M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1927

Press
~~Mis.~~

70-71

Dated 5 . 10 . 1864.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, *5th October* 1861.

No. 70. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th August 1861, No. 4,628.

Read again letter from the Collector of Tanjore, dated 29th July 1861.

(In Cons. 2nd August 1861, No. 4,835.)

Read also the following letters from the same Officer, dated 6th and 13th August 1861, Nos. 237 and 242.

(In Cons. 10th and 16th August 1861, Nos. 5,055 and 5,203.)

1. Ordered that the above correspondence be submitted for the orders of Government.

2 In the first of these letters Mr. Cadell reported that Durmaroya Mudali who was ppointed to the District on 11th January last, in view to his holding charge of the Manargudi nd Patenkotai Táluqs, had so conducted himself towards the Tahsíldár of Manargudi by quabbling with him, interfering with his work, and tyrannising over him in such a way as to legrade him almost to the position of a menial servant, that the Tahsíldár found himself unable o carry on his duties, and Mr. Cadell deemed it is duty "to relieve the Deputy Collector from is charge" till he could receive the orders of the Board.

He further states that, as Deputy Magistrate, Durmaroya Mudali has not afforded any ssistance, and that "neither his temper nor the reputation he has gained render it desirable that he should continue to hold office in the District."

He remarks on a pecuniary transaction between the Deputy Collector and the Tanjore ahsíldár in which he considers that "the conduct of the Deputy Collector does not appear in a very favorable light."

He also "sees reason to believe" that the Deputy Collector has spread rumours, injurious the character of the Tanjore Tahsíldár, in connection with the Tanjore Palace robbery, and hat he (Mr. Cadell) having told the Tahsíldár that he must clear his character from these spersions, the latter is about to bring an action against the Deputy Collector for defamation f character.

He concludes by recommending that Durmaroya Mudali be removed to another District.

3. Durmaroya Mudali in his letters to the Board included in the above papers, states that is zealous and close scrutiny into many irregularities, had provoked the hostility of the áluq and Húzur officials, who had combined to expose him to many undeserved checks from e Collector, whose mind they had biassed against him by misrepresentations of all that he id. He explains that the pecuniary transaction between himself and the Tanjore Tahsíldár as perfectly "bona fide" and above board on his side, and consisted solely in his entrusting, d eventually assigning over to the Tahsíldár who was not his subordinate and volunteered s services in the matter, a Promissory Note for Rupees 450, which he (Durmaroya Mudali) had ceived for the sale of a house from a merchant of Nursapatam in the Godavery District, and hich from not being personally acquainted with any of the Negapatam merchants he had not therto had an opportunity of getting cashed. The charge of obtaining through this Tahsíldár pplies for which he did not pay, he states to be an exaggerated misrepresentation of facts.

4. The Board see no reason to believe that Durmaroya Mudali has in any way acted shonestly in either of these matters, but they are of opinion that he should not have allowed e Tanjore Tahsíldár to have anything to do with the cashing of the Promissory Note, and at he should be required to receive it back, and to at once restore the money, Rupees 300, ich according to his own account he has received from or through the Tahsíldár in part uidation of it.

5. As regards the Deputy Collector's conduct of business in his charge, the Board see ason to think that his zeal probably exceeded his discretion, but they are not satisfied that r. Cadell was justified in removing him from his charge in the manner that he did. There s no such urgency in the matter as to preclude a reference to the Board or to Government, d the Collector did not act in the manner necessary to assert for the class of Deputy Collectors at position which the Government intends that they should occupy.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, *5th October* 1861.

6. But there is much in the Deputy Collector's letters which the Board consider altogether insubordinate and reprehensible. He seems inflated with an idea of his own importance, and not knowing how to obey, is unfit to control others. He appears to be ignorant of the line between freedom of speech and disrespect, and in some of his allusions to the Collector manifests much of this latter quality. He may very possibly have been actuated in many of his proceedings by a somewhat indiscreet and excessive zeal, but he shows himself wanting in tact and judgment, and has yet to learn, that reform of what needs reform, is hindered rather than advanced by acts tending to rouse the active hostility of all opposed to him.

