M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 891	Press ~~Mis.~~
340-341	
Dated 19—4—1861.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 19th April 1861.

No. 340. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th April 1861, No. 1,739 :—

Read Proceedings of Government, dated 20th March 1861, Revenue Department, No. 658.

(In Cons., 21st March 1861, No. 1,802.)

1. The Board have carefully considered the Statements contained in the letter of C. Rangá Chárlu to the Inám Commissioner, regarding the case treated of in the Board's Proceedings, dated 15th February last, No. 857, but see nothing in them to raise the least doubt of the correctness of the decision recorded in paragraph 14 of those Proceedings, of which also Government have approved.

2. The tenor of paragraph 3 of Mr. Taylor's letter to Government, and the tone of the latter part of Rangá Chárlu's letter to Mr. Taylor, are of such a character as to lead the Board to presume that Government do not intend them to touch upon Rangá Chárlu's personal defence; nor does it appear necessary that the Board should interfere in this part of the question, as the wrong has been redressed and Rangá Chárlu is no longer in the Revenue Department.

3. Passing over, therefore, Rangá chárlu's letter, the Board trust they may be permitted to draw the attention of Government to Mr. Taylor's remarks on their Proceedings of the 15th February last.

4. The Board in those Proceedings fully detailed the case at issue, and suggested to Government that Rangá Chárlu, of the Collector's Kacheri, "should be called upon to clear himself of the suspicion" which attached to his conduct in the matter. The Government not only approved of the Board's decision on the merits of the case, but called on Rangá Chárlu for any explanation he might wish to offer on the transaction in which his name was mixed up. The Board presume, therefore, that the Government also saw in the case matters which needed explanation. Mr. Taylor apparently overlooks this fact, and writes as if the Board had done Rangá Chárlu an injustice in procuring him an opportunity of exculpating himself.

5. Moreover, at the time when these circumstances occurred, Rangá Chárlu was not in the Inám Department at all; his subsequent promotion into that Department certainly cannot be held to render him unaccountable for acts done *previously* when he was a Revenue Subordinate. Lastly, the Board observe that Mr. Taylor's remarks were altogether uncalled for. The Government merely required him to obtain and submit Rangá Chárlu's explanation. No expression of his own opinion was sought. Mr. Taylor has nevertheless thought fit to pass strictures on the Board; to acquit Rangá Chárlu in anticipation of the verdict of Government, and to cast on the Board the unfounded imputation of holding Native Officers of all grades "capable of the meanest acts."

6. The Board regret thus to trespass on the time of Government; but Mr. Taylor's assumption of the power of censuring them leaves them no alternative.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

No. 341. ORDER THEREON, 19th April 1861, No. 891.

1. The Board have mistaken the intention of Government in the Order now replied to, in supposing that it was not desired that they should touch on Rangá Chárlu's personal conduct. The whole purport of the papers transmitted with that Order had reference to the imputations cast on Rangá Chárlu; and it was the intention of the Order that the Board should report their opinion thereon, after obtaining from the Collector, if they thought fit, the further explanation connected with the original case and the conduct of other parties in it, which was called for in their former Proceedings of February 5th.

2. It seems to Government quite necessary, both for the good of the public service and in justice to Rangá Chárlu, that the case, as respects him not less than as regards others should

be thoroughly sifted. The conduct of the present Sarishtadár of the Collector's Office, who was head Munshi under Mr. Elton, needs to be fully explained; and if Mr. Dykes has not yet replied to the Board's Order of February 15th on this and other points, it may be well to request him to expedite his proceedings.

3. The Government fully concur in the Board's observations in paragraphs 4 and 5. Mr. Taylor's remarks were out of place and unbecoming. His letter was sent to the Board by inadvertence; it ought to have been returned to him. He will now be informed that the Government strongly disapprove of his conduct in expressing his opinion on the Proceedings of the Board, and will be warned to be more cautious in his language for the future.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

Rev Dept

No 891

Proceedings of the Madras Government
under date the 19th April 1861

Read the following
Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue

Replying to Pro of Govt
d/20 March/60 No 638 relative
to the conduct of C Ramya
Chetty Special Agt to
the Indian Commissioner,
and calling attention to
Mr Taylor's remarks on the
Board's Proceedings of 5th
January last.

(Here enter 5th April/60 date 939)

The Board have
mistaken the intention
of Govt in the order
now replied to, in
supposing that it was
not desired that they
should touch on Ramy
gah Chetty's personal
conduct. The whole
purport of the papers
transmitted to the
Board with that order
had reference to the
imputations cast
on

on Rangachariar, and
it was the intention
of the order that the
Board should report
their opinion thereon,
after obtaining from
the Collector, if they
thought fit, the fur-
ther explanation
connected with the
original case and
the conduct of the
parties in it which
was called for in
their former Proc. of
February 5th.

2. It seems to Govt
quite necessary, both
for the good of the
Public service and
in justice to Ran-
gachariar, that the
case, as respects him
not less than as
regards others should
be thoroughly sifted.

The

The conduct of the present Deputy Collector of the Collector's Office who was Head Clerk under Mr Ellor, needs to be fully explained; and if Mr Dykes has not yet replied to the Board's order of February 15th on this and other points, it may be well to request him to expedite his Proceedings.

