

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	233	Press
		Mis.
	21-22	
Dated	4-2-19	1863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department
4th February 1863.

No. 21. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th January 1863, No. 212 :—

Read the following letter from J. W. B. DYKES, Esq., Collector of Nellore, to W. H. STON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd December 1862, No. 326.

SIR,

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Proceedings of the Board of Revenue under date the 15th instant, No. 8,179, directing for reasons stated the re-instatement of Kannugoo Vencata Row as Tahsildar of Kanageri Talook.

2. The Board direct his re-instatement with reference to the provisions of the Order of Government, Revenue Department, dated 19th May 1835, No. 555, which rules that "no Office except for special cause shown to the satisfaction of the Board of Revenue, shall be continued 'Acting' Tahsildar for a longer period than two months, and after that time shall be considered as confirmed in office, and entitled to the emoluments of the appointment."

3. The appointment and removal of public servants having been declared to be subject to such rules as the Governor in Council may from time to time issue under Section 3, Regulation VII of 1822, and believing that the Order quoted by the Board does not apply to the particular instance to which it has been applied by the Board, and believing further that the Order quoted has been superseded by subsequent orders issued by Government in virtue of the provisions aforesaid, viz., Revenue Department, 3rd April 1860, No. 514, I do myself the honor to request that the Board will be pleased to submit the enclosed reference on the subject for the orders of Government.

4. When I wrote to the Board my second letter from Ulavapola under date the 2nd instant, it had not occurred to me that the Order of the 19th May 1835, had been superseded by the Order of the 3rd April 1860, and was virtually opposed both to the letter and spirit of the subsequent Order. It was only next day when I was out in the District on a tour I was making in the inland Talooks of the District north of the Pennair that the bearing of the latter Order on the former occurred to me; and should the Board, taking into consideration this subsequent question I have raised, find themselves led to a different conclusion to that which they have hitherto arrived at, and allow me to leave Kannugoo Vencata Row in his present employment of Talook Serishtadar of Kandukur, I beg the enclosed reference may be returned to me, and it would only remain for me to express my pleasure at being saved the necessity of taking a step that I much regret, but nevertheless consider it is my duty, as well to the Board as to the District, to take; for, under the orders of the Board, I am answerable for the characters of the men appointed as Tahsildars. I am certain never appointed Kannugoo Vencata Row as a Tahsildar; and I am equally certain my estimate of his character must be very materially changed before I would ever consider I was doing my duty either to the District, to the Board, or the Government in recommending he should be appointed.

5. With respect to the Board's orders in the last paragraph of the Proceedings for acknowledgment, I have the honor to explain that no correspondence has passed between the Board and this Office in regard to the appointment of Puttam Vencata Krishnama Nayadu as Tahsildar of Guduru Talook. It was an appointment made at the close of the re-modelling of establishments when the Janabundi of the Guduru Talook had shown me that Vadlamudi Rangaya the Acting Tahsildar was not fit for that Talook. Having been an appointment it ought to have been reported for the Board's sanction, and I beg to express my regret for its not having been.

6. Pending the disposal of this reference I request permission to suspend carrying into effect the orders under acknowledgment.

1. The Board observe, with reference to the last paragraph of the foregoing letter, that Mr. Dykes, on receipt of the Board's Proceedings dated 15th December 1862, No. 8,179, should at once have carried out their orders requiring him to re-instate K. Vencata Row in the office of Tahsildar at Kanageri. The Board's decision was passed after a full consideration of all the objections made by Mr. Dykes to their previous instructions on the same subject. It was not therefore open to him to request, before acting on the Board's orders, that a reference should be made to Government.* Mr. Dykes will on receipt of the present Proceedings at once re-instate K. Vencata Row as Tahsildar of Kanageri.

* Vide Orders of Government in Extract Minutes of Consultation, 13th August 1835, Revenue Department, No. 490.
Board's Circular Orders, page 22.

