

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1338

Press
~~Mis.~~

376-377

Dated 20-7-1863.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
20th July 1863.*

Read again the letter from P. SUBBIAH, late Stamp Vendor of the Guntoor Talook, and recorded in the Proceedings of Government, dated 26th January 1863, No. 170.

Read also the following papers:—

No. 376. From PISAPATY SUBBIAH, late Stamp Vendor of Guntoor Talook, in the Kistna District:—

With reference to his Memorial, dated 19th December 1862, to the address of the Secretary of State for India on the subject of his dismissal from the post of Stamp Vendor, submits copies of certain vouchers to be forward to Home authorities together with that Memorial, and states that the charge which was the cause of his dismissal is malicious and false. Prays that he may be restored.

(Here enter 29th January 1863.)

No. 376A. Petition from PISAPATY SUBBIAH, late Stamp Vendor of Guntoor Talook, in the Kistna District, now at Madras, to Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 19th February 1863.

MOST HONORED SIR,

1. I respectfully and humbly beg leave to represent to your honorable presence that I submitted the triplicate copies of my Memorial for transmission to Right Honorable Secretary of State for India on the 19th December 1862, I now received letter that your Honor returned my Petitions to Guntoor, therefore I prepared other copies of triplicate Memorial sent them to your Honor with this Petition. Moreover I have already sent the vouchers of the same Petition on the 26th January 1863, I pray your Honor to send the vouchers with these Memorials to the Secretary of State for India and get justice.

2. I have the honor to inform you that I am residing in Checoola Nursiah house, at Sunjenaroynepetta in Madras, and I request you to send the answers for my Petitions to the above mentioned place.

No. 376B. From PISAPATY SUBBIAH, late Stamp Vendor of Guntoor Talook in the Kistna District, Madras:—

States that, with reference to his former Memorial addressed to the Secretary of State for India, under date 19th February 1863, he herewith submits three copies of the decision by Joint Magistrate together with a Supplemental Memorial to the address of the same authority. Prays that these may be transmitted.

(Here enter 13th June 1863.)

No. 377. ORDER THEREON, 20th July 1863, No. 1,338.

Ordered that the Memorials received with the foregoing letters be forwarded to the Home Government, and that the Memorialist be informed of their despatch.

(Signed) P. P. HUTCHINS,

Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

Prosecutor

Defendant

1 Vasreddi Papamma

1 Potur Ananda Rao

2 Chava Veramma

2 Kopparay Yoganandam

by their Vakeel

3 Prapatu Subbaya

Chaturvedala Adwaita

Brahmans.

Charge.

Fraud.

The 2nd Defendant is charged with fraud in having, between 2 or 3 P.M. on the 25th of January 1861, in the Taluk Kachkoti of Guntur, falsely personated one Sireddi Raghava Saidu, in such assumed character, buying from 3rd Defendant in the name of the 1st Prosecutrix, a stamped paper of the value of eight Rupees for the avowed purpose of executing a deed of settlement between the 1st Prosecutrix and the 1st Defendant, and also another stamped paper of eight rupees for the avowed purpose of executing a deed of settlement between 2nd Prosecutrix and 1st Defendant. The 1st and 3rd Defendants are charged with having aided and abetted the 2nd Defendant in the Commission of the above offences.

It appears from the statement of the Vakeel of the Prosecutrix that, at the time of the Commission of the alleged offence, the state of affairs was as follows. The 2nd Prosecutrix who is the daughter of

VP
Vakeel

-ramasa subba

of 1st Prosecution living in a village contiguous on the borders of the Territories of A. K. K. G. and in a jungle part of the Country, sent certain bonds of the value of 4,000 - Rupees which had been executed in her favor to the 1st Prosecution to keep in her house in Amaravati in the Taluk. While the bonds were there, the 1st Defendant having obtained a warrant to attach the property in the possession of the 1st Prosecution among other things attached the bonds which 2nd Prosecution had deposited with 1st Prosecution, and while negotiations were going on between the several parties concerned, the stamped papers were bought in the way stated in the charge.

The principal evidence against defendants is that of the 1st witness, who deposes to having gone to the Taluk Kacheri on business, and to having seen the 2nd Defendant buy the papers. He declares that the 2nd & 4th witnesses were present, and saw the transaction, and goes on to say after seeing the above occurrence, he went out of the Kacheri, met the 3rd witness, who is a friend of the Prosecution's family, and told him what he had seen, and asked him whether Raghunath were in Guntur. 3rd witness on hearing this, immediately made a complaint to the Tahasildar who made an Enquiry.

