M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-21.

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

---

## Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

| | |
|---|---|
| G.O. No. 1016 | Press Mis. |
| 176178 | |
| Dated 10-6-1963 | |

**Not to be folded or roughly handled**

## *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 10th June 1863.*

Read the following papers:—

No. 174. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th February 1863, No. 1,005.

Read again letter from the Collector of Madras, dated 5th January 1863, No. 1.
(In Cons. 7th January 1863, No. 80.)

Read also the following letter from the same Officer, dated 21st January 1863, No. 13:—

1. In reply to the Sub-Secretary Mr. Dalyell's letter of yesterday's date, I have the honor to forward the Tahsildar's report therein called for, together with all its enclosures.

2. Strict orders have been given to the Writers' Department as to numbering paragraphs.

Read also letter from the same Officer, dated Saidapet, 29th January 1863, No. 21:—

1. In compliance with the Board's orders, Proceedings 26th instant, I have the honor to forward the depositions of the Gumashtas, Ragaviah and Runga Row, taken on the 22nd ultimo, also translations of the same, and further depositions taken this day from the Serishtadar and those two Gumashtas, on the point specified in paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings under reply.

2. It will be observed that the Serishtadar proposes, should he on reference to his papers find it necessary, to submit a further explanation to-morrow.

3. The Huzur Abstract and Tahsildar's Statement are herewith re-transmitted to the Board.

1. In the first letter above referred to, Mr. Cunliffe reports on a Petition addressed to the Board by the Curnums of Velleyur, a village in the Teruvellur Talook, in the District of Madras, charging V. Vurthacharry, Serishtadar in the Collector's Office, with having wilfully and corruptly allowed to certain Meerassidars in the village of Velleyur in Fasli 1270, a remission of assessment, amounting to Rupees 431-13-0, on the false plea that certain wet crops in that village were "Shavi," or had withered from want of water.

2. In support of this charge the Petitioners state that crops on account of which the remission was granted were not withered; and that the Tahsildar, on whose report the remission was professedly allowed, recommended that no such claim should be admitted.

3. The Serishtadar admits that the Tahsildar, in a report which he sent with a certain figured Statement, recommended that the claim referred to by the Petitioners should not be complied with. He also admits that, in a Statement which he laid before the Collector, the sum in question was entered as one to be remitted, and that it was remitted accordingly, but he denies having acted in the matter under the influence of any corrupt or improper motives. He avers, on this latter point, that at the time the remission was allowed, neither he, nor either of the two Clerks who were employed in the Collector's Office, the one to prepare the office account of claims to remission, the other to check that account with the Tahsildars' Statements, was aware that the Tahsildar of Teruvellur had advised that the sum in question should not be remitted.

4. Mr. Cunliffe explains that the account above referred to, as prepared by one of the Clerks, is a Statement intended to show, in an abstract form, the result of the several Tahsildars' reports on claims to remissions for withered crops. This Abstract Statement exhibits the sums for which Shavi remission is claimed in the villages; and secondly, the amount claimable according to the Tahsildar's examination, with certain minor particulars. The Statement is prepared on the responsibility of the Collector's Serishtadar, whose duty it is to see that no improper claims are admitted, and ultimately to submit such claims to the Collector for final orders.

5. In the present case, the Tahsildar forwarded his figured Statement of Shavi claims in the village of Velleyur, accompanied by a separate report relating to the figured Statement, together with certain depositions and other papers connected with the same matter, the whole forming a large official packet. The Tahsildar's figured Statement is drawn up according to a prescribed form; but, in the last column intended for remarks, the Tahsildar entered an extra heading, the object of which was to show the result of an earlier inspection made by a subordinate Talook servant; from whose report it appeared that, in many instances, crops, which according to the statement of the village Monigars had withered, had, in fact, been reaped. In one column of his figured Statement (column 12) the Tahsildar shows the result of his examination against

each field. In the last column of the same Statement, under a special heading, he shows the state of the same field as certified by the subordinate Talook servant above referred to. A correct translation of this heading is entered in the margin. At the foot of the Statement he shows, in abstract, the result of his own examination under three heads, and below these particulars the result of his subordinate's previous examination in respect of the same lands, as detailed in the last column of the figured Statement. A correct translation of this abstract is as follows:—

"Particulars according to the Adungal Book, No. 4."

Total of one village.

| | Cawny. | | | Teervah. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nunjah..... | 80 | 14 | 12 | 410 | 10 | 0 | Shavi not present. |
| | 4 | 10 | 12 | 24 | 3 | 0 | Puludy (land ploughed and prepared for cultivation) not present. |
| | 65 | 3 | 4 | 358 | 13 | 11 | Shavi present. |
| Total..... | 150 | 12 | 12 | 793 | 10 | 11 | Of this total amount the particulars entered |

in the Adungal Book No. 4, are as follows:—

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entered as reaped... ... ... | 64 | 1 | 6 | 342 | 9 | 2 | Of this Cawnies 7-3-10, Rupees 33-6-7, is |
| Entered as Sist, and as produce. | 16 | 8 | 4 | 88 | 6 | 5 | found at the present inspection to be wither- |
| Entered as Shavi ... ... ... | 70 | 3 | 2 | 362 | 11 | 4 | ed in the bud and destroyed in the seed. |

6. In the Statement itself the Tahsildar does not explain in words what remission he proposed to allow, but in the report which he sent with the Statement, he states his views on that point and proposes (a small sum excepted) that no remission should be granted for fields in which the crops, according to the Talook Officer's previous inspection, had been reaped.

7. The Abstract Account prepared in the Collector's Office from the Tahsildar's figured Statement shows that, in the first instance, the person who prepared it entered in column 5* only the value of the withered crops shown in the abstract at the foot of the Tahsildar's figured Statement as "Shavi present," viz., Rupees 358-13-11; but this sum was subsequently altered to Rupees 793-11-11, the full amount of remission claimed by the Monigars. It would also appear that the remaining sum, viz., Rupees 434-13-11 (the sum which, according to the charge, was knowingly remitted on a false plea) was not at first entered in any of the remaining columns of the same account. This latter sum, as now found in columns 9 and 10, and erased in column 11, with the figures 793-10-11, as they at present stand in column 5, are in another handwriting. If, therefore, the Abstract Statement had been allowed to remain as at first prepared, the sum to be remitted would have been Rupees 358-13-11, instead of Rupees 793-11-11, the sum to be remitted as the Statement now stands.

*Headed "amount in Rupees of Shavi according to the Tahsildar's inspection account."

8. A Clerk, named Runga Row, who prepared the abstract account, and another Clerk, named Ragaviah, whom the Serishtadar deputed to check the same account, were examined by Mr. Cunliffe.

9. The Clerk, Runga Row, states that he prepared the abstract account from dictation; that he never himself saw the Tahsildar's figured Statement; and that he cannot remember who dictated to him. He states, with regard to the alterations made in the abstract account, that the figures, 793-10-11, in column 5, are not in his handwriting; and that he made the entries in columns 9 and 10, but did not make the entry, afterwards erased, in column 11. He also states, in a subsequent deposition taken before the Acting Collector of Madras, that after having handed this account to the Clerk Ragaviah, he did not see it again.

10. The Clerk, Ragaviah, admits that he was deputed by the Serishtadar to prepare the abstract account. He likewise admits that he examined the figured Statement sent by the Tahsildar of Teruvellur in the present case, but denies having read the report which accompanied the Statement. On this point he avers that he did not think of looking at the separate report, because the separate report sent with the figured Statement are usually mere covering papers, stating that the figured Statement is sent.



11. To the question why he had admitted in the abstract, as entitled to remission, items which were entered in the Tahsildar's figured Statement as "harvested" (so entered in column 19, and in the abstracts relating thereto), he replied that he did not think it necessary to bring that fact to the Serishtadar's notice, because the Tahsildar had himself shown that a portion of the crops entered as "harvested" (in column 19) had withered.* With regard to the alterations in the figures, he states that they were apparently made by the person who wrote the abstract and that they were required to correct clerical errors.

*Ragaviah here refers to a remark made by the Tahsildar in the abstract at the foot of the figured Statement to the effect that a portion of the crops entered in the Adungul account as reaped had failed, viz., Cawnies 7-3-10, assessed at Rupees 33-1-7.

12. The Serishtadar was called upon to give his explanation in writing. The chief points in his explanation are—first, that he could not himself undertake the duty of preparing the accounts, and that the Clerks to whom "as usual" that duty was "transferred," having failed to bring to his notice any special circumstances connected with the village of Velleyur, he passed, without question, the sums entered in the remission columns for that village; secondly, that he justifies the Clerks, in not having looked (as they profess) at the Tahsildar's report, by stating that the "Gumashtas invariably take the Dabs† only," in order to prepare the abstract account; thirdly, that he refers to the wording of the Collector's order, communicating to the Tahsildar the amount of the remissions passed in the Collector's Office, as proof that he could have had "no sinister motive;" for in that order "it is distinctly stated that the Shavi account in the Huzur "was prepared with reference to the Azmaish Dab‡ alone," &c., and the Tahsildar was directed "to rectify anything that might be found wrong."

†Figured Statements.

‡Inspection account.

13. Mr. Cunliffe, after commenting on the evidence, remarks, as regards the Serishtadar, that he cannot "on the whole assert that this deduction in the village of Velleyur of "Rupees 434-13-0, improper as it was, was the result of intentional fraud, for in this case we "might suppose to find a similar irregularity in the 170 other villages which received remissions, "and this, a close inspection has failed to detect."

