

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1928	<u>Press</u> <u>Mis.</u>
72-73	
Dated 57-10-1861.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

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

No. 72. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 25th September 1861, No. 5,174:—

Read the following letter from W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated Vellum, 17th September 1861, No. 304.

SIR,

1. I have had the honor, on the 8th instant, to receive the Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, under date the 17th August, No. 4,628. In these Proceedings (paragraph 5) the Board state that while approving of the recommendation I had deemed it my duty to make in the matter of the removal of Deputy Collector Durmaroya Mudali, "they are not satisfied that I was justified in removing him from his charge in the manner I did." The Board further add that "there was no such urgency in the matter as to preclude a reference to the Board or Government, and that I did not act in the manner necessary to assert for the class of Deputy Collectors that position which the Government intends that they should occupy." With much deference to the opinion of the Board, I beg respectfully to submit for their consideration a few out of many instances that might be selected of the Deputy Collector's acts, and I venture to hope both the Board and Government will concur with me in thinking that I could not, in justice to the public service, do otherwise than I did. The Board will please be good enough to bear in mind that it was not till after repeated warnings and remonstrances on my part that I felt compelled to take this step.

2. In the Tálúq of Pattukotai the Deputy Collector had, in lieu of one of his own Gumáshtas, called up the services of an Assistant Royasum, and this individual having been, at the time of settlement, suspected of having been concerned in giving in false accounts of cultivation, was requested (by Arzi in the usual manner) to be sent up for examination. Instead of doing this, the Deputy Collector ordered the Tahsildár to send up to him a List of questions to be put to the party in his presence, and which was accordingly done. The matter having, however, been brought to my notice in person by the Tahsildár, I requested the Deputy Collector, by Yadast, to send up the man for personal examination. This communication was sent on the 15th May, and after its receipt, and though the requisition came from myself, the Deputy Collector wrote again to the Tahsildár as to whether the attendance of the individual could not be dispensed with. Finally, however, the man was sent up, but not till about three weeks after the receipt of my Yadast, and the only reason given for his long retention was that he was engaged in examining extra cultivation. The Board will observe that it was the concealment of extra cultivation in his own Tálúq with which the man himself was charged.

3. *Second.* In the village of Sillapillayan Kottogum, two large Mirasdárs applied for remission to the extent of Rupees 73 on account of withered crops; they were men of considerable wealth and substance; and on investigation and inquiry of the circumstances of the case, the remission was refused. The amount was accordingly ordered to be collected, and orders to that effect sent on the 12th June 1861, the decision arrived at being also communicated to the Deputy Collector. Notwithstanding this, and in direct defiance of my order, the Deputy Collector issued an order to the Tahsildár, on the 15th July, directing that the amount should not be collected till he (the Deputy Collector) had passed his decision thereon.

4. *Third.* In the case of the Alagirja Nathan Pagoda, and in which one of two brothers was the Trustee, one of these having died and leaving a widow, the Deputy Collector directed the widow to be made co-Punchayet and to enjoy half of the Pagoda property on the strength of an alleged agreement made between the brothers when both were alive.

5. *Fourth.* In a case in which the amount of waram payable to the cultivator was disputed, the Deputy Collector took it upon himself to determine what the rate should be, and the decision at which he arrived was founded simply by striking an average of the contending claims.

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

6. Instances like these might easily be multiplied, but if the Board have still any further doubt of the propriety of the measure I took, I would beg to refer them to the opinions of both the present and late Acting Session Judges of Combaconum, and their proceedings as recorded on the Deputy Collector's decisions.

7. From what I have now brought to the notice of the Board, I trust they will acquit me of having acted hastily or unadvisedly in the matter. I was most anxious that the Deputy Collector should have every chance of learning his duty, and of maintaining the position of the office in which Government had placed him; but as all my efforts proved ineffectual, I did not deem it to be my duty to retain him in independent charge.

8. I would take also this opportunity of suggesting for the consideration of the Board, whether it would not be advisable that when Deputy Collectors are placed in independent charge, such as that of the late Special Assistant, they should be required to pass the same examination required of Covenanted Assistants (except of course that in the Vernaculars), and to be precisely under the same rules and restrictions. It seems to me that some precaution of this nature is necessary, and at all events it would have the advantage of guarding against the recurrence of parties being placed in independent charge till such time as they showed themselves qualified for it by a course of training under the Collector, and as is required of Covenanted Assistants.

1. Ordered to be submitted for the information of Government, in continuation of the Board's Proceedings, dated 26th August 1861, No. 4,628.

2. The instances cited by the Collector go to support his opinion of Durmaroya Mudali's want of discretion and insubordination, but it still does not appear to the Board that the urgency of the case was such as to have precluded a reference to them or to Government before the Collector deprived the Deputy Collector of the charge to which he had been appointed by Government. The Collector's suggestion for the Departmental test being made applicable to Deputy Collectors appears to the Board worthy of adoption.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Secretary.*

No. 73.

ORDER THEREON, 5th October 1861, No. 1,928.

1. The Government concur with the Board.
2. The advantage of having a Departmental test for Deputy Collectors will be separately considered.

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

No. 5,174.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 25th September 1861.