2. With regard to paragraph 5 of Mr. Dykes' letter, stating that the appointment of Pullom Vencata Krishnama Naidu, in May 1861, to be Tahsildar of Guduru, was made without the Board's sanction, the Board observe that Mr. Dykes has failed to offer any reasonable excuse for having neglected to obtain their sanction to the appointment; and that they are not disposed now to recognize the propriety of this appointment till Mr. Dykes has made the usual report on

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
4th February 1863.

he points specified in paragraph 3 of the Proceedings of Government dated the 3rd April 1860, No. 514. He will therefore be good enough to submit this report, explaining in full his reasons for considering that a person whose period of service was so limited (under six years) was a fit person for a Tahsildar's appointment.

3. Ordered also that a copy of the letter above recorded, with its enclosures, be forwarded to Government for their orders on Mr. Dykes' appeal.

4. The Board remark, with reference to this appeal, that they directed Mr. Dykes to re-instate K. Vencata Row in his former office on two grounds; first, that Mr. Dykes was not at liberty to treat K. Vencata Row as an Officer who had not succeeded permanently to the Tahsildar's office; and, secondly, that the reductions made in his Talook Establishments did not, as shown in paragraphs 1 and 2 of their Proceedings, dated 15th December 1862, No. 8,179, compel Mr. Dykes to reduce K. Vencata Row permanently to a lower office, even if it were necessary to place him in an inferior position for a short period; that is to say, for the few weeks which elapsed between his removal and the unauthorized appointment of the person referred to in paragraph 2 above.

5. The Board are quite prepared to admit of the Order of Government relating to "Acting" Tahsildars (dated the 19th May 1855, No. 555, paragraph 6), is inapplicable to appointments made subsequent to the Order of Government dated 3rd April 1860, No. 514; but in the present case K. Vencata Row was appointed Acting Tahsildar by Mr. Elton in October 1859, when the Board's sanction to such appointments was not required; and, as an Officer already holding a Tahsildar's appointment, he was transferred by Mr. Dykes to the Talook of Kanageri in June 1860. It also appears that the Tahsildar's office in Ravor, the Talook to which K. Vencata Row was appointed by Mr. Elton to act in October 1859, became a permanent vacancy in the succeeding month of November.

6. With regard to the remark made by Mr. Dykes in paragraph 13 of his letter, that he "believes K. Vencata Row to be wholly unworthy of the position in which the Board would place him," the Board observe that Mr. Elton, when appointing this Officer to act as Tahsildar of Ravor in 1859, explained that he made the appointment in consequence of K. Vencata Row's superior qualifications and previous good conduct and that other Officers, including Mr. Dykes himself, have since described the way in which he fulfilled his duties as a Tahsildar in favorable terms. The Board annex to these Proceedings a copy of the recorded opinions to which they refer.

7. They must also remark that Mr. Dykes, by transferring K. Vencata Row to the Talook of Kanageri in June 1860, proved that at that time he did not think him an unfit person for the appointment of Tahsildar; and that neither in his order removing him from office in February 1861, nor in his letter to the Board dated the 1st October 1862, No. 250, did he state that K. Vencata Row had proved himself during his tenure of the office incapable, or in any way unfit. The Board therefore do not think it right that the question in debate should now be tried on other grounds than the ones originally raised.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed.) W. HUDLESTON, Secretary.

No. 22.

ORDER THEREON, 4th February 1863, No. 233.

1. The Government have carefully considered the papers submitted by the Board and are of opinion that Mr. Dykes' judgment of the qualifications of K. Vencata Row for the important post of Tahsildar—supported as that judgment appears to have been by the Sub-Collector—ought to have had greater weight with the Board than they have given to it. The personal claims of K. Vencata Row, urged as they were eighteen months after his removal to a lower appointment, do not appear to the Government sufficiently strong to have called for his reinstatement in that important office in disregard of the Collector's explicit declaration of his unfitness for it.

2. But the course which Mr. Dykes has seen fit to pursue places it out of the power of Government to support him in this instance. The Government cannot permit the orders of the Board to be persistently disobeyed, and though in this case the assertion of the Board's authority compels the Government to reinstate a person, in whose favor they would not otherwise have interfered, they prefer this to the alternative of seeming to countenance deliberate disobedience of orders.