14. With regard to the Clerk Runga Row, he does not credit his story, as to his having forgotten by whom the account was dictated, if it were dictated. Also, with regard both to Runga Row and Ragaviah, he observes, that though the reports of the Tahsildar, containing an express recommendation as to the manner in which the Shavi should be dealt with, may have been overlooked, the Statement itself was enough to awaken their suspicions. He further remarks that the enclosures to the report were so bulky as to make the alleged oversight "extraordinary." But, on the whole, as he is "unable to bring fraud home to them, he must give them the benefit "of the doubt."

15. The Board cannot agree with Mr. Cunliffe in his view of the case. They do not doubt that a fraud was committed, and that the Serishtadar, V. Vurdacharry, with the two Clerks Runga Row and Ragaviah, were each concerned in the fraud. All the attending circumstances afford strong presumptive evidence in support of this conclusion.

16. Very strict orders have been given on different occasions by the Government and the Board of Revenue, enjoining on all Collectors the duty of most carefully scrutinizing such claims as these proceedings refer to. It is improbable that the Serishtadar, as the Officer on whom it chiefly devolves to examine and check such accounts, should have so neglected this important duty as to make it over entirely to subordinates in the Office. The line of defence adopted by the Serishtadar would therefore at any time be considered open to suspicion, but such a defence is obviously of no value when it is found that the evidence given by the subordinate servants, as to *their* alleged part in the work, is wholly unworthy of credit.

17. The Board do not believe that either of the two Clerks was unacquainted with the contents of the Tahsildar's report. The Clerk, Runga Row, if he really wrote the abstract simply

at the dictation of another, would have been able to name that person. He has no doubt hit upon his present story to evade the necessity of explaining on what principle he prepared the account, and how it happened that, *in the first instance*, he entered in the abstract only so much for remission as the Tahsildar was prepared to recommend. The Board believe that this account, as first prepared, exhibited only the total of "Shavi," which, according to the Tahsildar's report and Statement (both having been read) was fairly admissible; and that, subsequently, when the Serishtadar determined, under corrupt influence, to grant a still further sum, the figures were altered to tally with that intention. In any point of view, the subsequent alterations afford good evidence that the mode of preparing the abstract was the result of more deliberation than the parties implicated will admit.

18. With regard to the explanation made by Ragaviah, who is described to be "a confidential Clerk" of the Serishtadar's (a position which neither the Board, nor the Collector, can properly recognize as belonging to any subordinate), the Board do not consider that his account of the matter is at all reconcilable with the actual facts as revealed in the Tahsildar's figured Statement. It is apparent on the face of that Statement, that a great portion of the fields which the Village Monigars had described as entitled to remission, were fields on which the crops had been actually reaped; and it is inconsistent with this fact to suppose that Ragaviah could have assumed that such portion of the alleged Shavi ought to be admitted, or that the Tahsildar intended to recommend that remission should be allowed for those fields. Ragaviah entirely failed to give any rational account of his conduct in relation to this point; his answers being, for the most part, simply evasions of the questions put by the Collector.

19. In respect also to both of these Clerks, the fact adverted to in paragraphs 7 and 18 of Mr. Cunliffe's letter dated 5th January 1863, No. 1, viz., that they omitted to enter in the abstract the date on which the Monigars sent in their last report, claiming a remission for Rupees 55,* is further evidence as to the dishonest characters of their proceedings.

* Paragraph 14 of Mr. Cunliffe's letter.

20. The Board consider therefore that the attempt made by the Serishtadar and the two Clerks to excuse themselves, on the ground that the remission was simply an act of carelessness, has totally failed; nor can they allow that the evidence, against such an hypothesis is affected by Mr. Cunliffe's general statement, that he has been unable to find any proof that remissions were corruptly granted in any other village.

21. The Board further notice that, together with much irrelevant matter, the Serishtadar has in his explanations, made many palpable mis-statements, with the sole object, as it would seem, of mis-representing the case. The Collector very properly exposes these mis-statements in the remarks he has made in the margin of the Serishtadar's explanatory papers. One of these mis-statements relates to the purport of the Collector's order, communicating to the Tahsildar the amount for which remission had been granted. It was not true, as explained by Mr. Cunliffe, that the Tahsildar was invited in that order "to rectify anything that might be found wrong" in the remission already made, but was instructed "to supply anything which might have escaped "observation at the Hoozoor." Mr. Cunliffe also states in paragraph 15 of his letter, that the reports to which the figured Statements form enclosures are not invariably mere "covering Arzis." The truth must be that occasionally explanations are given in the Statement themselves; at other times in the report. The Board, in noticing Vurdacharry's mis-statements on this and other points, are reminded that, in their Proceedings dated 14th January 1861, No. 252, they had occasion to animadvert in strong terms on the conduct of this same officer for deliberately misrepresenting facts, and endeavouring by such means to deceive his immediate superiors.

22. Having thus explained their reasons for believing that the Serishtadar and the two Clerks severally knew, when the remission was granted, that the Meerassidars had no just title to it, and knew also that, by concealing the true facts to procure this remission, they were each committing a gross breach of duty; the Board resolve that the Collector of Madras be instructed to dismiss his Serishtadar, V. Vurdacharry, and the two Clerks, Runga Row and Ragaviah, from their appointments from the date on which this order reaches the Collector.



23. The Collector will be so good as to report in what way the refunds mentioned in paragraph 13 of his letter dated the 15th January 1863, No. 1, were adjusted in the accounts. The Board do not understand how any refunds on account of collections once credited in the accounts could be made without the direct sanction of the Government or the Board. The Collector will ascertain and explain the precise steps taken to effect the adjustment in this particular instance.

24. The Board regret to have to record their opinion in conclusion, that the Collector did not take the care that he should have taken in investigating and scrutinizing claims for remission. Had he done so, the Serishtadar and Gumashtas would never have had the opportunity of allowing undue remissions in the manner detected in this instance, whatever other means the subordinates might employ to obtain a share in the benefit intended for the Ryots.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Secretary.*

---

No. 175. Petition from V. VARADA CHARLOO, late Head Serishtadar of the Madras District, to His Excellency SIR WILLIAM DENISON, K. C. B., Governor in Council of Fort Saint George, dated Saidapet, 8th April 1863.

SHEWETH,

1. Your Petitioner was removed from office by the Board of Revenue by their Proceedings of the 17th February last, upon presumptive evidence of fraud in the matter of a remission granted in a certain village of the Madras District. He prayed the Board for a review of his case upon the grounds set forth in his Appeal, which the Board declining to comply with, he begs to submit the same for the consideration of Government.

2. The grounds of your Petitioner's Appeal are briefly as follows:—

*First.*—That no specific charge of fraud was preferred against your Petitioner.

*Secondly.*—That there was no evidence direct or indirect of any kind to prove the fraud.

*Thirdly.*—That the Collector who enquired into the case, rather with a prejudiced mind against your Petitioner, saw no ground to presume any fraud in the matter, or to consider that it was anything more than an accidental error which, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, is likely to happen in every Collector's Office.

*Fourthly.*—That the charge of fraud was based by the Board merely upon certain alterations of figures in a Statement prepared in your Petitioner's Department.

*Fifthly.*—That the above alteration which was made by the Gumashtas who prepared the account, was admitted by the Collector to have been made for a just and necessary reason in the ordinary course of business, and the whole supposition of the Board is entirely unfounded.

3. If the above, as your Petitioner trusts, are clearly proved by your Petitioner's Appeal, and the records of the case, and by reference to the original statement, he presumes that the whole case made out by the Board against your Petitioner, must fall to the ground, and he ventures to hope for redress at the hands of Government, placing his faith in the repeated orders of Government and the Home authorities, for the protection of Native servants of position from unmerited punishments, not only without any fair judicial evidence, but without any evidence of any kind whatever.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

---

No. 176. Petition from V. VARADA CHARLOO, late Head Sheristadar of the Madras Collector's Office, to His Excellency SIR WILLIAM DENISON, K. C. B., Governor in Council of Fort Saint George, dated Saidapet, 19th April 1863.

SHEWETH,

1. In continuation of your Petitioner's Appeal, dated the 8th instant, which, as it will be seen, was prepared when the Petitioner was not able to obtain a copy of the Board's Proceedings in his case, he now respectfully begs to subjoin a brief explanation to the Board's Proceedings paragraph by paragraph, and earnestly requests that it may be also taken into consideration, as without it, the subject, which is of a very intricate nature, cannot be seen in a clear light.

EXPLANATION.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 5.

2. From this paragraph it will be evident that the Tahsildar's Dab, both in its details and in the abstract at the end of it, shows the results of his examination as purely Shavi, either present or not present, but not as reaped. That the Adangal remarks written by the Curnum, to the effect that some fields were reaped, quoted in the last column of the Tahsildar's Shavi Dab, became unimportant in the face of the results of the Tahsildar's examination, especially as the Shavi Dab showed that such of these fields as could be examined by the Tahsildar was found to be really Shavi; and no opinion could be formed, or was expressed in the Dab, in regard to the other fields upon which Shavi was not present. That the Tahsildar's Dab made no allusion of any kind to the Arzi; so far therefore the Gumashtas who prepared the abstract Statement had nothing to warn them against the taking of the entries from the abstract in the Tahsildar's Dab in the usual course, unless great caution were exercised.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 6.

