

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.**Government of Madras.***Revenue* **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	1267.	Press Mis.
280-281		
Dated	27-6-	1861..

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th June 1861.

No. 280. Read the following letter from GOPARÁZ STRIRÁMULU, late Salt Tanadar of Conada, in the District of Vizagapatam, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Amulápuram, 1st April 1861:—

SIR,

I beg to enclose a Petition in triplicate addressed to Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India, and to request you will be pleased to transmit the same, informing me of the date of despatch.

No. 281. ORDER THEREON, 27th June 1861, No. 1,267.

Ordered that the Memorial received with the foregoing letter, be forwarded to Home Authorities, and that an intimation of its despatch be given to the Memorialist.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

Circumstances are some what different.

To The Honorable the Members of the

Board of Revenue.

Madras

1363

18/5/60

Six

The humble Petition of Goparaju
Sivaramulu, late Salt Sanadar
of Conadab, in the District of
Vizagapatnam.

Respectfully Sheweth,

1. That your Petitioner was employed
in various situations since the Year 1836, and
that the period of his continuous service amounts
to 15 years.

2. That on the 9th June 1857, he was promoted
to the Office of Salt Sanadar at Conadab, from
the situation of Pishcar, in the Amang Talook
of Surviddy, in the District of Vizagapatnam,
and conducted himself to the satisfaction of
his Superiors up to the end of the Year 1858,
as acknowledged by Mr. Renore, the Principal
Assistant, in his letter to the Collector, dated
9th January 1859 in the following terms,
Para 13. "I then proceeded to Conadab where
circumstances are some what different."

"The Tanadur and ryots are hostile, and until he
"entered present Office, the Tanadur's character was
"good."

3^d That in consequence of Mr. Knice's report contained in the said letter, Mr. C. Rende was instructed to recommend to your Honorable Board the removal of your Petitioner from Office; and your Honorable Board were pleased to direct his removal, in proceedings of the 24th June 1859, on suspicion of having tampered with certain Salt heaps, previous to Mr. Knice's inspection, and on the ground, that he had thereby forfeited the Collector's confidence.

14. That your Honorable Board will observe that his appointment to the Salt Department occurred just about the close of the period of the receipt of Salt in 1857, and that he is not accused of any misconduct in connection with that year.

Atte Enclosures 5.

 $\frac{1}{2} A \vee B$

5. That in June 1858 he had occasion
to bring to notice the ⁺mal practices of certain of
the Manufacturers, who were punished in conse-
quence of his report, which circumstance
created an ill feeling towards him on the part of the
Manufacturers as already noticed in the quotation
from

from Mr. Knovis letter.

6. That although thus ill feeling exposed
your Petitioner to the effects of the Malevolence of
the Manufacturers Mr. Rouse himself acknowledges
that not a single credible accusation was preferred
against him. And your Honorable Board may
easily imagine, how difficult it must have been
for your Petitioner to have reverted to the Mal
practices of which he has been accused, with any
chance of concealment, watched as he was by
hundreds of hostile eyes.

7. With regard to the suspicions entertained by that Gentleman, Your Petitioner entertains the hope, that your Honorable Board will be pleased to admit, on reconsideration, that they are based on premises which do not satisfactorily support the conclusions drawn from them; and which, Your Petitioner submits, would scarcely have been deduced, had the suspicion of fraud being general, not been entertained, and had the examination been conducted at a time, when the mind was free from such suspicion. Your Petitioner need not dwell on the danger to which any person situated as he was, would be exposed,

in a mind prepared to admit a foregone conclusion,
and to draw inferences from indications, which
would be considered of no moment under ordinary
circumstances. Whether Mr. Knox's mind
was in this state or not on his arrival at Conadale
from Copilly, Your Petitioner leaves it to your
Honorable Board to determine, on consideration
of that Gentleman's report on Copilly, in connection
with his report on Conadale.

Vide Enclosure
8
C, D, E,

Your Petitioner in September & October
1858, long before Mr. Reade appears to have intimi-
ated that he entertained any suspicion, & in
several reports to his superiors regarding the
damage sustained by the heaps from the great
fall of rain, and in consideration of the great
length of time the lower portion of a heap of
salt is likely to retain and communicate
moisture to the surrounding portions, Your Petitioner
submits to the determination of your Honorable
Board, whether the Cause assigned by Mr.
Knox for the appearance of the moisture, is
the only Cause that can possibly be assigned.