The 2nd witness does not wholly corroborate the evidence of 1st witness as to seeing the 2nd Defendant, but acknowledges he was present, and that 1st witness

Second Page

and

had asked him whether he had seen the 2nd Defendant, but when he looked he was not present, 4th witness deposes to his having been present, and seen the 1st & 2nd witnesses in the Taluk Kacheri, but says he did not see 2nd Defendant there. The statement of 1st witness that he came to get a putta does not appear to be wholly correct, as a Taluk Gumaasta. 5th witness, says - and so it appears from an account signed by the Sheristah of the Taluk, that he had received his putta from the Guntur Tahasildar on the 14th of January, thirteen days before the date of the buying of the stamps, and the Guntur Tahasildar reports he had only to receive one. The 5th witness however deposes to 1st witness being in the Taluk Kacheri at the time he states.

The Defendants try to make out that R. Raghunath (6th witness) did buy the stamped papers as mentioned, and produce two witnesses to prove that they saw the 6th witness in Guntur on the 25th January.

But their evidence, though consistent, is very suspicious. There is evidence in the record that both have considerable dealings with 1st Defendant; and therefore although the witnesses cited by 6th witness to prove his being in Amaravati, are in consistent with one another & with 6th witness. Owing to the Acting Joint Magistrate being to them attempting to remember too much - The Acting Joint Magistrate does not believe their statements. The whole proceeding took place in much too short a time for such a conspiracy as defendants allege to have taken place. That 3rd Defendant sold the papers, he does not deny. He has dealings

JP Third Page

Direct

ramasastri

Encl. No. 155 of 1863
Encl. No. 155 of 1863
Encl. No. 155 of 1863

with the 1st Defendant, & owes him money, and another very suspicious circumstance connected with 3rd Defendant's conduct is that his stamp book was kept in loose leaves instead of being bound up, though it had been in use a long time. He said at first he could not recognize the 6th witness, but gave the papers to him - an illiterate person - according to a chit which, he says, he returned to 6th witness; what object the Prosecution could have in not coming forward as the purchasers of the papers, does not appear - Immediately after the sale of the papers, the Complaint was laid, & the plot, if any, must have been most deeply laid. The circumstances as they occurred seem to be most natural.

The Acting Joint Magistrate convinced that 2nd & 3rd Defendants at least were engaged in an attempt at fraud which circumstances prevented coming to maturity, sentenced them to be imprisoned for six weeks in the Zilla Jail of Cuttack under section 404 of 1843, & Sec. VII Regulation of 1876. He does not think that the evidence is sufficient to establish the charge against 1st Defendant, but he would have cleared his character of a suspicion which now rests on it - had he immediately on hearing of the occurrence, disavowed all connection with the stamps, but he does not even brave taken any such steps till seven days after the sale of the stamps - he gave a deposition - He is released.

14/2/61
(signed) L. W. Peck
Acting Joint Magistrate
DP. (True Copy)
D. S. Kottamaya
Acting Deputy Collector
Walasinggan
R. Kawaiya



untov
1861
Kiah
Kiah
in
of
int
the
is no
islet
aged
a false
statement
to point

well deserves in his remarks, that this witness of falsehood, alleging he came to the Cuttack for in it was proved he had some days previously to, in fact the whole tenor of the Joint Magistrate's show the weakness & unsatisfactory nature of the

ness stated that himself and 2nd Witness saw the (by Jogannandan, the Tathiel of the Pottor Party, Mr. Ragoonaihookor - he denies this, and says he saw no such thing. He borne in mind that 1st Witness, Puttabee

Heet

=ramasastru

was the cause of his dismissal.
is malicious & false; -

Prays that he may be re-
stored. -

Copies in a letter to England
27/11/55 of 1863

Rev. 1863 V. 1/2
Pro of Govt for July 265.
308 of 1863

From Insolvency Sub.
biak late stamp vendor
of Guntur Taluk in the
Kistna District

Dated 17/11/55 of 1863.
Pro. 2. 329

With 13 Enclosures
S.O. No 1338 of 21 July
With reference to his Promo-
tional dated 19 December
1862 to the address of the
Secretary of State for India
on the subject of his dismissal
from the post of stamp
vender - Submits ~~copies~~
copies of certain vouchers
~~to be forwarded~~ to be for-
warded to Home authorities
together with that Promotional
states that the charge which
created his character of a suspicious, which now re-
had he immediately on hearing of the occurrence, dis-
all connection with the stamps, but he does not
taken any such steps till seven days after the
stamps - he gave a deposition - He is released.