3. The Tahsildar's report which, as above remarked, was lost sight of, after all goes to show that the Curnum had long-existing enmity towards the villagers, which was the cause of the false and unusual and uncalled for entries in the Adangal made to their prejudice, and if your Petitioner remembers right, the Tahsildar's report far from recommending the not present Shavi to be disallowed, recommends in general terms that such portion of it, for which grounds may appear, should be remitted. Further, in the Tahsildar's more recent report, he states that the whole was really withered crop not harvested, which, if the Tahsildar's report were read, and further enquiries instituted, might have been after all fairly remitted, though the Ryots could not claim it as a right, so long as there was any room for doubt in the matter.

Board's Proceedings, paragraphs 7 and 17.

4. The charges made in these paragraphs are fully explained in paragraphs 3 to 6 of the Appeal Petition:

*First.*—It was clearly shown that the alteration referred to was made for a just and obvious reason to correct a clerical error.

*Secondly.*—The supposition of the Board, that the present Shavi Rupees 358-13-11 was alone in the first instance entered in the General Statement, after perusal of the Tahsildar's Arzi, is incorrect, as that Arzi recommended not only the remission of the Shavi present, viz., Rupees 358-13-11, but also such portion of the Shavi not present, for which good grounds appeared, under which, at any rate, will fall Rupees 74 which were entered as Shavi, and not as reaped, in the Adangal, making thus the total amount Rupees 432.

*Thirdly.*—That if the above supposition was true, columns 9, 10 and 11 of the abstract Statement must have been in the first instance left blank, or, in other words, marked with dots or cyphers, as all blank columns are; whereas, it will be seen that the not present Shavi Rupees 434-13-0 was entered in columns 9 and 11, column 10 being marked with dots, and that afterwards the entry in column 11* being found erroneous on the very face of the Statement, it was erased, and the amount transferred to column 10,† which being under the head of allowable Shavi had to be included in column 5.

* "Shavi examined *within* one month."
† "Shavi examined *beyond* one month."

*Fourthly.*—That the above entries were all taken from the Dab itself, there being no occasion to refer to the Arzi.

*Fifthly.*—That the supposition of the Board, that the figures in columns 9 and 10, and the erased figure in column 11, were afterwards entered in a different hand, is incorrect, because the Gumashta who prepared the abstract admits that the figures in columns 9 and 10, at least, were his own, an admission which being fatal to himself, could not have been made for any collusive purposes, though he disowned the altered figures in columns 5 and 11 for fear of incurring responsibility, and because, in the event of the Board's supposition being true, there ought to be dots visible in columns 9, 10 and 11, or the dots in column 10 must have been left alone, whilst the dots not only in column 11, but also in column 9, must have been erased or otherwise interfered with, which your Petitioner respectfully submits is not difficult to make out



on a close examination. Further, if so many nice and dangerous alterations upon alterations had to be made for purposes of fraud, he might have instead easily got the Statement, or that particular sheet, written again, without any risk, as it was simply a Statement prepared in your Petitioner's office, and not a Talook record, before submitting it for the Collector's signature.

And, lastly that the inability of the Gumashtas to explain any part of what they had to do in the matter, whether from forgetfulness from lapse of time, or to evade responsibility, cannot fairly be taken against your Petitioner, whilst they do not criminate him in any manner, and their statements are neither so similar or complete as to show collusion in the matter.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 12.

5. Once for all, your Petitioner begs to explain that if he here and there afforded an explanation of what the Gumashtas did in the matter, it was simply to place the whole case clearly and not with a view to defend them.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 13.

6. Consideration is specially requested to the Collector's final verdict, acquitting your Petitioner of any fraud in the matter.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 14.

7. See explanation already given to paragraph 5. The Tahsildar's Arzi and enclosures, however bulky, were received at one time. The general Statement was prepared from 900 similar Dabs at another time after the Arzi was laid aside. These Arzies invariably simply cover the Dabs, which are the documents referred to, unless they refer to the Arzi for further information.

Board's Proceedings, paragraphs 15 and 16.

8. Paragraphs 7 and 8 and 11 of the Appeal Petition will show that there was no evidence of a direct or indirect kind to prove fraud on the part of your Petitioner, and that the error was one of an accidental kind which is not unusual. That the abstract Statement showing all the necessary items of information was prepared from the Dabs by the Gumashtas, which in the 900 cases for which it was prepared could not have been examined by your Petitioner; that this has been the usual course as far as your Petitioner is aware in this District; that the abstract in question was your Petitioner's first guide in checking the remissions; that the figures in the case under notice, or the alterations made had nothing in them to raise suspicion, any more than the several other alterations and corrections found in the same Abstract, so as to induce him to make further inquiries; that the remission was given after Jamabandi upon Tahsildar's Dabs in 900 and odd cases, and not upon personal inquiry of the parties; that the Collector found nothing wrong in the 170 villages which he caused to be specially examined, and there was neither complaint in regard to the remaining 700 and odd villages, or in regard to the settlement generally, during which there was every thing to show that your Petitioner protected the just interests of Government; that in this case one-half of the amount remitted had been previously collected, and this circumstance was only reported thirteen months afterwards, and though the Petitioner's claims to a refund of the remitted amount was admitted, no adjustment has yet been made though two years have elapsed, clearly showing that your Petitioner had no personal interest in the matter and there was no collusion with the parties; and in the face of all these facts your Petitioner would leave it to the authorities to consider whether the circumstance of there being an omission can itself be considered to be proof of fraud without even a shadow of evidence of any kind criminating your Petitioner.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 18.

9. Explanation is given under paragraph 5.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 19.

10. It is understood that this omission arose from the date in question not being found in the Tahsildar's Dab, and the sum being but a very small portion of the Shavi, most of which further was Shavi present and admissible.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 20.

11. The absence of fraud in so many other villages as 900 settled at the same time, must exonerate your Petitioner from any suspicion when there are no grounds for it.

Board's Proceedings, paragraph 21.

12. Explanation is given in paragraph 12 of the Appeal Petition. A copy of my explanation of the former case of misrepresentation, which the Board refused to consider at the time, but which your Petitioner was afraid to urge further against the Board's opinion, as it after all only deprived him of the chance of obtaining a Deputy Collectorship at the time, is herewith submitted.*

* Not submitted, not being forthcoming.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

No. 177. Petition from V. VURDA CHARLOO, late Head Serishtadar of Madras Collector's Office, to His Excellency SIR WILLIAM DENISON, K. C. B., Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, dated Saidapet, 14th May 1863.

SHEWETH,

In continuation of your Petitioner's Appeal of the 8th and 19th ultimo, he respectfully begs to submit herewith his Petition to the Collector, Mr. Cunliffe, who has been pleased to record thereon his views in reference to certain important points alluded to by your Petitioner in his appeal, and solicits that the remarks of that gentleman may be also taken into consideration.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

No. 178. ORDER THEREON, 10th June 1863, No. 1,016.

1. The Government have carefully considered the papers above recorded. They do not see reason for imputing corrupt practices to the Sheristadar in the present case, nor do they attach so much importance as the Board do to the alterations made in the Abstract Shavi Statement. The explanation given by Vardacharry seems to them reasonable.

2. There are similar alterations in the case of several other villages in the Statement, although in none of them does any fraud seem to have been practised.

3. Again, as the Sheristadar observes, had the alterations been made for fraudulent purposes, nothing would have been easier for him than to get the Statement re-copied. He would not have left it, as it was, in the Cutcherry to be brought up against himself.

4. Further, nearly half the Shavi erroneously remitted had actually been collected, and was not refunded, or re-credited to the Ryots, until several months afterwards.

5. For these reasons the Government are of opinion that the Sheristadar must be acquitted of any corrupt action, but he is clearly chargeable with very gross neglect of duty.

6. No part of a Sheristadar's duty is more important than that of scrutinizing narrowly claims to remission on account of Shavi or withered crops. In the present case the Sheristadar seems to have done little beyond handing the Talook Returns over to his Gumashtas for the preparation of the general Abstract.

From Collector to the Board of Revenue, 5th January 1863, paragraph 11.

7. Mr. Cunliffe admits that the Sheristadar "should have examined the Talook reports, as this duty was not more than a day's work; had he done this, he could no have failed to have observed the unusual character of the Tahsildar's report, would then have looked at the enclosures to the Urzi, and this improper remission would not have occurred." Again, in paragraph 20, he says, "I think that the Sheristadar might have inspected the reports of each Talook and compared them with the Goshwara, and that in leaving the preparation of this latter very important Statement to a Gumashta however confidential, he has failed in his duty. I certainly understood that he had examined the Goshwara before sending it to me."

8. There seem to have been only a very few detailed reports of the villages claiming Shavi and that for Vallyoor was so bulky with an elaborate Statement, depositions from the Village Officers, &c., that it is extraordinary it should not have been noticed by the Sheristadar.

9. Moreover, the remission claimed for Vallyoor was larger than that for any other village in the Talook with one exception, and it should especially have received his attention.

10. The Government consider the neglect of duty proved against the Sheristadar to be of a very grave character, and regard his defence as wholly inadmissible. He is, however, a servant of twenty-five years' standing and dismissal is a severer punishment than the circumstances of the case require. But the Government must evince in an unmistakable way their serious disapproval of his conduct, and show to officers in positions of such trust that neglect of their important and confidential duties will be visited with a heavy penalty.

11. The Government, therefore, direct that Vardacharry be suspended from office and pay for a period of one year, reckoning from the date of his dismissal by the Board, and that he be then transferred to another District. The Board will make arrangements accordingly for his transfer, when the time arrives.

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

## Testimonials

I nominated V. Varadacharri to the Office of Translator in the Cutchery of the Collector of Chingleput in Consequence of the high testimonials he held from the several Gentlemen under whom he had served, or who had interested themselves in his Education, and during the period he served under me, he affordes me satisfaction. Varadacharri appears to me to be very anxious to obtain the good opinions of his immediate superiors in Office.