3. Mr. Dykes will forthwith restore K. Vencata Row in accordance with the Board's instructions.

4. The Board will arrange, with as little delay as practicable, for the transfer of K. Vencata Row to a corresponding appointment in an adjoining District.

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

Extract from Enclosure in Board
Petition No. 2863 of 1862 from Kanagoo
Vencata Row of the District of Ravor.

K. Vencata Row during the short
time he officiated as Tahsildar of
Woodingherry has shown considerable
activity and is one of the clearest &
Inguandars in the District. On
these accounts he has been appointed
to act as Tahsildar of Ravor.

October 26, 1859.

(Signed) J. B. Elton
Collector

To
Kanagoo Vencata Rao
The Head of Police of
Ravor Taluk.

On perusing the copy of record
of the case No. 212 of 1859 forwarded by
you to the Sessions Court which accom-
panied your Azgi No. 157 dated 6th of
November, it appears that you have
displayed much zeal and activity
in

in apprehending and sending to the Court
the delinquents with some stolen property
in the gang robbery committed by them
in the houses of Vairinta Yarnadappa,
the Village Moonsiff, of Katayapale, and
on the night of the 20th October and your
diligence having appeared praise-
worthy this has been written to you
for your information -

(Signed) W. L. Whiteside
9th November 1859. Head of the Magistrate

Translated in Board's office -

I have pleasure in stating
that Mr. Venkat Rao, acting Tahsildar
of the Revenue Taluk, has exerted ex-
tremely in the most satisfactory
manner during the Samabandi or
now concluded, and has collected
a large amount of outstanding
arrears. His Taluk appears to be in
very good order at present and he is
doing his duty very well -

Balarai - } (Signed) W. L. Whiteside
Telug. 9th 1860 } Head of the Collector

Mr. Venkat Rao deserves
credit for having studied to some ex-
tremity the Penal and Criminal Proce-
dure Codes, though he was at the time
a Taluk Sheristadar -

Ramapatnam } (Signed) H. S. Thomas
22-11-62 } Acting Sub-Collector

To Mr. Venkat Rao, Tahsildar
of Kanagahally Taluk -

From Mr. Dykes, Collector -

I have appointed you to
act as Tahsildar for the said Taluk,
you have, although it is a new Taluk,
not only been well conversant of the
state of its business, but also have
realized arrears without allowing any
balances and have further expedited
the preparation of all the accounts
required for the Samabandi of this
year and effected it soon. In general
or in all respects, your behaviour is
sound

seems to be very satisfactory and as
D. Venkatas Bow Sahibdar of Souda
a Officer whose service is 23 years and
Nago Narasinga Bow Sahibdar of
Souda'sole Taluk whose service is
29 years are seniors to you in service
and are confirmed Sahibdars, and
as it does not appear to be just
that they be left unprotected for in
the same arrangement and that you
should be made Sahibdar, and as
you delayed sending the Income tax
preliminary accounts within the period
prescribed, as intimated to you that
it will be my remembrance,
therefore you are appointed to be Sheris-
tadar of Candosoor Taluk from the
1st Proximo on a salary of Rupees 55
a month - you will therefore as soon
as the arrival of Nago Narasinga Bow
at Banagerry where I have appoint-
ed as acting Sahibdar deliver
over charge to him and take
his receipts and then immediately
proceed to Candosoor Taluk
and

and inform me the date on which
you have taken charge of that office,
and will further be very careful
in the performance of the duties of
your office.

(Signed) J. W. B. Dykes
Collector

25th February 1861.

Translated in Board's Office

No 48.

Vellore,
Collector's Office,
22nd December 1862.