12376.
14/2/61
(signed) L. W. Peck
acting Joint Magistrate.

14/2/61
(True Copy)
D. P. R. Kottanarayana
acting Deputy Collector



Am 2673 of 1862

Endorsement on Petition No. of
1862. presented by P. S. P. Subbiah
Subbiah.

The Collector has no appoint-
ment to give to Petitioner

Kistna District
Collector's Office
Masulipatam
17 March 1862

Collector

Part of Guntur
3 March 1861
by P. V. V. Subbiah
P. Subbiah
Magistrate in
proceedings of

the joint
Magistrate of the
charge is no
sing in it or a

is charged
under a false

whose statement
and the joint

well observes in his remarks, that this witness
of falsehood, alleging he came to the Cutchery for
in it was proved he had some days previously
ta, in fact the whole tenor of the joint Magistrate's
show the weakness & unsatisfactory nature of the

ness stated that himself and 2nd Witness saw the
by Jogannandam, the Tathiel of the Poltoor Party
W. Ragoonai Kooloo-
denies this, and says he saw no such thing.
be borne in mind that 1st Witness, Puttabee

Heet

= Ramasastru

was the ca
is made

Copy in a Letter to Encl. and
Prags to July 17. July 17 5 of 1863
stored.

Copy in a
July 17 1863

13

Disturb district
Collector, in do 15-
Dated 29th July 1862
24/15 62

With Civil Pm
N 104/62

Returned to the Party
6/15/62

With

Encl. N 103-4 of 1863
3 Encl. N 103-4 of 1863
Copy in do 1863

29 July 1863

have cleared his character of a suspicion, which now re-
had he immediately on hearing of the occurrence, dis-
all connection with the stamps, but he does not
taken any such steps till seven days after the
stamps - he gave a deposition - He is released.

14/2/61

(signed) L. W. Peck
Acting Joint

Fourth & last page. (True Copy)



Shunahottam
Acting Deputy Collector

Encl. N 2673 of 1862

Endorsement on Petition N. 879 of
1862.

"The Collector having informed
the Board that though on appeal
the decision of the Joint Magistrate,
which was adverse to Petitioner, was
reversed by the Session Judge, very
strong suspicion was said to attach
to Petitioner, they see no reason to
interfere on his behalf."

Revenue D. Office
Madras
17th May 1862

By order

Master
Acting Sub Secretary

part of Guntoor
March 1861
P. Vankiah
P. Subbiah
Magistrate in
proceedings of
the Joint
Magistrate of the

charge is no
sing in do
is charged
under a false

Encl. N 2673 of 1862

and your Magistrate differ, and the Joint
Magistrate observes in his remarks, that this witness
of falsehood, alleging he came to the Cutchary for
in it was proved he had some days previously
ta, in fact the whole tenor of the Joint Magistrate's
show the weakness & unsatisfactory nature of the

stated that himself and 2nd Witness saw the
by yoga mandam, the Takkil of the Poltoor Party
Ragoonathkooloo
denies this, and says he saw no such thing.
be borne in mind that 1st Witness, Puttahee

Heet

ramasastru

was the
is made
Copy in a Letter to End
of 7th July 1875 of 1863

Pray
store.

Copy in a
of 17th 1863

C
Board of Revenue
involvement
Dated 17th May 1862

HC
with Civil En
at 10/1/62

Returned to the Party on
the 6/10/62

WM
WRH

Copy July 1863
have cleared his character of a suspicion which now
had he immediately on hearing of the occurrence, or
all connection with the stamps, but he does not
taken any such steps till seven days after the
stamps - he gave a deposition - He is released