(Signed) A. Freese
Late Collector of Chingleput

---

Saidapet 15th February 1855.

I have Known the Bearer, V. Varadacharlu, for many years. He was first brought to my notice by the late General Waugh,

when he was a very young man in a subordinate position in the Board of Revenue, as a well educated and promising native official, and since then he has risen through various stages to the the Nair Sheristadar of Chingleput. During my short Connection with the Chingleput Collectorate, I have always found him diligent, attentive, and useful in every Department. His talents are undoubted, and under efficient superintendence, I do not doubt he will prove an able Revenue officer. It will afford me great pleasure to hear of his success in his future Career.

(signed). P. B. Smollett.

---

V. Varadachari has given me the highest satisfaction by his careful and assiduous attention to his duties during the five years and a quarter he has served under me



The weight of business thrown upon him since the departure of the late Sirastadar has been very great, not only in conducting his own proper duties, but in bringing up the arrears left by that officer, and he has more than equalled my highest expectations. I consider him a most deserving Public Servant eligible for the highest appointment and which I have tried to obtain for him, and shall be very happy to learn he has been finally selected for it.

Chingleput
12th March 1860

(Signed). C. J. Shubrick
Collector and Magistrate

(True Copies)
V. Varada Chariar

Extract from the Register of Uncov. Servants on the Establishment of the Collector of Chingleput

Naib Sheristedar — Name Vurda Charloo. Age when first entertained.

| Establishment | Date | Appointment | Salary Rs. | As. | Period of Service in each Appointment: Years | Months | Days | Remarks regarding punishments, severe and formal reprimands, and all special commendations or marks of approbation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 5 | | | 6 |
| Revenue Board Office | 1st July 1837 to 13th Decr. 1842 | English Writer | 12<br>15<br>18 | .<br>.<br>. | 5 | 2 | 13 | Invariably affords satisfaction & specially commended for his assiduous labours in revising the Settlement of the Chingleput Talick. 5th October 1858. (Signed) C. J. S. Collr. |
| Military Audr. Genl's Office | 14th September 1842 to 31st January 1848 | Examiner | 40<br>60 | .<br>. | 5 | 4 | 17 | |
| Chingleput Collector's Office | 1st February 1848 to 15th February 1852 | Translator | 85 | . | 4 | . | 15 | During the time that I have officiated as Collector of Chingleput during which the Manager attended me for the Jammabandi, I had reason to be fully satisfied with his industry and with his great knowledge of every thing connected with the Revenue business of the district. May 1860. (Signed) R. S. Ellis Offg. Collr. |
| Do. Do. | 16th February 1852 to 30th September 1855 | Naib Sheristedar | 175 | . | 3 | 7 | 13 | |
| Do. Do. | 1st October 1855 to 31st March 1856 | Ag. Head Sheristedar | 280 | . | . | 6 | . | |
| Do. Do. | 1st April 1856 to 31st December 1857 | Naib Sheristedar | 175 | . | 1 | 9 | . | While in charge of the Collectorate for two months from November 1861 to Jany. 1862, I received from the Sheristedar every possible assistance and I invariably found him correct and clear in all the information which from time to time I required at his hands. (Signed) C. W. Reade Ag. Collr. |
| | | | | | 20 | 5 | 28 | |
| | | Madras Collr's Office Saidapet 12th March 1863 | | | | | | |
| | Compd. L. Nathamuny Clerk. | | | | | | | |
| Do. Do. | 1st January 1858 to 18th February 1863 | Sheristadar | 200 | . | 5 | 1 | 18 | |
| | | | | | 25 | 7 | 16 | |

(True Extract)

C. Roberts
Ag. Collector.

Extracts from the Settlement Reports for Faslis 1269-1270 and 1271 of the Madras District.

× × ×

V. Vurdacharri

73. It is only due to him to mention especially the Sheristedar whose intimate acquaintance with the somewhat intricate tenures of the District, his readiness to impart that knowledge, and his general attention to his duties, have so greatly assisted me.

× × ×

(Signed) B. Cunliffe
Collector.

× × ×

V. Vurdacharriar
Sheristedar.

39. They continue to deserve my warm commendation by the manner in which they discharge their duties and by their ready co-operation with me.

× × ×

(Signed) B. Cunliffe
Collector.

× × ×

V. Vurdacharri
Sheristedar.

53. Though I speak in merely general terms of approbation, I do not the less appreciate the good services rendered to the State by the Officers named marginally.

× × ×

(Signed) B. Cunliffe
Collector.

(True Extracts)

Madras Collector's Office
Saidapet 12th March 1863.

A. Roberts
Ag Collector.

Compd. T. Nathanamy
Clerk.

Saidapet 23rd March 1863

No 1018/63
14/6/63
Form enclos.

To
The resident and Members of the
Board of Revenue
Fort St George

The humble Petition of
V. Varadacharlu, the late
Head Sirastadar of the Madras
Collector's Office -

Sheweth,

That Your Petitioner
feeling much aggrieved at the decision of
the Board ordering his removal from his
office, he respectfully begs leave to submit
herewith a Petition for a review of his Case;
and humbly to request that the circumstances
therein set forth will receive the favorable
Consideration of the Board - If he is not so
fortunate as to meet with success at the hands
of the Board, he respectfully solicits that the

Ins No 996 of 1863.
Testimonials
and
Recorded Opinions
of the
Sewal Collectors,
of the late Sirastadar
of the Madras Collec-
-tors Office -
Ins No 1018/63
[illegible]
[illegible]

Petition may be forwarded to Government for such decision and orde. as they may be pleased to pass thereon.

And Your Pethtoner as in duty bound
Shall ever Pray
V. Vurda Charloo

Saidapet 23rd March 1863

To

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

The humble Petition of V. Varada Charlu
the late Head Sirastadar of the
Madras Collector's Office.

Sheweth,

Your Petitioner being aggrieved at your Board's Order, dated the 17th Ultimo, removing him from office, begs most respectfully to submit this Appeal, for their reconsideration of his case, in the earnest hope that they will be pleased to give to the subject all that attention which the claims of an old Servant of Government demand at their hands.

2- Your Pethtoner has applied more than once for a copy of the Order of the Board, in order that he may specifically meet the grounds on which they have been pleased to remove him. But as he is anxious that the circumstances of his case should be reviewed while they are fresh in the mind of the Board, he has ventured, though not yet furnished with the Copy applied for, to submit a brief Explanation on the points adverted to in the Board's Proceedings — a perusal of which he was allowed by the

× Has been furnished to me on the 21st March 1863-

Collector on their receipt— as far as his recollection and what he read enables him to do.

3— The Board were pleased to visit your Petitioner with the extreme penalty of dismissal, on the supposition that the granting of the Remission in the Village of Vellizur proceeded from corrupt motives on his part, and this supposition is based mainly, if not entirely upon certain alterations in an Abstract Statement prepared in the Sirastadar's Department, for the information of the Collector, and which was his main guide in disposing of the claims for Remission in the several Talaks settled by the Collector.

4— Your Petitioner already explained the nature of this alteration, which on its very face must appear to have been made for the purpose of correcting certain obvious clerical errors, and could not have therefore raised any suspicion in the mind of your Petitioner. In Columns 5, 6 and 8 of the Abstract Statement referred to, a correct translate of the Headings of which is herewith submitted, the amount of Shanie Present, Rs 358-13-11, was originally entered, whilst the Shanie Not Present, Rs 434-13-0, was entered in Columns 9 and 11. But as from the dates given in Columns 2 and 3, the Shanie was not examined within one Month, the entry in Column 11, headed "Shanie not present at the Ayamish made within one month", was an error on its very face. This entry in Column 11 was therefore erased, and the amount was



transferred to its proper Column 10. Again, as the entry in Column 5 should exhibit the Total amount of Shanie, particulars of which are given in the subsequent Columns, and not the Shanie Present alone, this entry appears to have been likewise altered. The propriety of these alterations being thus obvious, and having been concurred in by the Collector, Your Petitioner conceived that this Explanation on the subject would have proved satisfactory. He now regrets to find that the Board take a different view of the subject. They hold that the Shanie Present alone ought to have been, as it was in fact originally, entered in Column 5, as well as in Columns 6 and 8, and herein they are, be it said with all respect and submission to them, under a misapprehension. For an attentive perusal of the headings of the Columns of this Statement will not fail to convince them that the contents of Column 5 must represent the entire Shanie both Present and Not Present, while Columns 6, 7 & 8 should on the contrary contain particulars of Shanie Present, and 9, 10 & 11

⊗ Column 5 represents the "Amount of Shanie as per Ayamish Dab"
Columns 6, 7 & 8 have a Common heading viz "Of this Shanie Present"
(The italics are your Petitioners)
Column 9 is "Shanie Not Present"
& Columns 10 & 11 are "Particulars of this" ie of Column 9. Of these Column 10 represents Shanie not present "beyond one month", and 11 the same "within one month"
It must be clear to any one reading these headings that Column 5 is the sum total of 8 & 9, and that Shanie not present beyond one month should be entered in Column 10, and not in 11.

⊗ Encl A

those Not Present. In other words, that Column 5 should represent the total of Columns 8 and 9; whereas in the present Case there are both these descriptions of Shani, viz Present, and Not Present. With this leading, though inadvertently, erroneous idea in their mind, the Board consistently suppose that the entries in Columns 9 and 10, as well as the alterations in Columns 5 and 11, were afterwards designedly and advisedly made in a different handwriting, with the corrupt motive of getting the whole amount remitted. It need scarcely, in regard to this alteration, moreover, be argued that, while the premises are shewn to be based on a misapprehension, the Conclusion must necessarily be unsustainable.