9. Although your Petitioner humbly
submits

submits that the suspicions entertained by that
Gentleman and acted upon by Mr. Reade, are by
far too vague and uncertain to justify the dis-
missal of a servant of fifteen years standing,
he readily admits that grounds exist for sus-
picion in consequence of a certain excess having
been represented on sales, subsequently conducted,
in the absence of your Petitioner. Your Petitioner
further admits, that those grounds for suspicion
would amount to absolute certainty had your
Petitioner been present when those subsequent
sales were conducted.

Vide Enclosure
10
F

10. But as your Petitioner's request to
have the subsequent sales conducted in his
presence was disregarded, and as the subsequent
sales were conducted by a person, who is exposed
to the suspicion of being desirous of ingratiating
himself with his superiors, by showing the
correctness of a conclusion, founded on suspi-
cions, previous to any attempt at proof, Your
Petitioner humbly submits, that even the repre-
sentation of facts, under such circumstances,
amounts to nothing but bare suspicion.

Your

Wm. Reade

11 Your Honorable Board in the 22^d line
of proceedings of the 24th June 1859 (P. 2449) in its
remarks, "that a considerable difference was observed
in the quantity of Salt measured according to the
force with which it is thrown into the barrel."

If the remarks be true with respect to the quantity of Salt received into Store, Your Petitioner submits that it is equally true with respect to the quantity of Salt sold; and in consequence of the Salt being sold in the absence of Your Petitioner, and in the absence of any of the European Officers of the District, no person was ever known to

Suspension of being desirous of recommending
 himself to the good will of his Superior, and
 who was, on the removal of your Petitioner, &c.

pointed to his situation, the bare representation
of an Apparent excess in an Article, admitting
of such an uncertain representation of quantity,
according to the mode of measurement, ^{does not,} under
the circumstances, ~~concern~~ Your Petitioner

Submits, there an Amount of Disposition
sufficient to justify the extreme penalty of the
dismissal of a servant whose previous conduct

has been acknowledged to have been good.

12. Your Petitioner has based his claims to consideration upon the simplest and most reasonable grounds, in the hope that the benefit of doubt which has been extended to other persons, whose conduct was the subject of report at the same time, may be extended to him; and that, in consideration of the distress he has endured, his deprivation of Office and Salary, during the last sixteen months, an Order may be passed, permitting his reemployment in the public service.

May 1860

Your Beltonian shall ever pray
 for the success of your cause

The humble Petition of Goparaju
Sreeramuloo, late Salt Taxadar of
Conaduk, in the District of
Nizagapalam.

1st That your Petitioner was deposed from the situation of Salt Taxador of Conaduh in the District of Vizagapatam, on the 24th June 1859, by the Board of Revenue, upon the recommendation of W. B. Reade, late Collector of Vizagapatam.

3.^d That on the 25th May, the Board of Revenue endorsed his decision, declining to interfere with the decision already passed in Colthorpe's case.

Ad Board of

Provenue are no reason
to modify their decisions
already passed on the
subject and confusing
the claimants by the
collected.

Recd. to Office,
1st of George, 1860.
15. May 1860.

Ed. Jeff

Dr. J. C. Smith

H. J. D. G.

D. Norman
of the Board of Miners
Dated 18th May 1860.
Recd. Dec. 25th 1880

3/26/64

William A. Johnson
The National State
Board of Control
Washington
D.C.

What long had he been
diminished by or sea of
My house as a report
transmitted on darkness;
that the indication
of notice in the Runy's
departs the collector,
may be traced to C.

Ordinary Causes for

money, reported by
 petition; that the
 subsequent sales were
 conducted in the
 absence of petition
 notwithstanding his
 repeated requests to have
 them conducted in his
 presence; and that the
 subsequent statements may
 be attributed to the
 state of his memory in acting
 as a thing of doubt on the
 value of the statement of
 quantity of goods.

William Smith & Co. his ex. employment
on the part of the salary in the public service.
been conducted by the
person who has appointed
to discuss him, not only in
his own character but also
in the character of any of
the European officers.

of the District, and
County of
Hills,

The kind of Death
expected to attend
the want of common sense
for removal at the
same time, may be
expected in his former
state being in health
with only a little of the
dysentery, and the
then order may be
passed according.

4th That the said Petition with its enclosures is herewith submitted, and your Petitioner earnestly entreats that your Government will be pleased to accord to his statements therein set forth, the consideration due to a public servant, however humble, who solicits justice at the hands of your Government.