14/2/61

(signed) J. W. De
betting



Shankarottam
ting Deputy Co

Copy in a Letter to End
of 7th July 1875 of 1863

Copy in a Letter to End
of 7th July 1875 of 1863

3
Amr 26/3/1861

Extract from the Proceedings of the Session Court of Guntur
Dated 23 March 1861

- 1 Read again Petition N^o 3 of 1861 presented by P. Vankiah
an accredited agent for K. Yoganandam & P. Soollichah
complaining against the sentence of joint Magistrate in
Case N^o 32 of 1861 recorded in this Court's Proceedings of
the 16th Instant -
- 2 Read record of the Case received from the joint
Magistrate with his return to this Court's Precept of the
16th Idem -
- 3 The Session Judge is of opinion that the charge is not
substantiated by the evidence -
- 4 The 2nd Defendant is charged with purchasing under a
false name certain stamps -
- 5 The 3rd Defendant, who is stamp Vendor, is charged
with selling to 2nd Defendant the said stamps, under a false
name -
- 6 The principal evidence is that of 1st Witness, whose statement
before the Police and joint Magistrate differ, and the joint
Magistrate himself observes in his remarks, that this witness
has been guilty of falsehood, alleging he came to the Cutchery for
his Putta, when it was proved he had some days previously
received his Putta, in fact the whole tenor of the joint Magistrate's
remarks tends to show the weakness & unsatisfactory nature of the
evidence -
- 7 This 1st Witness stated that himself and 2nd Witness saw the
stamps purchased by Yoganandam, the Tahsil of the Poltoor Party
in the name of ^{joint} P. Ragoosai Kooloo -
- 8 The 2nd Witness denies this, and says he saw no such thing -
- 9 It must be borne in mind that 1st Witness Putta bhee

Direct

= ramasa stuba

4
Jan 26/30 of 1862

namasastoorloo, Buttiproloo Kristniak, Murredda Ramalingam (who presented the original charge), and Murredda Ragoonikiloo, whose name appears as having purchased the stamps, are all on the side of the Vasareddy party in this case, and opposed apparently to the Pottoor Party.

10 It is incredible to suppose under such circumstances, that a cunning Vakiel of the Pottoor party, should, in the presence of those connected with the Vasareddy party, have satisfied himself in perpetrating such a fraud.

11 The evidence, therefore, of 1st Witness being untrustworthy & contradictory, cannot have any weight.

12 The endeavor to prove the charge, therefore, in the opinion of the Session Judge, has quite broken down, nevertheless, there are strong grounds for suspicion that some fraud took place. 2nd Defendant admits he was at the stamp Vendor's Puteherry that day, whilst the stamp Vendor acknowledged he sold the stamps in the name of N. Ragoonikiloo on behalf of Vasareddy Paupamma & C. Verimma, to execute Paurikuts to 1st Defendant, Pottoor Sunandarow, whose Vakiel is 2nd Defendant, & strange to say when asked by the Tahasildar that very day whether such a sale of stamps had been made, pretended not to know without referring to his Boops.

13 The 3rd Defendant also pretends he did not recognize the person who purchased the stamps, altho it is his duty to know to whom he sells stamps, in order to prevent fraud similar to the present - otherwise no body would be safe from imposition and roguery, if the stamp Vendor is dishonest or neglects his duty.

14 Whatever suspicion may exist, the Session Judge -

[Signature]

Considered

Dec^r 26th 73 of 1862

* Order -

Corrections, two. *MS*

A. M. L.
Session Judge

— gauge across the

[illegible]

156/1000
18/6/2000

Handwritten signature:

[illegible]

The
 Smith & Lind & Son
 of New York
 returned to the party on
 the 6/10/12

Amr 26/3 of 1862

SEP 1862

Proceedings of the High Court of
Judicature at Madras, 27 Sep-
= tember 1862.

The following petitions were rejected:-

x x x

Criminal Petition No. 10 of 1862.

(True Extract)

The District

Acting Deputy Registrar

Handwritten signature

862 number in 2021
C. S. S. S. S. S. S.
S. S. S. S. S. S. S.

Handwritten notes in English and Tamil script, including dates like 6/10/62 and 29 July 1862.

Copy in a letter to...
July 5 of 1862

Handwritten notes in Tamil script, including dates like 29.10.1862 and 29.10.1862.

Handwritten notes in Tamil script, including the word 'பெரிய' (Peyari).

11272 No 447

R. J. J. J. J.

6th Oct 1862

Mumby W

21 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

Copy in letter to England
17th July 1863

Madras High
Court Extract

Dated 27 September
1862

J. B. J. J. J.

his application to the
Collector to restore him
to his Post has been rejected
on the ground that a
strong suspicion
was attached to Petitioner
that his appeal to the
Board of Revenue has
also met with same
success.