5— Your Petitioner submits most respectfully that no decided inference can be drawn from the nature of the hand in which the figures are written. He need hardly remind the Board how irregular and unsettled are, and must be, English figures written by Vernacular Clerks, who have learnt English numeration only recently, and how hard it is to base merely upon a comparison of such figures a conclusive presumption that the entries were all afterwards made, and to draw from this again the further, and by no means a necessary, Conclusion that the whole was done under the Corrupt influence of Your Petitioner, in the absence of Corroborative evidence

of



of any description whatever to warrant such Conclusions. If this mode of reasoning be permitted, then the existence of the alterations in the Columns of the Statement, not only in respect of Vellicjur, but also of many other Villages in the Taluk, may, with equal force, be taken as proof of Corruption. But it is allowed by the Collector, and not denied by the Board, that, notwithstanding the admitted fact of there being numerous alterations in the Case of other Villages, he, the Collector, failed to discover any error or mistake in the Case of any of those Villages.

6— Your Petitioner would also humbly submit in regard to this alteration that the decision of the question need not be left to surmise, but there are in this Case means by which its true nature can be placed beyond a doubt. If the entries in Columns 9, 10 and 11 were made subsequently as surmised by the Board, those Columns should have been originally marked — as indeed all blank Columns in the Statement are — with either dots or Cyphers, and the dots or Cyphers should be now visible, or the paper should present the appearance of their having been scraped off — not an easy process upon Country paper. If on the other hand, the entries in Columns 9 and 11 were originally made as supposed by your Petitioner, the

dots would be only visible in Column 10- Your Petitioner regrets that, under the belief that his former* explanation in regard to this alteration would be considered satisfactory, it did not occur to him that he should direct his attention specially to this point; but he now earnestly solicits that the Board will be pleased to refer to it as the only satisfactory means of placing this question beyond all possibility of doubt-

*Dated 30th January 1863.

Note- I kept a Copy of this statement with the permission of the Acty Collector

7- Your Petitioner would also submit that whatever may be the conclusions arrived at on the above point, they cannot in themselves establish any thing against him, while it is admitted on all hands that the statements were prepared by the Gumastas, who do not criminate your Petitioner in any manner whatever; and there is no other independent evidence of any sort or kind to establish even a presumption of fraud against him- The representation of the Village Karnam out of which this enquiry arose, implies no specific acts of Corruption to Your Petitioner; and there are circumstances connected with the Remission in this individual Case which preclude even the slightest shadow of a doubt existing as to your Petitioner's innocence in the matter-

8- It must be evident to the Board from the Records of the Case that, a little less than one-half of the disputed Remission of Rs 434-13-4 had been actually collected in the Taluk before it was

†The entire disputed Remission Rs 434-13-4

granted in the Collectors office, and your Petitioner would leave it to the Board to determine whether this fact does not in itself exclude the idea of any communication between him and the Villagers for Corrupt purposes- Again, the fact of this Collection, made in the Taluk, was only reported to the Board six months after the Remission was actually granted; when it was directed in the usual course that the Villagers should in justice be allowed credit for the Collections made out of the Remission to which their claims had been admitted- And it is important to observe that no adjustment has yet taken place with reference to this Order to credit the prepaid sums in their favour. This last circumstance is utterly irreconcileable with any hypothesis of fraud on your Petitioner- For, if he was Corruptly inclined, how easy would it have been for him, in the position he held, so to arrange matters as to persuade the Ryots not to overpay the Rent in the first instance, or, if it had been paid before the Corrupt intercourse began between him and them, he could have allowed them the fullest benefit thereof by adjusting, or causing the adjustment of the Accounts with the least possible delay, instead of leaving them still unadjusted- These long intervals

of time which were thus suffered to intervene, will your Petitioner trusts, be deemed inconsistent with the supposition of any personal interest in the matter on the part of your Petitioner. All these circumstances, coupled with the admission of the Collector that, after a close inspection, he failed to detect any irregularity in the 170 Villages in the Taluk in which Remission was at the same time granted, and with the recorded opinion of that officer that there was no fraud on the part of your Petitioner, will, he trusts, relieve him from the imputation of corrupt motives which the Board have attributed to him in general terms. Your Petitioner can also appeal to the knowledge of the Collector, who is now a Member of your Board, in regard to the firmness with which your Petitioner always discountenanced unreasonable claims for Remission, so that, out of the total Shani Remission claimed in the 4 Taluks settled by the Collector in the Fasli[+] under notice, one-fourth[⊗] was rejected; and in the Taluk of Tiruvallur alone a sum of 3000 Rs would have been granted as Remission if, as observed by the Board, the recommendations of the Tasildar

⊗ Shani recommended by the Tasildars of the 4 Taluks settled by Mr Cunliffe in Fasli 1278 — Rs 86,600. Rejected at the Collector's office on examination — 17,900

+ 1270.

3/



Tasildar were acted up to, which was not done by your Petitioner, the consequence being the refusal of applications for Remissions to the above extent.

9- After all now that your Petitioner had the opportunity of thoroughly sifting the subject, it cannot be said that a perusal of the Arzi, which accompanied the Tasildar's Dab, would have led to the refusal of the Remission granted to the Villagers. The Arzi is most dubiously worded. In it the Tasildar says as follows; "The Shani present should be remitted," "together with that portion of the Shani not present" "on sufficient grounds, and the other portion of the Shani" "not present should be disallowed". This statement amounts to a truism of which there can be no question. But, beyond this, there is no statement either in the Arzi, or the Dab, or any other paper which accompanied it, what the amount of the Shani not present was which he thought should be remitted, or what portion of it was in his opinion disallowable. It was, your Petitioner submits, the duty of the Tasildar to have shewn in the Dab and Arzi what these sums were,

instead of his jesuitical enunciation of a general principle about which there was, and could be, no dispute. On the Contrary, the Dab clearly shows that part of the Shanè was present, and therefore remittable, and that the other part, which was not present, was so at the inspection which was made beyond one month. Consequently anyone would, for aught that is Contained in the Tasildars Report, have been justified in remitting the Entire sum claimed Nay more. The Tasildar himself in his last Arzi to Mr Cunliffe, dated 24th December 1862 No 582 clearly states that the whole amount of Rs 793-10-11 was actually withered Crop, and not harvested; a statement which as proceeding from him who ascertained the Shanè must be entitled to weight. Your Petitioner learns also from enquiries which he has since made, that of the 400 and odd Rs which have recently been ordered to be levied by the Collector, almost the whole was really Shanè, and as such ought not to have been objected upon the poor Ryots. If the Board order an enquiry into the matter, this circumstance will come to light. The Tasildar now says that he intended in his Arzi that portion of the Remission should not be allowed, and that what he intended should have been granted was only

300 and odd Rs. If so, why did he he not say so at least when the Order went from the Huzur to remit the whole amount. His explanation that he did not point this out, because the Huzur granted the Remission, is entirely begging the question. As to the Adangal Account being used as a check over the Dab, your Petitioner explains that the Tasildar, by his Remarks in Column 12 of his Dab, shows beyond all doubt that the entries in the Adangal, as posted in Column 19 of the Dab, were not worthy of being trusted, as he found by actual inspection entries in the Adangal as "reaped" were really Shanè.

10 — Your Petitioner regrets to find that Contradictory or unsatisfactory replies given by Ranga Rau, whether from forgetfulness of the facts of the Case, which occurred nearly two years ago, or from a desire to evade responsibility, are all brought forward as evidence of corrupt motives on the part of your Petitioner. He is unable to understand how the forgetfulness of Ranga Rau as to the person upon whose dictation he admits he wrote the Abstract, or the supposed inability of

Raghavaya to explain why he did not bring to your Petitioner's notice any Remarks in the Tasildars Shanè Statement — in fact Raghavaya clearly explained that his doing so would not have helped the matter at all —, Can establish Corruption on the part of Your Petitioner, in the absence of any thing in their depositions to criminate him either directly or in-directly.

11- Your Petitioner ventures to hope that he has satisfactorily shewn that no Corrupt or sinister motives Can be fairly attributed to him in this matter. As to the responsibility attaching to him from his position in the office, he readily admits that the responsibility of any improper Remissions given through neglect or oversight in the Sirastadars Department rests on himself; and he would submit his Case for the indulgent Consideration of the Board under the peculiar circumstances attending it. The Shanè Remissions in the Case under notice was not given during the Jamabandi Settlement, when a personal Enquiry in each Case might preclude the

possibility

4/-

possibility of error, but it is one of the numerous Cases of Shanè which in this District occur always towards the end of the year after the Completion of the Settlement Along with the Case under notice, nearly 900 other Shanè Debs, to the extent of upwards of 80,000 Rs, had also to be disposed of. Without any desire to evade responsibility, your Petitioner submits it is neither usual, nor possible for him, to have scrutinized all these Statements himself, except wherever doubt or suspicion arises. The figures in the Tasildars Statements were posted in an Abstract form, as usual, by the Gumastas appointed for the work; and the Abstract, which contained all the principal items of information, for deciding upon the justice of the claims for Remissions, was the document which underwent more immediately your Petitioner's examination; and if an accidental error occurred out of so many Cases, through the neglect of the Gumastas, your Petitioner trusts that he will not be visited with severity on that account. That the Deb in this Case was accompanied by a somewhat detailed Report of the Tasildar

is an unusual circumstance which occurred in not more than two or three of these 900 Cases. The Dab in question having been, with the other Dabs, made over to the Gumastas, for the preparation of the general Abstract Statement, the Tasildar's Arzi was unfortunately lost sight of; and in the absence of any allusion to it in his Dab, the totals in which were further not classified by the Tasildar in proper manner, as is done in all other Cases, there was nothing to suggest a reference to the Arzi itself. The utmost that could possibly have been done if the Arzi were looked into, was a Call on the Tasildar for an explanation of what he meant by its very ambiguous Contents, as shewn above. This therefore was all that was not done, and at worst, your Petitioner submits, it amounts, and could amount, to no more than an omission.