From,

J. W. B. Dykes Esq^r,
Collector of Vellore.

To,

J. D. Sim Esquire,
Secretary to Government, Revenue Depart.
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

The Board of Revenue having ruled,
under date the 15th instant, that one Kanugu
Venkat Ravi, my Sharistadar Nephew, should
be re-instated as Tahsildar of Kanigiri with
reference to the orders of Government in the Revenue
Department, under date the 19th May 1835, No
555. I have the honor to request that you will
be so good as to submit for the consideration
of Government, first, whether under the
circumstances of the case the order quoted is ap-
plicable, and, secondly, whether the order
itself has not been superseded by the order

Entered the Proceedings
after 12.00 noon & the
Rev. Mr. G. J. G. J. G.
14 January 1863 at 22

CL 157/62

Extract from Govt
in 1862 Addition No 2883
of 1862 -

conveyed in the second Paragraph ^{of} the Proceedings
of Government under date the 3rd April 1860,
No 574. Revenue Department.

2. The facts of the case are as follows.

3. When I joined the District, on the 26th
October 1859, my first duty was to carry out the
revision of the Revenue Establishments and
the rearrangement of Taluqs under the orders
of Mr Pelly. The District was composed
of 17 Taluqs, of which 5 were in the Sub-
Division, 12 in the Principal Division. And
in the beginning of 1860, the question having
arisen as to whether the revision of Establish-
ments was to be carried out for each division
separately, or for the District generally, the
Board ruled that the revision was to be a
general measure. And I proceeded to reduce
the number of Tahseldars from 17 to 9. and
select those who should be retained, to the

* Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue
dated 17th February
1860, No 874.

best of my judgment with reference to their personal
claims and the interests of the District.

4. When I joined the District, I found the
said Kanugo Venkat Ravi with regard to
whom the present reference is made, Acting
as Tahseldar in the then Talug of Revenue.
I had joined the District on the 26th October,
Mr Elton my predecessor, had appointed
him on the 18th with reference to certain ar-
rangements then pending consequent on the
misconduct of the Tahseldar of the Talug, Mr
Willix. On the 18th November, with reference
to the same question, I was enabled to give
Kanugo Venkat Ravi full pay, and gave it
to him. Subsequently the new Police having
been introduced, the Talug of Revenue was
merged in the new Talug of Attamkur, and
placed under the charge of Attavanam
Jagganadha Ravi, whom I did not consider
fit.

fit to remain in charge of the important Taluq
of Nellore. And, Mr. Attavaram Jagga-
natha Rao taking charge of Atmakuru,
Kannegodhat Rao was sent to Hanigiri in
the Sub Division, to take charge of the Police
Divisions of Gogulapalli and Panuru, and the
99 Dupad Villages which were to be and
were transferred 5 days subsequently from
Kurnool.

Proceedings of the
Madras Govt. Revenue
Department dated
2^d June 1860. P. 413.

5. Appointed thus to act as Tahsildar
of the new Taluq of Hanigiri on the 25th
June 1860, he remained in charge of the Taluq
till the 25th February 1861, on which date, further
reductions having taken place in the meanwhile,
I appointed him, carrying out the revision of
Establishments, the Taluq Shariestadar of
Kandukuru also in the Sub Division. I had
become aware that he was my Shariestadar
nephew. Therefore determined to employ him

in the Sub Division. And the acting appoint-
ment he had held up to that date was made
available by his transfer to Kandukuru for
Nago Narsinga Rao an old man, whom I
found the Tahsildar of Rapuru but did not
consider equal to the charge of any one of the
new Taluqs, and whom on the formation of the
new Taluq of Rapuru, I temporarily transferred
to Hanigiri, but finally appointed Sub
Magistrate of Poluru.

6. Against all these changes Kannegodhat
Rao makes no complaint at the time. He says
in a Petition presented this year to the Board
he was waiting for me to change my mind.
And this Petition he sends in when I am
absent under the leave granted me under
date the 17th April last.

7. In further explanation of the above par-
ticulars. I must add that whilst acting as
Tahsildar of Hanigiri, Kannegodhat Rao

draw pay as Tahsildar of Purnea, and subsequently in consequence of a question raised by the Civil Auditor by order dated 21st December 1860 he drew pay as Tahsildar of Manigiri from the date on which the new Officer took charge.