7. The Board consider his further retention in the Tanjore District to be desirable neither for himself nor yet for the public service, and recommend his removal to another District with such admonition as may awaken him to a sense of the impropriety of his conduct in relation to his superior the Collector.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed.) W. HUDLESTON, *Secretary.*

No. 71. ORDER THEREON, 5th October 1861, No. 1,927.

1. The Government concur generally in the view taken by the Board of Revenue of Durmaroya Mudali's conduct, and resolve to remove him from his present appointment in the Tanjore District. This order will take effect from the date on which it reaches Durmaroya Mudali.

2. Durmaroya Mudali will be informed that the Governor in Council regards with displeasure his behaviour both in reference to the affair of the bond, and in writing as he did regarding the Collector. Claiming to be so eager a reformer of abuses he ought to have strictly adhered to the salutary rule of Government, and abstained from any pecuniary transactions with the public servants of the District. His conduct on this point is viewed very unfavorably by the Government. He will arrange for the settlement of the bond matter in the manner pointed out in paragraph 4 of the Board's Proceedings.

3. The Board will intimate to the Collector that he ought to have addressed them, instead of removing suddenly an officer of this class when there was not an urgent necessity for so doing.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

IN CONS. 2ND AUGUST 1861, No. 4,835.

From W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of TANJORE,

dated 29th July 1861, No. —.

It is with much regret that I am compelled to bring to the notice of the Board the following circumstances relative to the conduct of the Deputy Collector Durmaroya Moodelly.

2. As the Board are aware, Durmaroya Moodelly joined the district early in March with a view to holding charge of the late Special Assistant's duties, viz., the Revenue and Magisterial administration of the Manargudy and Pattukotai Taluqs. As I have already informed the Board, I did not, however, give him revenue charge of the latter taluq, as I was anxious to make myself acquainted with the taluq, and intended to make the settlement thereof in person for the Fasli lately closed.

3. Durmaroya Moodelly accordingly proceeded to Manargudy, but before going I took occasion to impress upon him the importance of treating his subordinates, and especially his Tahsildars, with respect and consideration, and that the Government, in raising the pay and status of the Tahsildars in the recent arrangements, were most anxious that they should be made to feel the importance and responsibility of the post they are called on to fill. As the Deputy Collector was also perfectly new to the district, and his charge, I recommended him to employ himself in making a tour of his taluqs and of becoming acquainted with the people who were placed under his charge; I regret, however, to say that my wishes have been unheeded, and with the exception of a few short excursions in the neighbourhood of Manargudy, for the purpose of checking supposed extra cultivation, Durmaroya Moodelly has remained at Manargudy itself for nearly five months, during the greater part of which time he has been constantly engaged in petty squabbling with the Tahsildar interfering with the latter in his work and tyrannising over him in such a way as to degrade him almost to the position of a menial servant. As instances of this I may mention orders for bidding the Tahsildar to quit his Cusbah without leave, interfering with the Tahsildar's examinations, constant calls for the attendance, at his Cutcherry, of the Tahsildar's subordinate, and in short, treating him with every possible indignity. The consequence is that the Tahsildar finds himself unable to carry on his duties, and things have at last come to such a pass without any hope of improvement, that, when passing through Nidamungalum on the 23rd instant, I deemed it my duty to relieve the Deputy Collector from his charge, till I received the orders of the Board. I regret also to add that in the discharge of his Magisterial duties, I have not derived any assistance from the appointment of Durmaroya Moodelly being entirely new to his duties. I was fully prepared to make every allowance and consideration for any little shortcomings, but after an experience of new nearly five months, I am compelled to state that neither his temper, nor the reputation he has gained, render it desirable that he should continue to hold office in this district.

4. Besides what I have stated above, I deem it also right to bring to the notice of the Board a pecuniary transaction which has taken place between the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar of Tanjore and in which I conceive that the conduct of the Deputy Collector does not appear in a very favorable light. I enclose the written statements of both these officers, and from the tenor of which, I think the Board will agree with me in thinking it is impossible both these officers can remain in the same district with advantage to the public service. I was most unwilling to bring this matter forward in the hope that it might be amicably adjusted and without the discredit of its being made public. I sent, therefore, purposely for both these officers at Nidamungalum on the 22nd instant, and urged the Deputy Collector to take back his bond and the transfer thereof made to the Tahsildar, and also advised him to repay to the latter all that he had received from him. The Deputy Collector, however, appeared unwilling to adopt this course, and I have, therefore, no alternative but to bring the matter to the notice of the Board.