12. It is with extreme regret that your Petitioner finds that apparent Mis-statements occurring in his Memo, as to matters of Construction — on which difference of opinions may well exist between the Collector and himself — are added, as it were, to the grounds of his dismissal by the Board.

In the one instance alluded to by them, it is submitted that the phraseology of the Taked is susceptible of both Constructions. It is as follows.

" × × ×. The above Account having been"
"prepared here exclusively in reference to the"
"Azmaish Dabs, a comparison should be insti-"
"-tuted between each item of the above mentioned"
"Shani, and the Adangal, Chitta and other Accounts"
"Should it be discovered perhaps that any thing"
"has been left out, the same should be duly added"
"up, applying at the same time the principle"
"just explained, and after thus preparing"
"a correct Remission List, and making up the"
"Jamabandi Settlement Accounts, the Remission"
"Amounts should be deducted accordingly from"
"the Pattas, and the latter sent up for the"
"Collector's signature" Surely, it cannot be contended that the foregoing instructions did not include correction of what was wrong or incorrect. And after all, the subject

of the so called Mis-statement is of a very trivial and immaterial character not affecting the merits of the Case. If matters like this are to be construed into deliberate Mis-statements, no officer under Government, your Petitioner submits, can be free from the charge. As to the old Case referred to by the Board, your Petitioner will not venture to take up the time of the Board with any lengthened observations in addition to those contained in his long Explanation already submitted by him under date the 6th November 1861. In that Case, the Board considered him deserving of severe censure for a misrepresentation said to have been made to the Collector, who far from viewing it as such observed "2 – I have already fully stated my view of the Case in" "my letter of the 21st December 1860. I will only remark" "further that I have no recollection of the fact alleged in" "Paragraph 7, that I assented to the omission in the Order" "Consequent on Board's Proceedings, 6th June 1860 No. 2690," "referring Sabhapati Chetti to the Civil Courts, but that I

I readily receive the Sirastadars assertion that I did" so, which is confirmed by 2 or 3 Gumastas in this Office."

3 – My experience of him during the 18 months" I have had charge of the District is opposed to the idea" that he either withheld information from me, or allowed" "private feelings to interfere with the proper discharge" "of his public duties." The Board, notwithstanding this opinion of the Collector, were pleased to adhere to their former view, and declined to forward your Petitioner's Appeal to Government, or to recommend him to the post of Deputy Collector. Such being the Case, it is with the most painful feelings that your Petitioner finds the circumstances of such a Case now brought to bear against him; in order to support the serious step of dismissing him from Office on the grave charge of Corruption. A reference to the Collector, who is now a Member of your Board, and before whom the Misrepresentation is said to have been made, will, your Petitioner sincerely trusts, show to your Board his opinion of the

Candid and straightforward manner in which your Petitioner has always conducted his duties under him.

13- In Conclusion, Your Petitioner would beg to bring to the notice of your Board that he is an old servant of Government of 26 years' standing, during the last 10 years of which he filled the office of Sirastadar, without any interruption or even prolonged absence on leave, in a District where the duties have been more than ordinarily of an arduous kind; and that during the whole of this period, as well as during his prior service, his unmeaned attention to business, and his straightforward discharge of his duties, have been borne testimony to by all his superiors, without exception, and several of whom such as Messrs Freese, Cochrane, Smollett, Thubrick & Cunliffe administered the affairs of the District for considerable periods. Their numerous testimonials, and recorded opinions, are herewith submitted. Under such circumstances, and at a time when, meaned by long service, your Petitioner entertained thoughts of retiring, it is with great pain that he finds himself cut off from all future prospects, and the benefit of his past service, by an Order of your Board which, for its severity, he believes, has no parallel in the records of the Board's office, which throughout are marked by a uniform desire on the part of the Board not to permit the removal of even the most inferior class of their servants without a regular conviction of guilt upon the most satisfactory evidence. Your Petitioner therefore prays that, after taking all the circumstances now brought forward under their favorable consideration, they will be pleased to pass such orders as they may deem just to your Petitioner.

And Your Petitioner as in duty bound

Shall ever Pray,

V. Vurda Charlos

and order as they may be pleased to pass thereon.

Petitioner should himself address Government if he considers himself aggrieved by the Board's order in his case.

By order.

[illegible]

Sub Secretary

Pres Bd Office
Govt House
8th April 1863

[illegible]

No 1018 of 1863
From V. Vurda Charlie the late Head Shristadar of the Madras Collectors Office.
Dd 23rd
Recd 24th March 1863
With 4 Encls

Appeals against the order of the Bd dismissing him from his office, and prays for a review of his case. Also requests that if the Bd be not disposed to comply with his request, the enclosed Petition may be forwarded to Govt for such decision

With 4 Enclosures

23

Explanation of the former Case of misrepresentation, which the Board refused to consider at the time, but which your Petitioner was afraid to urge further against the Board's opinion, as it after all only deprived him of the chance of obtaining a Deputy Collectorship at the time, is herewith submitted.

submitted not forthcoming.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever Pray.

V. Vurda Charlie

| Names of Villages | Date of receipt of Report, ie of Pattamanigar's Report | Date of azmaish ie by Taluk Officers | Amount of Shani as per Pattamanigar's Dab | Amount of Shani as per azmaish | Of this Shani Present | | | Amount of Shani Not Present | Particulars of this | | Name of the azmaish dar |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Shani Present | Loss in shoot, withered &c | Total | | Shani not Present at the azmaish made beyond one month | Shani not Present at the azmaish made within one month | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 49 Velliyur | 1st March<br>14th Do<br>1801 | 23rd April | 793 10 11 | altered<br>793 10 11<br>old<br>358 13 11 | 358 13 11 | 0 0 0 | 358 13 11 | 434 13 0 | 434 13 0 | altered<br>0 0 0<br>old<br>434 13 0 | The Jaa |

Rent 1800 Dollars
Rec'd of Pattamanigar

From G. Plowden Collector and Superintendent of Shanum Cultivation

Dated 19th August 1801

Sir

I am commanded by the Board of Revenue to acquaint you that the measurement of the Shanum Crop has been completed in the Districts of Tinnevelly, Madura, Dindigul, Coimbatore, Salem, Baramahl, North Arcot, Chingleput, Chittoor, Nellore, Ongole, Guntoor, Rajamundry, Ellore, Masulipatam, Condapilly, Nundigam, Kistnah, Guddapah, Bellary, Cuddapah, Kurnool, Sunda, Canara, Malabar, Wynaad, Coimbatore, Dindigul, Madura, Tinnevelly, Tanjore, Trichinopoly,

15/5/63

Loudspet 14th May 1863 -

To His Excellency Sir William Denison K.C.B.
Governor in Council of Fort St George

The humble Petition of V. Varada Charlu,
late head Sirastadar of the Madras
Collector's office.

Sheweth,

In Continuation of your Petitioner's Appeal of the 8th and 19th Ultimo, he respectfully begs to submit herewith his Petition to the Collector Mr Cunliffe, who has been pleased to record thereon his views in reference to certain important points alluded to by your Petitioner in his Appeal, and solicits that the remarks of that Gentleman may be also taken into consideration.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound
Shall ever Pray.

V. Varada Charlu

[illegible] 1863

[illegible] in this Case, there ought to have been dots in the

Memo.

V. Varada Charlu, late Sirastadar of the Madras Collector's Office.

That your Petitioner finds it very difficult to meet the charge of fraud based as it is throughout in the Board's Proceedings upon surmises and not upon evidence. The only ground assigned is that there were certain alterations of figures in this case in the Shani Abstract Statement; but it was a mere rough Statement prepared in your Petitioner's Department for his information and that of the Collector, in which there are several other alterations comprising as it does 900 and odd cases. That your Petitioner clearly shewed, and the Collector admitted, that the alteration in this case was made simply to transfer the erroneous entry of the not present Shani, from the Column of "examined within one month", to that of "not examined within one month", in which latter case the Shani was generally remitted, no fault being attributable to the Ryots in not preserving the Shani, according to the rule introduced only since Fasli 1270, and this alteration was justified by the other Columns of the Statement, which shew that more than one month elapsed between the date of the receipt of the Villagers' Dab and Tasildar's examination. The Board, however, without admitting this, suppose that the entries in the Columns 9, 10 and 11, including that erase in Column 5, were all afterwards made for corrupt purpo[illegible] But in this case, there ought to have been dots in th[illegible]

– Col 11.
o Col 10.

Revenue 1863 Oct. 20 of Govt for Times No. 1131.

From V. Varadachar[illegible] Sirastadar of the Madras Collector's Office.

Dated 14th May 63. Received 15th May 63.