8. And these being the facts of the case on the Petition presented under the circumstances above stated, the Board ruled that under the order of Government dated 19th May 1835, N^o 555. Kanugotinkat Rava had become confirmed Tahsildar of Manigiri when I removed him to Kandukuru, and my removing him to Kandukuru as Taluk Shauktadar was virtually dismissing him from the office of Tahsildar, for which step I had no authority. And the Board therefore direct that he should be re-instated, an opportunity offering itself for that purpose by the degradation in the present year of our Vadlamudi

Rangaya, the Officer who was finally appointed Tahsildar of Manigiri; and whom I found when I joined the District Tahsildar of Saida-pur.

9. I submit for the information of Government. Copies of the correspondence between the Board and this Office on this subject; & the Board insisting on the employment of Kanugotinkat Rava as Tahsildar of Manigiri, it becomes my duty, however much I may regret the step in other respects, to refer the matter for the orders of Government, for I believe Kanugotinkat Rava to be wholly unworthy of the position in which the Board would place him. I am convinced he could never aspire to it; were he ordered to pass the Examinations now prescribed. And I have good reason to believe that the Sub Collector, in whose division he has been employed during the

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue
dated 28th November
15th December 1861
respectively N^o 7850
and 8179.

last two years, as Talug Shariadav, and under whose immediate orders he would be employed if appointed as Tahsildar of Kanigiri, is as much opposed to Hanugo Venkat Rao's employment in the capacity of Tahsildar, as myself.

10. The orders of Government to which the Board refer were passed in 1835 and laid down that "no Officer, except for special cause shown to the satisfaction of the Board of Revenue, shall be continued Acting Tahsildar for a longer period than two months, and after that time shall be considered as confirmed in office, and entitled to the emoluments of the appointment." And this order I would submit had reference only to ordinary occasions. It did not contemplate a revision of Establishments such as was in progress when Hanugo Venkat Rao was allowed to act for more

17 Tahsildars
of Talugs

than 2 months. It never was intended, I would submit, to give a man a title to a Tahsildarship when there was no real vacancy. I had more Tahsildars than Talugs. Officers were retained in charge of Talugs to complete the settlement of the old Talug, And as soon as the settlement of the old Talug was completed the old Talug was merged into the new Talug and the new Talug placed as far as possible under the charge of the officer under whom it was finally to remain. Some times it was convenient to allow supernumeraries to remain in charge. Generally the Supernumeraries were transferred to other Talugs as circumstances & the retirement on Pension of the older men admitted. And under these circumstances I request the Government will be pleased to decide whether the order of Government of 1835 was in any way applicable to Hanugo Venkat

Rao when acting as a Supernumerary

Tahsildar of Tanigiri.

11. If under the circumstances the order of 1835 was in any way applicable to appointments made in a transition stage such as ensued on the revision of revenue establishments, the rule should apparently have applied to Kanugo Venkat Rao in his appointment as Acting Tahsildar of Revenue to which Talug he had been appointed before I joined the District, and to which Talug he should under the rule apparently have succeeded on the resignation of Mr. Willis. - But I have not thought it necessary to go into the dates on this point, because the order quoted seems to me wholly inapplicable to the circumstances of the case.

12. Whilst I beg further to submit for the consideration of Government, whether the order of Government of the 19th May 1835 N^o 555,

quoted by the Board has not been superseded by the orders conveyed in Para. 2^d of Proceedings of the Madras Government under date the 3^d April 1860, N^o 511 Revenue Department, ordering in the first paragraph, "that the changes about to be made in the salaries and powers of Tahsildars, rendered the present a proper time to adopt further measures for securing a careful selection for this important Officer," and in the 2^d paragraph that "the Collector shall nominate for the approval of the Board of Revenue the name of the person whom he proposes to appoint for it."

13. To allow a man to become Tahsildar, because he had been allowed to remain two months acting in the office is opposed in the most direct manner not only ^{to} the letter, but the spirit of the subsequent order of the 3^d April 1860. Where would be the

Selection? And when this order is transgressed
 not in the appointment of a worthy man, but
 in the appointment of a man whom I believe
 to be wholly unworthy it seems to me a course
 is adopted the worse of that likely to secure
 a "careful Selection". And I trust under these
 circumstances the Government will consider
 I am justified in referring the orders of the
 Board for their consideration, & will issue
 such instructions as shall prevent the orders
 of 1835 being again made available to frustrate
 the wholesome provisions of 1860.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servt

Wm A. R. 2
 Collector.