Read the following letter from W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated Vellum, 17th September 1861, No. 304:—

1. I have had the honor, on the 8th instant, to receive the Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, under date the 17th August, No. 4,628. In these Proceedings (paragraph 5) the Board state that while approving of the recommendation I had deemed it my duty to make in the matter of the removal of Deputy Collector Durmaroya Mudali, "they are not satisfied that I was justified in removing him from his charge in the manner I did." The Board further add that "there was no such urgency in the matter as to preclude a reference to the Board or Government, and that I did not act in the manner necessary to assert for the class of Deputy Collectors that position which the Government intends that they should occupy." With much deference to the opinion of the Board, I beg respectfully to submit for their consideration a few out of many instances that might be selected of the Deputy Collector's acts, and I venture to hope both the Board and Government will concur with me in thinking that I could not, in justice to the public service, do otherwise than I did. The Board will please be good enough to bear in mind that it was not till after repeated warnings and remonstrances on my part that I felt compelled to take this step.

2. In the Taluk of Pattukotai the Deputy Collector had, in lieu of one of his own Gumatshs, called up the services of an Assistant Royasum, and this individual having been, at the time of settlement, suspected of having been concerned in giving in false accounts of cultivation, was requested (by Arzi in the usual manner) to be sent up for examination. Instead of doing this, the Deputy Collector ordered the Tahsildar to send up to him a List of questions to be put to the party in his presence, and which was accordingly done. The matter having, however, been brought to my notice in person by the Tahsildar, I requested the Deputy Collector, by Yadast, to send up the man for personal examination. This communication was sent on the 15th May, and after its receipt, and though the requisition came from myself, the Deputy Collector wrote again to the Tahsildar as to whether the attendance of the individual could not be dispensed with. Finally, however, the man was sent up, but not till about three weeks after the receipt of my Yadast, and the only reason given for his long retention was that he was engaged in examining extra cultivation. The Board will observe that it was the concealment of extra cultivation in his own Taluk with which the man himself was charged.

3. *Second.* In the village of Sillapillayan Kottogum, two large Mirassdars applied for remission to the extent of Rupees 73 on account of withered crops; they were men of considerable wealth and substance; and on investigation and inquiry of the circumstances of the case, the remission was refused. The amount was accordingly ordered to be collected, and orders to that effect sent on the 12th June 1861, the decision arrived at being also communicated to the Deputy Collector. Notwithstanding this, and in direct defiance of my order, the Deputy Collector issued an order to the Tahsildar, on the 15th July, directing that the amount should not be collected till he (the Deputy Collector) had passed his decision therein.

4. *Third.* In the case of the Alagirja Nathan Pagoda, and in which one of two brothers was the Trustee, one of these having died and leaving a widow, the Deputy Collector directed the widow to be made co-Punchayet and to enjoy half of the Pagoda property on the strength of an alleged agreement made between the brothers when both were alive.

5. *Fourth.* In a case in which the amount of waram payable to the cultivator was disputed, the Deputy Collector took it upon himself to determine what the rate should be, and the decision at which he arrived was founded simply by striking an average of the contending claims.

6. Instances like these might easily be multiplied, but if the Board have still any further doubt of the propriety of the measure I took, I would beg to refer them to the opinions of both the present and late Acting Sessions Judge of Combaconum, and their proceedings as recorded on the Deputy Collector's decisions.

7. From what I have now brought to the notice of the Board, I trust they will acquit me of having acted hastily or unadvisedly in the matter. I was most anxious that the Deputy Collector should have every chance of learning his duty, and of maintaining the position of the office in which Government had placed him; but as all my efforts proved ineffectual, I did not deem it to be my duty to retain him in independent charge.

8. I would take also this opportunity of suggesting for the consideration of the Board, whether it would not be advisable that when Deputy Collectors are placed in independent charge, such as that of the late Special Assistant, they should be required to pass the same examination required of Covenanted Assistants (except of course that in the vernaculars) and to be precisely under the same rules and restrictions. It seems to me that some precaution of this nature is necessary, and at all events it would have the advantage of guarding against the recurrence of parties being placed in independent charge till such time as they showed themselves qualified for it by a course of training under the Collector, and as is required of Covenanted Assistants.

1. Ordered to be submitted for the information of Government, in continuation of the Board's Proceedings, dated 26th August 1861, No. 4,628.

2. The instances cited by the Collector go to support his opinion of Durmaroya Mudali's want of discretion and insubordination, but it still does not appear to the Board that the urgency of the case was such as to have precluded a reference to them or to Government before the Collector deprived the Deputy Collector of the charge to which he had been appointed by Government. The Collector's suggestion for the departmental test being made applicable to Deputy Collectors appears to the Board worthy of adoption.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

[Signature]

Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.

Copy to W. M. Cadell, Esq., Collector of Tanjore.

Exd. J. Wright

Submitting a letter from the Collector of Tanjore explanatory of the grounds upon which he removed Deputy Collector Durmaroya Mudali from the charge of the Manargudi and Patenkotai Taluks pending the orders of the Board.

No. 5,174.

Dated 25th September 1861.
Despatched 1 Oct 61
Received 2 Oct 61

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE,

No. 2352

1861 Department.

Office of Govt for Collector.