S. O. No. 116 Shine

Submits Mr Grant Offr's reviews recorded on the Petitioner presented to that Office with reference to certain important points alluded to in his Appeal Petitioner to Govt of 8th & 19th April 1863

No. 117

first instance in all the three Columns, that is, in Columns 9 and 11, as well as in 10, which latter alone, according to your Petitioner's statement, was first left blank; and if the dots in the Columns 9 and 11 were erased, or written over, it can be easily made out. Further, if such nice alterations were required for purposes of fraud, the more natural course would have been to prepare the page of the Statement, or the whole Statement altogether, newly, as it was a mere rough Statement prepared under your Petitioner's orders - The Gumastas who prepared and examined the Statement from the detailed Dabs, admit the fact in their Depositions before the Collector, and he that prepared the Statement admits that he made the entry in Column 9 first, and in 10 afterwards, both of them without in any way criminating your Petitioner. But the Board surmise that the Gumastas are in collusion with your Petitioner, though their Depositions would clearly shew that they rather tried to escape themselves than save your Petitioner, and their Depositions, either from the absence Cause, or forgetfulness, have several inconsistencies as pointed out by the Collector. That it must be very hard for any person to be convicted upon such series of surmises without any evidence, and against the opinion of the Collector, the investigating Officer, that there was no fraud. But it is especially in this Case, as there is much collateral evidence to shew your Petitioner's innocence



That this was one of 900 and odd Cases of Shanie which occurred after Jamabandi, and had to be disposed of upon the mere Accounts of the Tasildars and without the aid of personal enquiry - That the Collector nevertheless found no fault in the 170 Villages which he specially examined after this Case arose, and in several of which there were such Corrections of figures in the rough Statement. That there were no Complaints in this, or in any of the 900 and odd Cases, or in regard to the others settled at Jamabandi, which were all settled, as the Collector can bear out, with a just regard to the interests of the State, one-fourth of the Shanie or Rs 17,000 having been on a close examination of the Accounts withheld upon various grounds.

Further, in this Case, the whole was really Shanie, as confirmed by the Tasildar even when recently asked by the Collector; and being examined after the Month, and there being good grounds to shew that the Karnam who made entries in the Adangal Account, to the effect that crops on certain of the fields had been harvested, to the prejudice of the Villagers, had long-standing enmity as reported by the Tasildar, the not present Shanie might have been remitted upon further enquiry without the necessity of any underhand attempts, the Tasildar having left the matter for the judgment

of the Collector's office, and not made any express recommendation for disallowing it altogether, as supposed by the Board. In short, there was much for the Villagers in the Tahsildar's Arzi to prevent its being kept aside from any bad intentions. It was laid aside, and forgotten, simply because the Arzies were merely covering Arzies generally, and the Dabs generally contained all the information, and the one in this case made no allusion to any Arzi, and the 900 cases were disposed of upon the Dabs, at one time, and not as each was received.

It is further to be remarked in this case that one-half of the not present Shavi had been collected from the people at the time when it was remitted; and this again was reported by the Tahsildar 13 months after the Remission was given; and no adjustment has yet been finally made; clearly shewing that there could have been no collusion on the part of your Petitioner, as in that case the Villagers would not have paid, or if they have paid, the Petitioner would have been aware of it; the whole delay in the matter, your Petitioner concerns, being conclusive against any supposition of fraud.



Bo's remarks in reference to the alteration —

The abstract account prepared in the Collector's Office from the Tahsildar's figured statement shows that in the first instance the person who prepared it entered in Col 5 only the value of the withered crops shown in the abstract at the foot of the Tahsildar's figured statement as "Shavy present" Vizt Rs 358-13-11, but this sum was subsequently altered to Rs 793-10-11, the full amount of remission claimed by the Maniagars. It would also appear that the remaining sum Vizt Rs 434-13-0 the

Petitioner's explanation

The abstract account was a mere rough statement prepared in your Petitioner's Department for his information and that of the Collector, in which there are several other alterations comprising as it does 900 and odd cases. That your Petitioner clearly shewed and the Coll admitted that the alteration in this case was made simply to transfer the erroneous entry of the not present Shavy from the Column

of examined within one month or Col 11 to that of not examined within one month or Col 10, in which latter case the Shavy was generally remitted. and this alteration was justified by the other Columns of the State=ment which show that more than one month elapsed between the date of the receipt of the Villagers Dob and Tahsildar's examination. The Bd however without admitting this, suppose that the entries in the Columns 9, 10 & 11 including that in Col 5 were all

sum which according to the charge was knowingly remitted on a false plea - was not at first entered in any of the remaining Columns of the same account. This latter sum, as now found in Columns 9 and 10 and erased in Col 11, with the figures 793-10-11, as they at present stand in Col 5, are in another hand writing - If therefore the abstract statement had been allowed to remain as at first prepared, the sum to be remitted would have been Rs 358-13-11 instead of Rs 793-10-11 the sum to be remitted as the statement now stands -

The Clerk Runga Rao states that he prepared the abstract account from dictation, that he cannot remember who dictated to him. He states with regard to the alterations made, that the figures 793-10-11, in Col 5 are not in his handwriting, and that he made the entries in Cols 9 & 10, but did not make the entry afterwards erased in Col 11 -

afterwards made for corrupt purposes in a different hand=writing - But in this case there ought to have been dots in the first instance in all the three Columns 9 and 11 as well as in 10, which latter alone according to your Petitioners statement was first left blank; and if the dots in the Columns 9 & 11 were erased, or written over, it can be easily made out - The Jomastah who prepared the abstract account admits as stated in the Bds Ps that he

made the entries in Cols 9 and 10 and yet denies having made the alterations in Col 5 as well as the entry afterwards erased in Col 11 -

Vurdachary

6/5

I am willing to believe that Vurdachary has not been guilty of fraud as well as of neglect of duty - at all events the evidence is hardly sufficient to prove the former offence though I admit there are grounds for suspicion. I am willing therefore to adopt the milder punishment suggested, upon the supposition that suspension involves the loss of salary for the whole period - I am not certain that I should not double the period. This is an appeal

I make it two years instead of one it is of such importance that the native officials should learn that neglect of duty is looked upon by the Govt as a very serious offence - we are compelled to employ & to trust them, it behoves us therefore to let them know that punishment follows an abuse of the confidence placed in them

[illegible]

+ [illegible]

from Vurdachary, Sheristadar of the Madras Collectorate; from an order of the Board of Revenue directing his dismissal in consequence of certain remissions improperly made in 1861 for the "Shany"+ in the village of Vullyoor -

The facts of the case are as follows -

Fusly 1270 / 1860/61 was a bad year and extensive remissions were consequently necessary for "Shany" or withered

withered crops - The proper course when application for such remissions are made is for the village officers first to examine the fields and enter the result in the "Adungul" account and then for a Talook official to inspect or "dymaish" the land - where the remission &c exceeds a certain amount the second process is per=formed by the Tahsildar - The ryot is bound to preserve the "Shany" for inspection and the period for which he must preserve it or forfeit his claim to re=mission was fixed by the Collector at one Month - Shany "not present" that is "not preserved" after that interval is admitted, if entered in the "Adungul".

on

on the ground that the Ryot in Keeping it for a Month has done all that can be expected from him - The claims for remission are ultimately submitted by the Tahsildar to the Collector for his final &c orders - after careful &c scrutiny in his office and consideration of the &c Tahsildar's reports and Statements -

In the Vullioor village in Fasli 1270, the Talook Officer, a Gumastah, arrived for the Aymaish &c before the preliminary Adungul had been per=formed and consequently he and the Village Officers inspected the fields together. The result was entered in the Adungul which how=ever the Curnums only signed

signed - the Monigars refusing to do so and sending in statements of their own subsequently - and the Gumastah withholding his signature because the Shavy was of greater amount than a subordi:nate could "aymaish" - The Gumastah reported this to the Tahsildar who however appears from pressure of business to have been unable to visit the village until 2 months had elapsed - He then sent in a detailed State:ment shewing in separate columns for each field the Curnums Adungul which as already stated had been verified by the Talook Gumastah - the Monigar's Adungul and his

his own aymaish - The Statement was accom:panied by depositions &c and a report in which the Tahsildar recommended that the Shavy "present" and "not present on suffi:cient grounds" i-e- for the absence of which there were sufficient grounds, should be re:mitted - the rest being disallowed.

When all the Shavy Reports of the District had been received an abstract Statement was prepared from them in the Sheristadars dept and submitted to the Collector for his orders.

This Abstract was

was prepared by a Gumastah named Ruega Rau and then examined by another Gumastah named Ragaviah. It showed Rupees 358-13-11 as "Shany present" and Rs. 434-13-0 as "Shany not present on sufficient grounds" — The Sheristadar laid this Statement before the Collector who relying on his examination, passed the whole amount viz Rs. 793-10-11 in July 1861.

The Curnums of the village in November or December last petitioned the Board on the subject and the result of the enquiry which followed has

has been the dismissal of the Sheristadar and the two Clerks. —

There can be no doubt that a sum of some 400 Rs. was improperly remitted — It is indeed stated that much of this ought to have been remitted as the crops had really withered — but this was a question to be submitted for the Cmrs. decision — specially — not included in a statement supposed to be quite correct.

It is equally beyond question that the Tahsildar in his report and even in his statement of Shany set

forth the case fully and had his lead been followed the improper remission would not have been made - the utmost that could have been done would have been to enquire further into some doubtful cases.

The Sheristadar's defence is that he necessarily entrusted the preparation of the abstract and the examination of the Tahsildars returns to his clerks who "as usual" went by the statements disregarding the reports which almost invariably were mere covering letters.