5. I may add that the Deputy Collector admits having received from the Tahsildar, articles to the value of Rupees 50 when he first came to Tanjore and for which he has never paid. The Deputy Collector also states that in June, he received from the Tahsildar Rupees 200 in part payment of the bond transferred to the Tahsildar. This, however, the Tahsildar most positively denies, and I am inclined to believe the latter's story, for, previous to the time this payment is alleged to have been made, the bond was already in my hands, and the Tahsildar had already brought the circumstances to my notice, alleging that the document was not negotiable, and, therefore, worthless.

6. I should also further mention for the information of the Board, that since this transaction took place between these officers, there is much reason to believe that the Deputy Collector has been industriously spreading reports that the Tahsildar of Tanjore was concerned in the robbery in the Tanjore palace, and search has already been made in the houses of some of the Tahsildar's relatives or supposed dependants, and I have told the Tahsildar that it is for him to clear his character from such aspersions. He is accordingly about to bring a suit against the Deputy Collector for defamation.

7. From the circumstances now brought to notice, I submit for the consideration of the Board that it is impossible both these officers can remain in the same district, with regard to the interests and respectability of the public service, and I would take leave to recommend that the services of Deputy Collector Durmaroya Moodelly be otherwise availed of.

ENC. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Copy of Deputy Collector Durmaroya Moodelly's explanation.

ENC. 2.

ABSTRACT.—Copy of Tanjore Tahsildar's explanation.

Exd. J. Wright

1861. Depart.

Enclosure 1 in Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Govt. R. D. dated 17th August 1861. — No. 4628.

Enc 2

Rec 24/26/61

Letter from the Collector of Tanjore to the Board of Revenue dated 29th July 1861. reporting on the conduct of Durmaroya Mudali Deputy Collector —

5th Octr/61

O 1927

13 70-71

In Cons. 10th August 1861, No. 5,055.

From W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of TANJORE,
dated Vellum, 6th August 1861, No. 237.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Extract from the Proceedings of the Board under date the 31st ultimo, No. 4,122, and, as therein directed, beg herewith to re-submit the letter of the Deputy Collector Durmaroya Moodelly, of the 26th idem.

2. I have already, in my letter of the 29th July last, stated the reasons by which I was actuated in relieving Durmaroya Moodelly from his charge, and with the permission of the Board, I will now proceed to offer a few remarks on some of the statements made in the Deputy Collector's letter.

Paragraph 2. 3. The Deputy Collector complains of irregularities under the head of "Remissions." I would observe that the remissions given in the Fasli just closed are considerably less than in previous years, and have been carefully scrutinized in this office. The Deputy Collector was inclined to give remissions in some cases, where I conceive they were not required or warranted, and as regards irregularities, I may observe that since taking charge of the Deputy Collector's office, I have already found one order on record directing the suspension of a remission claimed, but which I had ordered to be collected. As regards extra cultivation and which has not been brought to account such no doubt exists, and I should have been indeed glad if the Deputy Collector had confined his attention and energies to the examination and discovery of such lands; examinations have been made under his orders to a certain extent, but I am not at present prepared to state whether the extent of cultivation has been correctly ascertained or not, and no doubt the accuracy of the measurements will be disputed.

Paragraph 3. Income Tax Irregularities.—4. The Deputy Collector has had nothing whatever to do with the Income tax, nor has he ever been sworn under the Act; the irregularities complained of have never been brought to my notice.

Paragraph 4. Embezzlement.—5. This case is now under examination, and has been fully reported on by the Tahsildar. The latter officer has by no means been wanting in sifting the case, although the Deputy Collector threw every hindrance he could in his way.

Paragraphs 5 and 6. 6. The malpractices spoken of here were of the most trivial nature, and were not even complained of. The Deputy Collector was informed to make every inquiry into any complaint of the kind which might be brought before him, but that it was not his duty to appear as prosecutor or instigator in such matters.

7. I presume the Board will deem it unnecessary for me to remark on the report of an alleged conversation, as I have already said I was anxious that the matter of the bond given to the Tanjore Tahsildar might be cleared up, and I gave the Deputy Collector the opportunity of retracing his steps and taking back the bond. This, as the Board have already been informed, the Deputy Collector declined to do, and with reference to the report of the alleged conversation in paragraph 12 as to the articles received from the Tanjore Tahsildar, I have no hesitation in stating that this part of the story is deliberately and wilfully false. I most distinctly recollect that what Durmaroya Moodelly stated at the time was that he had *not* paid the Tahsildar, because the latter had not sent in his account.