3. The Govt fully concur in the Board's observations ~~recommendations~~ in paras 4 and 5 - Mr Taylor's remarks were out of place and misleading. His letter was sent to the Board by inadvertence

it ought to have been returned to him - He will now be informed that the Govt. strongly disapproves of his conduct in expressing his opinion on the proceedings of the Board, and will be warned to be more cautious in his language for the future -

Conduct of C. Rungpahartá Special Apt to the Income Commissioners

Remarks
Let me see
Board's
Separate

13 Copies to Bd of Rev.

~~One Draft returned to Bd of Rev. 9/9/61.~~

Mr Ram Coar &
~~with Copy of Order~~ 2a

© 16 all 61 187

Rev Dept

No

Proceedings of the Madras Govt

Under date the

Read the following

Proc: of the Bd of Rev no

Replying to Proc: of Govt
of 20th March 1861 No 653 relative to
the conduct of C. Rungacharlu, Spe-
cial Asst to the Inam Commissioner
and calling attention to Mr Taylors re-
marks on the Bds Proc: of 15th Feby last

(Here enter 5th April 1861 No 1739)

I have read the papers and it
appears to me that a very simple
matter has become unnecessarily
complicated by the interference
of persons in no way called
upon to express an opinion.
The Collector of a district finds
documents in his office which
lead him to suspect that
certain persons have entered
into a combination to defraud
others - he very properly reports
his circumstance to the Revenue
Board who after considering
the facts of the case recommend
that Govt should adopt a course
which will give substantial
justice to the parties injured
and then state that suspicion
attaches to a man named
Rungacharlu who was
formerly in the office of the
Collector, but who has
since been promoted to the

The Board have
mistaken the intention of
Govt in the order now re-
plied to, in supposing that
it was not desired that
they should touch on
Rungacharlu's personal
conduct. The whole por-
tion of the papers trans-
mitted to the Board with that order
had reference to the im-
putations cast on Runga-
charlu; and it was the
wish

intention ~~work~~ of the ~~Govt~~ order that the Board should report their opinion thereon, after obtaining from the Collr if they thought fit, the further explanation connected with the original case and the conduct of other parties in it, which was called for in their former Progs of February 5th.

2 It seems to Govt quite necessary, both for the good of the Public Service and in justice to Ramjacharlu, that the case, as respects him not less than as regards others should be thoroughly sifted. In Para 7 of the Bds former Progs he is declared to

a pendant to the Imam Commr they recommend therefore that this man should be called upon to give some explanation of the suspicious circumstances under which he appears to have acted —

The Govt approving of the course suggested call upon the Imam Commr Mr Taylor to obtain from him a further and explanation as he may choose to give and Mr Taylor not content with simply forwarding the documents handed to him takes upon himself to find fault with the Revenue Boards the Govt for the course has pursued with reference to his subordinate — The letter which from the time was likely to be offensive to the Revenue Board was forwarded to them without previous submission to the Govt — and in so doing the Collr acted incorrectly and a letter should have been returned to Mr Taylor with a reprimand warning him for the future not to meddle in matters which did not concern him — From the fact of this letter having been forwarded to the Board these Gentlemen

drew an enormous inference that they are not disposed to proceed with the evidence with reference to the complicity of Ramachandra in this fraud committed.

The fact is that this only matter which is left undetermined is his conduct and connection with this affair and that that he is referred back that the papers were sent.

I think therefore that the Board should be called upon to consider the question with reference to the conduct of Ramachandra & this other parties supposed to be implicated.

That they should be informed that the Govt. disapprove of the conduct of Mr Taylor in expressing opinions as to the conduct of the Board

That as the letter cannot now be returned to Mr Taylor he should be reprimanded for having acted in such a manner and warned to be more cautious in future

to be responsible for the non production of the Tahsildar's order, and for the execution of the Razinama; he is also "presumed" to have countersigned the Collr's order making over the tope to Rama Rau, and is charged by implication with keeping back the Petition addressed by the Board to the Collr. But if his present statements are true, all these imputations, including the taking of the Razinama regarded as culpable act, are erroneous, since he is said to have stated and the Petition was not received by the Collr's till six months after he left the Office.

Rangachariar

3 Ranzacharlu
also explains that he was
not Head Serishtadar but
Naib Serishtadar; the real
Head Serishtadar Chedam-
bra Rau, now a Deputy
Coll.r in the Godavery Dist.t
may properly be applied to
for explanation on the
subject

The conduct of the
present Serishtadar of
the Coll.rs Office, who was
Head Munshi under Mr.
Elton, needs to be fully
explained; and if Mr. Dykes
has not yet replied to
the Board's order of Feb.y
18th on this and other
points, it may be well

to

sent to the Board -

The town of Kenosha Charter

letter - leads me very seriously

to doubt the propriety - and

also if not - by the letter of

the Statute -

Yours Truly

A. W.

Miller Esq. Counsel &c

Request also that the

Injunction in Racine

-charter contained in Bay

of the Board's Proceedings

were not received during

a full Quorum.

A. W.

Conduct of C. Ranza Charles
Special Agent to the Italian
Commissioner

Spécial circulation.

C. 11. Avril 6 R 15 C 16 R 15.

Revenue 1861 Department

Proc of Govmt for April

164-5
9-3-61
380-81
20-3-61

No 891

Proc. of the Madras Govmt

Dy 19th April 1861.

Transb of Rec 24th July/61 C No 1852.
rec'd 19th Augt No 1668.

Passing observations on the
Bd of Rev. relating to the
conduct of Runga Charlu, in
connection with certain Durk-
hast case in Nellore.

No 341 & 341