Such an excuse is wholly inadmissible - as Sheristadar of course cannot do everything himself - but he certainly ought to check the work of his subordinates - Claims for remission are especially the very things which ought least of all to be entrusted implicitly to subordinates - for frauds are easily effected and improper claims not fraudulent, are constantly made - In the present case the means of coming to a right conclusion were at hand - the report of the Tahsildar showed exactly what ought to

Purdachary must know this - as he got into trouble with them once before - though acquitted ultimately.

have been remitted
his statement,
which was peculiarly
prepared, suggests
a reference to the
accompanying
letter - or at least
further enquiry -
and yet a gross
mistake is per-
petrated -

It seems to me
that Vindachary
must be held to
have been guilty
of a very serious
neglect of duty -

The Bd. consider
that fraud was
at the bottom of the
mistake.

This inference
is chiefly founded
on the alterations
made in the Abstract



In the first instance
the abstract seems
to have been correctly
prepared - but who
made the alterations
cannot be ascer-
tained - These cir-
cumstances, I
think, tell against
the Bds inference -
I. The alterations are
self-evident -
II. The ~~Stolen~~ Abstract
was an office St:
prepared by Vin-
dachary's clerks -
who would or might
have recopied it
before it was sub-
mitted to the Comr.
III. Part of the re-
mission was actually
collected from the
Ryots & remained
several months in
the Tahsildar's Tea-
sury. As the charge of

Further as the Village
Officers were known
to be at feud, it
was dangerous ground
to operate on.

fraud is entirely inferential — there being no accusation and no evidence, Vindachary is I think entitled to an acquittal.

— Had the case come before Govt in the first instance, I should have suggested as a suitable punishment, suspension for a year or so and transfer to another District. The Bd however have dismissed Vindachary, and in corroboration of their estimate of

his character, they send up various cases in which he has been censured by them.

In the first case Vindachary with others was charged with procuring improper remissions & receiving a consideration for the same. He was acquitted wholly by the Bd & Govt.

G.O. 24 April 54.

In the second case a number of petitions were received by the Bd charging Vindachary with bribery. They were ultimately lodged as pseudonymous. The alleged writers disavowing them wholly. The

packet marked No. 2.

Abstract

while the Board have always had pure doubts of Vurdachary, the Colors whom he is believed to have misled to stand up for him.

I do not think these cases should be raked up against Vurdachary.

The punishment I have suggested seems to me the fitting one after all.

Vurdachary received Rs 200 monthly and has served 25 years.

Orders requested

I. D. S.

C 4th June/63 R.D.

[illegible] Petition of C Vurdachary Sheristadar of the Madras District from the orders of the Board of Revenue dismissing him from his appointment

I do not see reason for imputing corrupt practices to the Sheristadar in the present case, nor do I attach so much importance as the Board do to the alterations made in the Abstract Share statement. The explanation given by Vurdachary seems to me reasonable (viz) that they were made so as to represent correctly the abstract of the Thavildar's return regarding the Share of the Vellyoor village. Col No 5 represented the amount of Share as reported to

R793

Abstract

the Thanildar where, came for the Azenaith. Of this R 358 Col 6 was present at the Thanildar's visit - and R 434 was not present, and as the Thanildar's visit was paid more than a month after the Admr. this near property fell into Col 10 not Col 11. I see nothing to take exception to in this.

Besides there are similar alterations in the case of several other villages in the Statement, altho' in none of them does any fraud seem to have been practised -

Again as the Sheristadar observes had the alterations been made for fraudulent purposes, nothing would have been easier



for him that to get the statement recopied - He would not have left it, as it was, in the cutcherry to be brought up against himself.

Further nearly half the Shari erroneously remitted had actually been collected, and was not refunded, or recredited to the ryots, until several months afterwards.

For these reasons (I) am of opinion that the Sheristadar must be acquitted of any corrupt action - but he appears to me clearly chargeable with very gross neglect of duty.

No part of a Sheristadar's duty is more important than that of scrutinizing narrowly claims to remission on account of

Abstract

Thai or inthered crop.
(In theory such claims are inadmissible as the assessment formed on an average of years is supposed to be such as can be paid year by year. The good years compensating for the bad ones. Practically it cannot always be denied, but it should have been allowed unless after full inquiry & every precaution to guard against fraud.) In the present case the Sheristadar seems to have done little beyond handing tossing the Taloob returns over to his Gomastahs for the preparation of the general abstract.

From Collector to the Board of Revenue 5 January 1863. P 11

Mr Cunliffe, who certainly is not unfavorable to Vindachary, admits that "he should have examined the Taloob reports as this



duty was not more than a days work; had he done this, he could not have failed to have observed the unusual character of the Thaindar's report, would then have looked at the enclosures to the Arzi, and this improper remission would not have occurred." Again para 20. "I think that the Sheristadar might have inspected the reports of each Taloob & compared them with the Goshwara, and that in leaving the preparation of this latter very important statement to a Gomastah home confidential, he has failed in his duty. I certainly understood that he had examined the Goshwara before sending it to me."

There seem to have been only a very few

Abstract

detailed reports of the villages claiming Shai, and that for Pullyoor was so bulky with an elaborate statement, depositions from the village Officers &c that it is extraordinary that it should not have been noticed by the Sheristadar.

Moreover the remission claimed for Pullyoor was larger than that for any other village in the Talook with one exception — and it should especially have received his attention —

I deem that that gross neglect of duty has been proved against the Sheristadar but not fraud — He is home a servant of 25 years standing — Mr. Cunliffe



thought well of him, and so, I know, did Mr Sherbrick the previous Collector of Chengleput. I would adopt Mr Sims suggestion & suspend him for a year, to date from the time of his removal from office under the orders of the Board, and I would transfer him to another District —

5/6/63 JP

Reve. Deptt.

No. 1016.

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
Under date the 10th June 1863.

Read the following papers

Pro. of the Bd. of Revs.
Directing the dismissal of Sheristadar V. Vardacharry of the Madras Collectorate and two other clerks from their appts. for gross breach of duty.— (Here enter 17th Feby. 63 No. 1005

Petitions from V. Vardacharry late Hd. Sheristadar of the Madras District.— 3 Here enter 8th & 19th April and 14th May 1863.—)

The Govt. have carefully considered the papers above recorded. They do not see reason for imputing corrupt practices to the Sheristadar in the present case, nor do they attach so much importance as the Bd. do to the alterations made in the

Abstract

Abstract Shavi state-
-ment. The explanation
given by Vardacharry
seems to them reasonable.

2 – There are similar
alterations in the case
of several other villages
in the Statement, altho'
in none of them does
any fraud seem to have
been practised. —

3 – Again as the She-
-ristadar observes had
the alterations been made
for fraudulent purposes,
nothing would have
been easier for him
than to get the Stat-
-ment re-copied. He
would not have left it, as
it was, in the Cutcherry
to be brought up against
himself. —

4 Further nearly
[illegible]

erroneously remitted had
actually been collected, &
was not refunded, or re-
credited to the ryots, until
several months afterwards. —

5 For these reasons the
Govt. are of opinion that
the Sheristadar must be
acquitted of any corrupt
action – but he is clearly
chargeable with very gross
neglect of duty. —

6 – No part of a She-
ristadar's duty is more im-
portant than that of scru-
tinizing narrowly claims
to remission on account of
Shavi or withered crops. In
the present case the Sheris-
tadar seems to have done,
little beyond handing the
Talook returns over to his
Gomastahs for the prepa-
ration of the General ab-
stract. —

Mr.

7 Mr. Cunliffe admits that the Sheristadar "should have examined the Talook reports as this duty was not more than a day's work; had he done this, he could not have failed to have observed the unusual character of the Thasildar's report, would then have looked at the enclosures to the Urzi, and this improper remission would not have occurred." Again in para 20. he says "I think that the Sheristadar might have inspected the reports of each talook and compared them with the Goshwara, and that in leaving the preparation of this latter very important statement to a Gomastah however confidential, he has failed in his duty. I certainly

From Collector to the Bd. of Revn. 5th Jany./63 P 11.—

understood that he had examined the Goshwara before sending it to me."

8.— There seem to have been only a very few detailed reports of the villages claiming Shavi, and that for Vallyoor was so bulky with an elaborate statement, depositions from the village officers &ca. that it is extraordinary it should not have been noticed by the Sheristadar.—

9. Moreover the remission claimed for Vallyoor was larger than that for any other village in the Talook with one exception — and it should especially have received his attention.—

10 The Govt. consider ~~that~~ ~~gross~~ neglect of duty ~~has been~~ proved against

the Sheristadar ~~but not~~ a very fair character & regard ~~fraud~~, ~~and that~~ his defence is wholly inadmissible - He is however a servant of 25 years' standing and dismissal is a severer punishment than the circumstances of the case require - But the Govt. must evince in an unmistakable way their serious disapproval of his conduct and ~~prove~~ shows to officers in positions of such trust that neglect of their important and confidential duties will be visited with a heavy penalty. —

11. — The Government therefore direct that Nurdacharry be suspended from office and pay for a period of one year's

understood

reckoning from the date of his dismissal by the Board and that he be then transferred to another District. The Board will make arrangements accordingly for his transfer, when the time arrives

E. W. S.

14 Copies Lothe B. of Revl Desp. to 12th Lune M. & Copy Disp. to
3 — Civil Paymaster.

Revenue 1863 Deptt
Pro: of Govt for June

No 1016

Pro: of the Madras Govt
Dt 10 June /63.

Pro of the Board of Rve
Dt 8 Septr /63 C No 2164
Pro of the Board of Rev 9 June
65 C A 1581

Directing the sus:
pension of V. Vardacharry
for one year for neglect of
duty and ordering his trans:
fer to another District after
the expiration of that period.

No 174 @ 178.