8. In conclusion, I may add that there is some reason to believe that the transaction above referred to is not the only one of a pecuniary nature in which Durmaroya Moodelly has been concerned during the short time he has been in the district, but venture to think that what has now been brought to notice will suffice to show that Deputy Collector Durmaroya Moodelly should not be permitted longer to hold office in Tanjore.

9. I take this opportunity also of forwarding, for the information of the Board, a further explanation received from the Tahsildar of Tanjore, together with the bond itself and the transfer thereof made by Durmaroya Moodelly to the Tahsildar.

Enc. 1.—Tahsildar's explanation.

Enc. 2.—Teloogoo documents.

Encs. 4 to 6.—*Vide* in No. 4,743 of 1861.

Exd. J. Wright.

1861 Depart

Enclosure 2 in Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Govt Ro. D. dated 17th Aug 1861 No. 4628 -
Encl. 3 -

Rev 2126/61

Letter from the Collector of Tanjore to the Board of Revenue dated 6th August 1861 No. 237 reporting on the conduct of Durmaroya Moodelli Deputy Collector -

R 5th Octr 61
C 1927
18 Oct 61

IN CONS. 16TH AUGUST 1861, No. 5,203.

From W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of TANJORE,
dated Vallum, 13th August 1861, No. 242.

At the request of Durmaroya Moodelly, 3rd Class Deputy Collector, I have the honor to forward the enclosed copies of correspondence which have passed between him and myself.

2. I presume the Board will not expect that I should enter into any explanation regarding this correspondence. I would only take permission to make one remark with reference to the letter, No. 47, regarding my having called upon the Tahsildar to state the amount of fines paid into the Treasury. One of the Jawabnevisses belonging to this office, but temporarily attached to the Deputy Collector, had complained to me that, in a very short time, he was fined no less than 13 times, and the fines not having been imposed in the regular way, viz., by deduction from salary at the Treasury department, I was unable to ascertain in what way the fines were levied and whether they were brought to account. I therefore directed the Tahsildar to send up a list of all fines paid into the Treasury, and requested the Deputy Collector at the same time to send up his office book of fines. With this latter request the Deputy Collector has never complied, but I have the strongest reasons for knowing that, in the case of the Jawabneviss above referred to, he was fined as often as stated, though the fines were nearly as often remitted, and in only two instances were they brought to account.

ENCS. 12.—*Vide* in No. 4,891 of 1861.

The Governor concurs in the course proposed to be adopted towards Dunnaraya Moodelly - He leaves it to the Member of Govt to make the necessary arrangements both for transferring him elsewhere

---

1861. Decr 4th

Enclosure 3 in Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Govt R. D. dated 17th Augt 1861 No 4628-

Rev 2126/61

Letter from the Collector of Tanjore to the Board of Revenue dated 13th August 1861 No 212 reporting on the conduct of Dunnaraya Mudali Deputy Collector

P. 5th Octr /61

C 1927

B 70-71

and supplying his place at Tanjore

JP

28/9/61

J. D. Sim Esq.

These Proceedings relate to a disagreement which has taken place in Tanjore between the Collector and his Deputy Durmaroya Mudali, x which has resulted in the latter being "relieved" of his duties by Mr Cadell, who has further recommended Durmaroya's removal to another District.

Durmaroya Mudali joined the district early in March last, and was placed in charge of the Mannargudi Taluq, where he remained during the five months preceding the date (23 July) on which the Collector took the step already referred to.

From the Collector's letter of the 29 July No. it appears that instead of following Mr Cadell's directions and making a tour through his district, the Deputy Collector remained at Mannargudi, where he tyrannized over, and squabbled with, the Tahsildar to such an extent as to prevent the latter officer from carrying on his duties. Mr Cadell also complains that his Deputy has afforded him no assistance in his magisterial duties.

The details of a pecuniary transaction between the Deputy and the Tanjore Tahsildar are also brought to notice. In the Collector's opinion they do not shew Durmaroya Mudali's conduct in a favorable light.