Submitting the Endorse-
ments of the collector
& the Board of Revenue
together with the Extract
of Proceedings of the Sessio-
& High Courts prays
for restoration to his
former Post.

1273 of 1862

From P. J. J. J. J.
Sobhan Late Stamp
Vendor of Guntur
Talook Krishna
District.

Dated 8 October
Rev. 9 October 1862
with 7 enclosures

States that he has
been falsely accused
of certain frauds in the
sale of Stamp papers
by his opponents herein
referred to & he has been
committed & acquitted
of the charge by the
Session Court, that

7

Gouvernement fédéral
Endowment =
Date 21 October 1886.

P. M. Kitchen

Ag. Dy. Leez. 6. 1841.

[Faint handwritten notes at the bottom of the page:]

The Honorable Governor in Council
The Honorable Secretary of State
Properly Solved & stamped
under of Customs & Excise
Kistna District

Respected Sir

[illegible]

founded on the evidence of purchased witnesses & committed the case to the Magistrate who also on more suspicion committed to the court.

imposed, as Supreme Judge. Having found out the truth case,
released him. & others immediately being of opinion that
neither circumstantial nor direct evidence is forth
coming to convict me.

The Superior Judge wrote in the proceedings
of 23^d March 1861. In the 8th Para 2^d witnesses denies
this & says he saw no such thing.

In the 9th & 10th Para It was borne in the mind that 1st witnesses Pattacharamadasastoti, Balapool Kistral, Munnalla Ramalingappa &c. who printed the original charge & Munnalla Ruziyyeroloo whose name appears as having purchased the stamps are all on the side of the party in this case & opposedifferentially to the Petition Party.

21. The stamps vendor did not see any body
when he was selling the stamps to Ruzumizetsoa.

In the 11th Para. I have evidence, therefore of 14
witnesses being untrust worthy & contradictory, and
have any weight.

In the 12th Para the endeavor to prove the charge, therefore in the opinion of the session Judge has quite broken down & 2^d defendant. It is strange to say when asked by the Sabasaldaw that many days before such a sale of stamps had been made pretended not to know without referring to his book.

It is the opinion of petitioner that the Government should the Stamp writer of Madras

whether he would be able, or not, to mention
- whether he would be able, or not, to mention
names of men to whom he has sold stamps in a
day without referring the book. It will be understood
that you say or not
In the 13th Para the third defendant also
pretends he did not recognize the person who
purchased the stamps although it is his duty to
know to whom he sells, in order to prevent frauds
nobody would safe, the stamp vendor is dishonest
B. neglect his duty, the stamp vendor is dishonest
as long time under the Government he never do
at any time with any construct himself, but he
antagonist Barber and his interest. Sent for the stamps he
I brought this case, simply against petitioner
thereby the superior Judge is also supported
by my unfortunate that I am a guilty I will
pray government to inquire my case and
the justice. I submitted a petition to the

the justice. I submitted a petition to the
Consequently I submitted a petition to the
Deputy Collector in charge of Treasury to favour
me back with my former post on the 26th March &
another petition to the head Collector on the 30th May
1861 although it has transpired 12 months ago
no reply were made, nor my post favoured to me
The Deputy Collector died by sudden
sickness upon which I applied a petition to the head
Collector on the 6th March 1862 the Collector endorsed
me that he has no employment to be given to the
petitioners. It that indorsement to the Revenue

I set fourth that indorsement to the Penman who
 Board. The Board favoured not an indorsement that
 ever say that they did not
 interfere and not find Justice -

Although the session Judge wrote in the

[The following text is written upside down and is largely illegible due to extreme fading and bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

Although the session Judge wrote in the

whole of proceedings that witness and others did not see during the sale of stamps, he wrote unjustly in the 12th Para to endeavour to prove the charge - therefore in the opinion of the session judge has quite broken down nevertheless there is no strong ground for suspicion that some fraud took place the 2nd defendant admits that he was in the stamp venductory that day whilst the stamp vendor acknowledges that he sold the stamps in the name of Ragoonoy cooloo this is our suspect -

The stamp vendor address the 2nd defendant - never was admitted in the stamp vendor office & did not acknowledge him, every day many persons use to come for the stamps to the office that day - at 10 of All a sooder man named Murudla Ragoonoy cooloo came to the office, purchased the stamps and went away -

