permitting him to
resume his duties without any molestation
whatsoever. For which act of charity and
Kindness your Petr is in duty bound
Shall Ever Pray

Madras
3rd April
1857

To

The Right Honorable Lord Harris
Governor in Council
Fort St George

The humble Petition of Thandavarayen Narahary late Curnum of Doogay Talook in the Zillah of Guntur.

Humbly Sheweth.

That Petitioner begs most respectfully to inform the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, that he was dismissed from his hereditary Curnumship by the Collector of Goontoor on account of the mistake that has crept in, in entering (P) sicca Rs and although Petitioner submitted his Appeal to the Board of Revenue against his unjust removal from his Curnumship, which was under the enjoyment of his family from time immemorial, yet they were pleased to sanction the same which is to be seen by their Endorsement; but as they have not taken into consideration the various grounds mooted by the Petitioner, he is now obliged to submit this Humble Petition agreeable to Section 6 Regulation 6 of 1831 in the confident hope that your Lordship in Council will be graciously pleased to render justice to the Petitioner.

2. That Petitioner submits that whether the said mistake of 5 Rupees happened intentionally or by any other cause ought to be first enquired into and

No 1295 of 1854

From Thandavarayen Narahary late Curnum of Doogay Talook in the Zillah of Guntur

Rec'd 15th Sept 1854

Petition 3rd Sept 1854

Referred to the Board of Revenue

Sept 22nd 1854

Petition of Thandavarayen Narahary late Curnum of Doogay Talook in the Zillah of Guntur praying that he may be restored to his Curnumship from which he was dismissed by the Collector of Goontoor on account of a mistake that has crept in, in entering (P) sicca Rs instead of 5 Rupees

Forwarded to the Collr with reference to the Bd's Order of 22nd Augt 1854

Bd's Office, Fort St George, 1st May 1854

By Order,

Secy

Returned with his Letter of the 15th August 1854 - Rs 23.

Collr

Guntur Collector

Letter from Collr Guntur dated 15th August 1854 with Enclosure

Read

Ordered that a Reference be made to the Collector for his Report

Ordered that the Petitioner be informed that a Reference has been made to the Collector for his Report

Read the Collector's Report

Ordered that the Petitioner be informed that the Collector has reported that the Petitioner was dismissed from his Curnumship for the mistake of 5 Rupees for which he was fined 5 Rupees and that the Petitioner was restored to his Curnumship on his paying the fine

Petition of Thandavarayen Narahary late Curnum of Doogay Talook in the Zillah of Guntur praying that he may be restored to his Curnumship from which he was dismissed by the Collector of Goontoor on account of a mistake that has crept in, in entering (P) sicca Rs instead of 5 Rupees

Ordered that the Petitioner be informed that the Collector has reported that the Petitioner was dismissed from his Curnumship for the mistake of 5 Rupees for which he was fined 5 Rupees and that the Petitioner was restored to his Curnumship on his paying the fine

Read the Collector's Report

Ordered that the Petitioner be informed that a Reference has been made to the Collector for his Report

Petition of Thandavarayen Narahary late Curnum of Doogay Talook in the Zillah of Guntur praying that he may be restored to his Curnumship from which he was dismissed by the Collector of Goontoor on account of a mistake that has crept in, in entering (P) sicca Rs instead of 5 Rupees

Read

Ordered that a Reference be made to the Collector for his Report

Ordered that the Petitioner be informed that a Reference has been made to the Collector for his Report

Read the Collector's Report

Ordered that the Petitioner be informed that the Collector has reported that the Petitioner was dismissed from his Curnumship for the mistake of 5 Rupees for which he was fined 5 Rupees and that the Petitioner was restored to his Curnumship on his paying the fine

and if the said mistake occurred intentionally why and what for the Petitioner and the other Curnums have reported regarding the said mistake through an urgee to the Tasildar three months before such complaint was made.

3. Petitioner further begs to submit- that the said Village contains 5000 Cawnies yielding 8000 Rs annually and inhabited by about 9000 souls and it is likely that such mistakes would happen when entering the names of the ryots and on account of which how such punishment was made.

4. Petitioner further begs to submit- that the Petitioner and the other Curnums report- -ted the circumstance to the Tasildar 3 months before the complaint was made who upon inquiry ordered the Petitioner to pay the said 8 Rupees out of his own money as a punishment which he consi- -dered sufficient for such neglect- and made his report thereon accordingly- Petitioner's cousin inorder to obtain the said post, procuring the influence and interest of the Zamindar of Mr Powell who has been newly appointed to the Collectorate of Guntoor, submitted this com- -plaint and got him dismissed, for which Peti- -tioner submitted his appeal to the Board of Revenue who without taking into consideration the just- -ments of his cause, sanctioned the same, and how and in what channel Petitioner can obtain Justice. If the Board were to write to the same officer for explanations against whom the complaint was made, how he would sub- -mit anything in favor of the aggrieved, but- only strengthen the grounds upon which such an dismissal

dismissal took place

5. Petitioner further submits that he has referred the Board to the public records to prove against his unjust removal which is that the date of the Petition and the other curnums report to the Tasildar on the subject of this Petition, and the date of the Tasildar's report to the Collector and the subsequent date of the complaint being preferred and if the Board were unwilling to send for those papers from the Collector how could the Petitioner be redressed-

That Petitioner begs further to

6. submit that your Lordship in council exercises now and then the heavy mistakes of the Collectors and also counteracts mistakes that creep in the Hon- -ble George Gazette and the other presses by publishing errata, and Petitioner further begs to bring to the consideration of your Lordship in Council that in 1853 one Venkiah superintendant employed under the Collector of Nellore was restored to his post- from which he was dismissed on the ground that the said Venkiah had previous to his dismissal brought to the notice of the Collector on account- of the mistake for which he was removed.

That Petitioner and the curnums

7. brought this circumstance to the notice of the Tasil- -dar immediately after the mistake and his report- -thereon to the Collector after investigation and the date of the complaint he sent for and ascertain- -ed the truth of the Petitioners statement that the mistake happened by an oversight, without any intention and the date of the charge being preferred by

Petitioner's cousin, through the interest and influence procured by him from the Jamabandees, although Petitioner paid 6 Rupees by the direction of the Tasildar.

Therefore on all these grounds your Petitioner humbly prays your Lordship in Council will call for this Petition to the Tasildar; the report of the said functionary to the Collector and the subsequent charge that was brought against him, and do justice to your Petitioner by restoring him to his post, in consideration of his unjust removal from his hereditary Curnamship which he enjoyed from time immemorial.

For which act of Justice your Petitioner as in duty bound

Shall ever Pray.

Madras
13th July 1858

Petitioner's name
Caste
Age
Residence

Petition of [illegible]

Received

Revenue 1859 Dept.
Dº to Covs: 1st April

Nº 435

From D. Narahare late
Curnum of Doogary in
the Talook of Toomooreotta
in Guntoor.-

Dated 8th March 1859.
Recd 16th

3 Encls.

Requests that the
annexed Petition regarding
his dismissal from the
Office of Curnum may
be transmitted to the
Home Govt.-

Nº 79 & 80.

Nº 430 - 30th March 1859.
With an order

C21st Minute R28th