The Tanjore Tahsildar's account is that in April on occasion of a visit paid by him to Mannargudi, the Deputy Collector gave into his hands a bond passed to him (Darmarozu Mudali) for Rs 450 by an inhabitant of Coringa in the Godavery District, the amount of which the Deputy Collector wished to recover by transferring it to some merchant at Negapatam who might have dealings at Coringa. As the Deputy Collector stated that he was unacquainted with any body at Negapatam the Tahsildar undertook to do what he could, and in the mean time lent him 100 Rs. for present expenses. The Tahsildar then made enquiries at Negapatam and found (apparently) that no one wd advance any money on the bond as it was understood that the man in Coringa who had given it, was in bad circumstances. In the mean time the Deputy Collector had drawn up a deed on unstamped paper, making over to the Tahsildar the amount of the bond in question, & this deed he sent to the Tahsildar with a request that the balance, after deducting the sum already lent, might be remitted to him. The Tahsildar declined this offer, & proposed to restore the bond on receipt of the amount lent, and also 50 Rs expended on articles purchased by him for the Deputy Collector, when the latter first arrived in the District. The Deputy Collector (apparently) refused to listen to this arrangement, and the Tahsildar therefore declared that he wd sue him in the Courts.

x dated 19 June /61

Darmaroza Mudali's x account is that on the 6 April the Tanjore Tahsildar voluntarily offered to get the bond cashed; that on the 27th idem a dependant of the Tahsildar brought him 100 Rs, stated to have been sent thro' the Tahsildar by a merchant at Negapatam who declined to make further payment unless a transfer document was given him. The Deputy Collector, not knowing who the merchant was, made out the transfer in the Tahsildar's name. On the 18th June following 200 Rs were brought by the same man from the Negapatam merchant; leaving 150 Rs still due on the bond. The Deputy Collector denies having borrowed any sum from the Tahsildar. He offers to prove his statement by documentary evidence, and expresses his desire to prosecute for damages the person from whom the Collector received his information, as soon as he learns his name.

x d/ 26 July /61.

In a further x statement the Tahsildar reiterates his former ~~statement~~ story: he denies having sent 200 Rs on the 18th June, giving as a reason in support of the improbability of his having done so, that prior to that date he had brought the circumstance to the Collector's notice: and Mr Cadell himself says that the Tahsildar had, previous to the time when this payment was alleged to have been made, delivered the bond into his hands, alleging that the document was not negotiable. The Tahsildar put forward x a letter dated 12 June to shew that the Deputy Collector

para 5. letter of 29 July

x Inst. sent up

had asked *him* to cash the bond, and that *he* had not made the first offer. That the 100 Rs advanced by him to the Deputy Collector in April was as a loan, and not in part liquidation, was to be inferred also from the same letter of June 12, in which the Deputy Collector claimed the *whole* amount of the bond, without referring to any portion of its value having been received. The Tahsildar also proposes that the man who is said to have brought the Rupees sh^d also be examined. (From a marginal note by the Collector it seems that this man had been sent for but was not then - July 26 - forthcoming.) The Tahsildar also refers to a memo. which the Deputy Collector had produced as given by Venkatasami Naick, (the person who is said to have brought the 200 Rs. on 18 June) the purport of which was that the bond had been cashed at Vizagapatam, and that the remaining 150 Rs w^d be remitted immediately on its receipt from the merchant. This memo (or deposition?) was in the handwriting of the Deputy Collector's Javabnavis, and (the Collector notes marginally) "of a very suspicious nature". The Tahsildar points out the improbability of ~~the~~ any merchant having sent any money when the bond was all the time in his (Tahsildar's) hands—

& by the Tahsildar?

The Deputy Collector in his letter to the Board of Revenue of 26 July /61 states that the Tahsildar having been informed that he (Deputy Collector) had made some remark to the Superintendent of Police which w^d connect the Tahsildar's visit to Manargudi with the great Tanjore Robbery, had out of revenge fabricated this story about the bond. The Board (para 4 of their Proceedings) see no reason to believe that Durmaroya Mudali has in any way acted dishonestly. but they think that he sh^d be required to receive back the Promissory note, & to restore the 300 Rs which according to his own account he has rec^d from or through the Tahsildar in part liquidation of it.