[illegible][illegible]

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
Department
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours, &c.
John C. Smith

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Navy
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours, &c.,
John C. Smith

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Navy
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours, &c.,
John C. Smith

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Navy
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1868.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. Very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
John A. B. Smith, Secy. of the Navy.

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Treasury
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.

Enclosed are the reports of the
Comptroller of the Treasury
and the Secretary of the Navy
relative to the proposed
amendment of the
Act of March 3, 1849,
relating to the
collection of duties
on foreign goods
imported into the
United States.

Very respectfully,
John C. Smith,
Secretary of the Treasury.

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Treasury
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.

Enclosed are the reports of the
Comptroller of the Treasury
and the Secretary of the Navy
relative to the proposed
amendment of the
Act of March 3, 1849,
relating to the
collection of duties
on foreign goods
imported into the
United States.

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Navy
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The matter is now under consideration, and I will be glad to hear from you again when I have the opportunity to do so.

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Navy
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1868.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours, &c.,
John A. B. Smith

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Navy
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The matter is now under consideration, and I will be glad to hear from you again when I have the opportunity to do so.

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Treasury
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed amendment to the Act of March 3, 1855, relating to the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury.

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Treasury
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed amendment to the Act of March 3, 1855, relating to the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury.

[illegible][illegible]

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Navy
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours, &c.,
John C. Smith

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Navy
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours, &c.,
John C. Smith

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
Department
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1868.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed purchase of the schooner "Albatross" for the service of the Navy. The same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
John A. King

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Treasury
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed amendment to the Act of March 3, 1849, relating to the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury.

From the Hon. Secy. of the Navy
to the Secy. of the Treasury
Washington, D.C.
June 15, 1857.
Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the proposed amendment to the Act of March 3, 1849, relating to the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury.

1. The Collector reports on a Petition No. 3,304, dated 31st October 1862, presented to the Board by Kanaga Venkat Row, late Tahsildar of Canagherry, complaining of his having been reduced from the office of Tahsildar to the appointment of Taluk Sheristadar without sufficient cause, and without the Board's sanction.

2. It appears from the Petitioner's statement that he was appointed by the late Collector Mr. Elton, to act as Tahsildar of Ravor in October 1859; that on the 25th June 1860, Mr. Dykes, the present Collector, transferred the Petitioner from Ravor to act as Tahsildar of Canagherry; that on 21st December 1860 Mr. Dykes made this appointment permanent; and that, subsequently, on the 25th February 1861, he reduced the Petitioner to the inferior post of Sheristadar in the Taluk of Cundacoor.

3. The Petitioner furnishes copies of the several orders conferring on him the above appointments, with copy of the Collector's orders dated the 25th February 1861, appointing him a Taluk Sheristadar. He complains, with reference to the last mentioned order, that though the chief ground assigned for removing him from his office of Tahsildar was his short period of service, other persons junior to himself in the public service have since been appointed Tahsildars in the Nellore District; and that as he held the office of Tahsildar for about three years, he ought, with reference to the Orders of Government dated the 19th May 1835 (Board's Circular Orders Volume 1 (page 228), to have been considered as confirmed in the office.

4. Mr. Dykes in the letter above recorded states that he does "not propose to promote the Petitioner as he is his Sheristadar's nephew;" that on his appointment to Nellore (in 1860) he found the Petitioner "acting" as Tahsildar of Udayagiri; and that as soon as he heard of his relationship to his Sheristadar he did not approve of the appointment, but allowed Petitioner to remain in it, pending the changes consequent on the re-organization of the Establishment. Mr. Dykes also remarks that the Petitioner has falsely stated that Mr. Dykes confirmed him in the Tahsildarship, and requests that the Petitioner may be punished for making this false statement.