On the evening the Vakil of Vasareddy party Bateproloo Kistiah and others considering to gather brought up this case by false evidence to connect to Dotoor amundarow to the Zillah Court by some fee -

The judge having known the whole of circumstances wrote unjustly by mistake in the 12th & 13th Para the words of false evidence -

Such as the 3rd defendant also pretends that he did not recognized the person who purchased the stamps although It is his duty to know to whom

he sells the stamps in order to prevent frauds similar to prevent other wise nobody would be safe from imposition rogery if the stamp vendor is dishonest or neglect -

The duty of stamp vendor is to take care of the stamps from being lost by robbery or fraud & to sell them to any body and to enter the name of purchaser in the Office Book but the stamps that were in my possession were neither lost by robbery or by fraud nor was I negligent to sell or to enter the name of the purchaser in the Office Book -

I told the name to whom I sold after seeing the Book according to my duty -

Neither that man had any fraudulent intention I donot know at all It is unjust the part of judge to charge me for an offence of which I had not any part and knew nothing -

The stamp vendor is not dishonest or neglect he served for 18 years as a Post office head and after abolishment of that station he entered in the stamp vendor post served 7 years altogether makes 25 years in the Government service without any fault and conducted himself faithfully this case was brought up by enmity to destroy each other -

Under these circumstances petitioner most humbly solicit your Excellency in council to bring his pitiful case into merciful consideration and for

order directing that he restore to his stamp
der ship, Commission and salary since he stopped
from employment, he has been unjustly remo-
ved from his post—

I pray your honor to be merciful and
just to wards this poor petitioner
Madras — —

out the 19th February
1863

I am your most faithful
& humble servant —

Pesapanty Sooliah
late stamp vendor of
Guntur

Copy in letter to England
21st Feb 1863

W. 1

Petition to England

21st Feb 1863

To

The Chief Secretary of Govern-
ment

The humble petition of

Pesapanty Sooliah late

Stamp vendor of Guntur

Talook in the Kistna Dis-
trict —

Most Honored —

Sir —

I respectfully and humbly beg
leave to represent your honorable presence
that I submitted the triplicate copies of my
Memorial to for transmission of Right honor-
able secretary of state for India on the 19th Decem-
ber 1862. I now received letter that your honor retur-
ned my petitions to Guntur therefore I prepared
another copies of triplicate memorial sent them
to your honor with this petition moreover I have
already sent the vouchers of the same petition on the
26th January 1863, I pray your honor to send the
vouchers with this memorial to state of India
and get Justice —

I have the honor to inform you that I am
residing in Checoola Kurrah house at Nijura
roy nupetta in Madras & I request you to send
the answers for my petitions to the above mention-
ed place —

Madras — —

out the 19th February
1863

I am your most obedient
& humble servant —

Pesapanty Sooliah

late stamp vendor of Guntur

To The Right Honourable Sir Charles Wood K. B.
Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorial of Pisapat,
Sookiah late Stamp Vendor in the
District of Kristnach attached to the
Presidency of Madras.

Most respectfully sheweth,
That your Petitioner begs to submit the

following details as supplementary to his Memorial of the
19th February 1863.

That shortly after your Petitioner came to
the Lutchery on the 25th January 1861, Nareda Ragoonayagoo
came to him with sixteen Rupees, and required two stamps
papers, of eight Rupees each, on account of Vasireddy Papam
ma, and J. Serranina, for executing a Document to
Pootloor Ananda Row, when your Petitioner, as was his
duty, sold them to him.

That the Petitioner sold the stamps did
to whom it was stated the Petitioner sold the stamps, as
not come to the Lutchery, nor did he buy the stamps, as
alleged.

That the Extract from the Proceedings of
the Session Court of Yennitoor dated 23rd March 1861 runs as
follows.

Para: 3. The Session Judge is of opinion, that the
charge is not substantiated by the evidence.

Para: 6. The principal evidence is that of 1st Witness,
whose

W.C.

Revenue 1863 28/1/64
No. 907 of 1863 of 1863.