5th That your Government will perceive that Mr. Knowe himself bears testimony to the character of your Petitioner; that that Gentleman acknowledges a hostile feeling existed between your Petitioner and the Salt Manufacturers; and that although your Petitioner was instrumental in bringing some of them to punishment for malpractices, he further acknowledges that not a single well grounded Complaint was preferred against him: nevertheless, your Petitioner has been condemned on Mr. Knowe's report on the supposition entertained without ^{that} proof holes had been made and water poured into the heaps for the purpose of destroying a portion of the Salt and allowing no excess quantity to appear, and in support of the inference deduced from the fact assumed, no excess

was discerned in the two heaps sold in presence of your Petitioner by Mr. Knowe's Assistant Sheristadar and Sanabaniis.

That in the 8th para of his petition to the Board of Revenue your Petitioner accounted for the appearance of the indications noticed by Mr. Knowe, and to show that those indications are not to be relied on as conclusive evidence of guilt, your Petitioner begs to enclose copy of an Order dated 28th February 1838, addressed by Mr. W. A. Arbuthnot, late Collector of Vizagapatam, to a Sanadar of that District, wherefrom your Government will perceive, that the damage occasioned by rain is of itself sufficient to produce the appearances which Mr. Knowe held to be so significant of guilt; and which damage and appearances in every respect, as they subsequently presented themselves to Mr. Knowe, had been reported by your Petitioner to Mr. Pelly the Assistant Collector, in the months of September and October 1838 before Mr. Pelly commenced the enquiry in November and Mr. Knowe inspected the heaps before Mr. Knowe inspected the heaps.

Extraordinary as it may appear your

marked G

vide enclosures D. E.

Mr. Pelly commenced the enquiry in November and Mr. Knowe inspected the heaps before Mr. Knowe inspected the heaps. November 1838.

Petitioner

Petitioner has been condemned on the one hand,
because he is alleged to have adopted successful
measures to prevent the appearance of any excess, and
on the other, because an excess was alleged to have
existed before expectants for Office who eventually
succeeded to the situation of your Petitioner.

Vide Enclosure

F.

7th That your Petitioner's repeated prayers
to have the Salt examined and sold in his presence,
and in presence of an European Officer, were disregarded,
and the reports of an individual, interested, in creating
a vacancy, by which he expected to benefit, and by
which he did benefit, were received as true and
infallible to the detriment of your Petitioner,
notwithstanding the circumstance of their referring
money to the report of Mr. Knoss.

8th That under any circumstances, reports of
such a nature, founded on an Examination made
in the absence of your Petitioner, and of any of
the European Officers of the District, concerning
an Article admitting of such variation in
quantity according to the mode of measurement,
should be received with caution; but coming
as

as they did from an individual in the position of
the Examiner, and prejudicial as they were to the
supposition based on Mr. Knoss's report, on which
he was chiefly condemned, Your Petitioner humbly
submits that they should not have been relied
on unless subjected to the test solicited by your
Petitioner.

9th That the above facts are supported by
the Proceedings connected with the Case in the
Office of the Board of Revenue.

10th That your Government will perceive that
the grounds on which he has been condemned, even
if they can be reconciled one with the other,
are based on the vaguest possible suspicion,
a suspicion which at any other time could
scarcely have been entertained for a moment,
on such grounds, against a man whose character
had hitherto been unblemished, had not the

state

of the Petitioner

is that the undue circumstance of friends in their Tanahs, created
doubt in consequence
of whose - doubts regarding the integrity of every Salt Tandar
concerned the heads
has prevailed in the country and prepared the minds of the
British
suspecting that Officers who had to decide his case, to men
known to be
in the District

with

with suspicion any imputation, however slenderly supported.

11th Your Petitioner most respectfully submits that no individual in the public Service, whether in a high or in a low position, would consider himself treated with justice were he to be deprived of Office and reputation upon similar grounds; and as the removal of public servants upon sheer vague suspicion is opposed to the orders of your Government; and your Petitioner has been removed solely upon such suspicion, your Petitioner most earnestly and humbly solicits, that his reemployment in the public Service may be permitted.

For which as in duty bound

your Petitioner shall Ever pray

ಗಾವಾಳು & ರಾಮಣ್ಣ

Marras—
Triplican—
5th August 1860

December 1861. Boston
 Dear Mr. T. W. Higginson
 I have just received your letter of the 13th

90/126/1

Reverse Text the Memorial:

received with the foregoing Letter,
the consent of James Clinton is
and that an instruction of its des:
patch be given to the Memorialists

Ad. J. Lee.

27 June 1881

Ms. A. 9.2.8.5 v. 2.8.1.

Towards Memorial
 to the Secretary of State opposing
 against the order of the
 Government to decline to permit
 his re-employment in the
 Public Service.
 A. 1867 75. Edward
 With our order

20 June 1924