Orders are requested on this point. or whether it w^d not be the best course to leave it to them to fight out. No thorough examination into the case has been made. Is any further notice to be taken of it? It will be observed that in para 7 of his letter of 6 August 1861. No. 237 - the Collector charges his Deputy with having "deliberately & wilfully" made a false statement in his (Deputy Collector's) letter of 26 July - to the Board - regarding certain articles supplied by the Tanjore Tahsildar. & w^h were referred to in this dispute—

The foregoing transaction no doubt operated unfavorably to the Deputy Collector in Mr Cadell's mind, but the ostensible cause for "relieving" him from his charge was his behaviour to the Tahsildar of Manargudi; no detailed statement of the style of behaviour is given beyond the following - "he has been constantly engaged in petty squabbling with the Tahsildar interfering with the latter in his work, & tyrannising over him in such a way as to degrade him almost to the position of a menial servant. As instances of this I may mention orders forbidding the Tahsildar to quit his Cusbah without leave, interfering with the Tahsildar's examinations, constant calls for the attendance, at his Cutcherry, of the Tahsildar's subordinates, & in short, treating him with every possible indignity."

Para 2. letter of 29 July.

Durmaroya Mudali's two letters of the 26 July and 31 July contain what he has to say on the subject. In the first he recites that he had experienced much opposition from the Collector in bringing to his notice abuses connected with Remissions - concealed cultivation - Income Tax - Embezzlement in the Taluq Treasury and illegal collections: i.e. the Collector instead of supporting, snubbed him for his pains: that about this time having found it necessary to apply for a month's leave to Madras, the Collector, thinking that he (the Deputy Collector) was about to bring his grievance in person before the Board of Revenue, determined to injure him "in any manner" and therefore sent for the Tanjore Tahsildar to bring a ~~[illegible]~~ charge against him regarding the bond: that in an interview with the Collector which he had applied for in order to bring to notice all the irregularities which had been going on in Manargudi Taluq, the Collector took occasion to bring the subject forward, and in conversation (the details of wh. are given, and in which the Collector is made to speak in the most insulting manner) accused him of (the) various offences (which have since been reported to & by the Board). The result of the conversation being that the Collector got up in a rage at his Deputy objecting to be abused in the presence of the Manargudi Tahsildar, and immediately relieved him of his duties.

The first portion of this letter is commented upon in the Collector's letter of 6 August. No. 237. viz - as regards the irregularities and malpractices in the suppression of which the Deputy Collector stated that he had met with such opposition from Mr Cadell. Some are shewn to be exaggerated: some trivial: & in the examination into others the Deputy Collector's interference did more harm than good.

Mr Cadell, does not think it

necessary to go into the report of the alleged conversation beyond saying that his Deputy told a falsehood on one point.

4/31 July/61 In his second letter the Deputy Collector details in order of date, as apparent from the records of his office, the circumstances which shew the Collector's attitude towards him from the commencement viz- from April 1861- or soon after he joined the District. These were briefly as follow. Annulling by the Collector of certain of his orders to the Tahsildar relating to entry of leaves to Taluq subordinates: employment of batta peons: transmission of daily copy of Magisterial Proceedings- Interference with his magisterial decisions without any apparent cause- Refusal of the Collector to allow him an interview: Inattention of the Collector to certain important information on the Tahsildar's improper recommendation for the grant of remissions- Delay in replying to certain propositions for the discovery of concealed cultivation: in replying to application for certain orders of the Board: ~~in~~ leaving without reply a report on a money irregularity: ~~in~~ taking away a gomastah when he was very much wanted by the Deputy Collector: ~~in~~ neglecting to send copy of Foujdaree Adawlut orders- also stationery- calling on the Tahsildar to furnish certain information about fines levied by the Deputy. Delaying the transmission of his salary & batta bills- Sending orders direct to the Tahsildar on subjects under enquiry

in the Deputy's Office. Dorasawmy a Mudali however acknowledges that a great deal of the underhand opposition which he met with, was the work of the Huzur officials and was unknown to Mr Cadell.

Para 5 of the Proceedings

The Board of Revenue do not think that Mr Cadell was justified in removing the Deputy Collector in the summary manner that he did. There was no such urgency as to preclude a reference to the Bd or of Govt.