From Description of
which late then
Minister of Finance
Srikrishna
which amount to Rs 100

28/1/64
Cen 3 19-6/10

25/1/64 13/11/64
With reference

The endorsement
sent to him to be
with his Memoir

addressed to the
of State for India

Major G. S. Roberts
herewith submit
a Memorial in

duplicate to the
authority & pray

Copy in a letter to England
21/1/64 17/5/64

for its transmission

Memorial of
Petitioner to the Secretary
of Government

2/3/64

20/1/64

20/1/64

Joint Mary's Grates
Record of the case
N: 32 of 1861-

10

921007.

Maing

Р. Гаг. 11

2

That under these circumstances
Petitioner begs your Lordship in Council will be
pleased to restore him to his former post; from which
he has been unjustly dismissed, or give him another,
which

That under these circumstances
Petitioner begs your Lordship in Council will be
pleased to restore him to his former post; from which
he has been unjustly dismissed, or give him another,
which

mk

Received 1862 28/1/1862
Pro: of Govt 10/3/36 2/1862

From the Editor of the

with Kate Thompson.

Index of Authors

Henry Thorne at

West-Aboriginal Products

2nd Dec 1926

See also 5/1-6/1-7/1-

*Received of C. Constable
J. G. No 1338. 20 July*

With reference to

Condolence

will be joined together

the his Memorial

relates to the identity

State for India

Dec 13/1862

13

10. 11. 1881

When erect in

Philaeate Island

discovery 4/22/2000

1

which will enable him to maintain himself and his poor family in these hard days.

For which act of Grace, and Justice your Petitioner shall, as in duty bound, Ever Pray.

Madras
13 June
1863

I have the honor to be,
Right Honorable Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant.

Resapanty Subbar -
late Stampender of
Guttoo Talook in the Puduk
District

Copy in Letter to Encl.
11/11/1863

Encl. No. 1554 of 1863

together with a supple-
mental Memorial
to the address of the same
authority.

Prays that these may
be transmitted.

Revenue 1863 Dept.
Pro. of Govt for July
No. 1554 of 1863

From Resapanty Sub-
bar late Stampender
of Guttoo Talook in Puduk
District Madras.

Dated 13th
Recd 15th } June 1863.

With 6 Encls -
S.O. No. 1338-20 July
States that with reference
to his former Memorial
addressed to the Secretary
of State for India under
date 19 February 1863,
he herewith submits
three copies of the
Decision by Joint Magistrate,

N. 376 B.

Copy in Letter to Encl.
11/11/1863
July 1863

and with the foregoing
forwarded to the Home Govt and that
intimation of the same be given
the Memorialist be informed of their
dispatch

Wm

From Resapanty Subbar
late Stampender of
Guttoo Talook in the Puduk
District
Dated 19th June 1863
Revenue 1863 Dept.
Pro. of Govt for July
No. 1554 of 1863
I have the honor to be,
Right Honorable Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant.

R. D.

N^o 1338 7338

Proceedings of Madras Government
Dated 20th July 1863.

Read again the letter from P
Subbiah late Stamp Vendor of the Guntur
and recorded in the Proceedings of Govt dated
26 Jan^y 1863 N^o 170.

Read also the following papers
From P Subbiah late Stamp Vendor here written dated 26th
of Guntur falling in the District Jan^y 19th February & 13th
June 1863.

Ordered that the Memorialists
received with the foregoing letters be
forwarded to the Home Govt and that
an intimation of the same be given
to the Memorialist be informed of their
despatch

pm

17th
18th
19th
20th
21st
22nd
23rd
24th
25th
26th
27th
28th
29th
30th

Memorialist
to be informed of their
despatch

28th Jan^y 1863

to be informed of their
despatch

to be informed of their
despatch

to be informed of their
despatch

to be informed of their
despatch

to be informed of their
despatch

to be informed of their
despatch

to be informed of their
despatch

Revenue 1863 Sept 11th
Pro: of Govt for Duty

21. 1838

Pro: of the Warehouse
of 20: Duty 1863

Memorial to
The Government
presented by O. P. Smith:
with late stamps
Vendor of the same
forwarded to the
authorities.

no
di
re
at
un
in
te
of
See
the
is
to
of
P.
N.
by
the
ap
er
sh
Pa
su
s.

no
di
re
at
un
in
te
of
See
the
is
to
of
P.
N.
by
the
ap
er
sh
Pa
su
s.

no
di
re
at
un
in
te
of
See
the
is
to
of
P.
N.
by
the
ap
er
sh
Pa
su
s.