For orders

As to the Deputy Collector's conduct of business, they think that his zeal probably exceeded his discretion. also that he has shewn himself wanting in tact and judgement, & that he has yet to learn that reform of what needs reform is hindered rather than advanced by acts tending to rouse the active hostility of all opposed to him. Much of his language they consider "insubordinate and reprehensible".

For orders

They finally recommend his transfer to another District. with "such admonition as may awake "him to a sense of the impropriety "of his conduct"

The Collector recommended his transfer because the ~~[illegible]~~ interes of the public service demanded that the public servants in the same district should not be continually fighting with one another. And also the language which Durmaroya Mudali has allowed himself to use regarding Mr Cadell it is plainly impossible that he can remain in Tanjore.

Orders are requested as to the nature of the admonition (if any) which is to be administered to Durmaroya Mudali.

I agree with the [illegible]

Sep 17/61

(6)

Memo for orders

Deputy Collector Durmaroya Mudali's case

[illegible] the history of this case

previous cases

WM

– I concur in the Board's views & think that orders should be drafted accordingly – 1 – Durmaroya M. must be removed to another district – 2 He must be reprimanded both for the affair of the Bond & his style of ~~writing~~ regarding the Collector. 3 – He should be required to settle the Bond matter according to P 4 of the Bd's Pro. – I presume he will lose salary either wholly or in part till he joins his new Office, & this loss will justly fall on him for his errors – Claiming to be so eager a reformer of abuses he ought to have strictly adhered to the salutary order of Govt & abstained from any pecuniary transactions with the public servants of the district – I cannot but view his conduct on this point very unfavorably – Mr Cadell should be told that he ought to have addressed the Board instead of removing suddenly an Officer of this Class when there was not urgent necessity – I hope the Depy Collrs will be employed chiefly in looking after the Treasuries, Salt, Customs &c – I always thought it better policy to raise the salary & status of the Tahsildar, than to place between him & the Collector another Officer not more experienced nor carrying more influence & respect. – Here the evil of the new system appears & it is not likely to be a solitary instance

EM

13 Sep 20

R D

No 1927

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 8th October 1861

Read the following
Lr of the Board of Revenue –

Submitting with remarks certain letters from the Collr of Tanjore, reporting on the conduct of Durmaroya Mudali, Dy Collr.

(Here enter 17 Augt/61 No 4628)

The Government concur generally in the view taken by the Board of Revenue of Durmaroya Mudali's conduct, ~~1st~~ & resolve to remove him ~~to another District~~ from his present appointment in the Tanjore District. This order will take effect from the date on which it reaches Durmaroya Mudali.–

WM

EM

2 Durmaroya Mudali will be informed that the Governor in Council regards with displeasure his behaviour both in reference

to the affair of the bon
and in writing as he
did regarding the Collr.
Claiming to be so eag
a reformer of abuses
he ought to have strictly
adhered to the saluta
rule of Govt., and ab
stained from any pe
-cuniary transactions
with the public ser
-vants of the District.
His conduct on this
point is viewed very
unfavorably by the
Government.

He will arra
for the settlement of
the Bond matter
the manner pointed
out in para 6 of the
Boards' Proceedings.

#8. — ~~He will cease~~
~~draw half salary~~
~~from the date~~
~~he~~

~~duty by the Collector~~
~~until he joined his new~~
~~appointment. This~~
~~loss properly falls~~
~~upon him on account~~
~~of his own.~~ —

#3. — The Board will
intimate to the Collr.
that he ought to have
addressed them, instead
of removing evidently
an officer of this class
when there was not
an urgent necessity
for so doing. —

CJM

14 Copies - Board of Revenue
3 " Civil Paymaster.

Dispd. 519 Enclosures returned to the Bo the 24/10/61

Respecting D^y. Coll^r.
Durmaroya Mudali

Revenue 1861 Depart^t.
Pro. of Gov^t. for October

N^o. 1927

Pro: of the Madras Gov^t.
D/ 5^th October 1861.

From the Off^g Civil Paymaster d/ 6^th.
December 1861. C. No. 2902

Pro. of the B^d. of Rev d/ 8^th Jany 63
C^t N^o. 9.5 30 Jany 63 N^o 207

Council

Removing Durmaroya
Mudali, D^y Collector, from his
present appointment in the
Tanjore District.

[illegible]

N^o. 70 + 71.