5. The Board observe that Mr. Dykes ought to have replied to the claim made by the Petitioner, to the effect that by the Order of Government above referred to, he should have been considered as confirmed in his appointment. The Order in question is perfectly clear on this point, and expressly directs that no Officer, "except for special cause shown to the satisfaction of the Board of Revenue, shall be continued 'Acting' Tahsildar for a longer period than two months, and after that time shall be considered as confirmed in office, and entitled to the emoluments of the appointment." Mr. Dykes acted in contravention both of the letter and the spirit of that Order in retaining the Petitioner as acting up to June in Ravor, that is for six months after Mr. Dykes joined, and then appointing him again "Acting" at Canagherry, when the Tahsildar's office was at the time vacant.

6. With regard to the false statement imputed to the Petitioner, the Board do not believe that the Petitioner intentionally stated anything false. He ascribes the error in fact to his having employed another person to prepare his English Petition and its enclosed translations. The Board readily accept this explanation, for it is not at all probable that the Petitioner should have intended to practice any deception in the matter. He could not have expected that a mis-statement on such a point would escape undetected, nor was it really essential to his case to prove that the Collector had confirmed him in an appointment, which by the Orders of Government it was the duty of the Collector to treat as confirmed, whether he had actually passed his own orders confirming it, or not.

7. The Board are further of opinion that V. Venkat Row's relationship to the Sheristadar in the Collector's Office would not be a sufficient ground for removing him from his office of Tahsildar. This circumstance should have been considered when the Petitioner was first appointed; but, in any case, the fact referred to by Petitioner, that the Taluk of Canagherry to which he stood appointed is in the Sub-division, obviates any practical objections that might exist to the two relatives both holding important offices in the same District.

8. The Board therefore direct that K. Venkat Row be re-instated in the Tahsildarship of Canagherry Taluk; and request that Mr. Dykes will not on any future occasion fail to observe the Orders which have been passed for his guidance in making or filling up such appointments.

9. They also deem it necessary to point out that Mr. Dykes, whenever he may have occasion to visit a public servant with deprivation or other punishment, should distinctly record each and every ground on which his orders are based. They do not think it just to the parties concerned that on such occasions a Collector should found his orders on different grounds from those which are subsequently assigned, when the case comes up before the superior authority in appeal. The Board refer in this case to the fact that the Collector justifies his having removed K. Venkat Row from the Tahsildar's office by stating that Venkat Row is related to the Collector's Sheristadar, though nothing on that point appears in Mr. Dykes's order of the 25th February 1862, removing Venkat Row from his office. The Petitioner complained, in respect to the ground actually given in that order for his removal, that the proceeding was unjust, inasmuch as others whose service had not been so long as his own had subsequently been made Tahsildars; and the Collector should not by his silence on this point have allowed the Board to infer that this complaint was well founded.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. W. B. Dykes, Esq., Collector of Nellore.

Exd. J. Wright.

Read the following letters :—

From J. W. B. DYKES, Esq., Collector of Nellore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 1st December 1862, No. 304.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Board's Proceedings under date the 28th November, and state the requisite instructions shall be issued to the Sub-Collector to re-appoint Kanugo Venkat Row Tahsildar of Kanigiri.

2. The Board observe nothing is shown in my Order of the 25th February 1862, removing Kanugo Venkat Row of his relationship to my Serishtadar, and the Board previously observe that when a Collector visits a public servant with deprivation or other punishment, each and every ground on which the order was based should be recorded.

3. I beg to bring to the Board's notice that the order in question was issued not in "February 1862," but on the 25th February 1861; and I beg to bring further to the Board's notice that the Petitioner has failed to explain why he allowed a year and a half to elapse without bringing forward his claim.

4. I likewise beg to state that I was not aware of the Order of Government to which the Board refer, making the appointment of Tahsildar an exception to all other appointments. I was not aware when I appointed a man to be Tahsildar of the Taluk, in which Kanugo Venkat Row was acting, that as he had acted more than two months, I was dismissing him; and under these circumstances the Board will observe that the remarks as to what I should have recorded are inapplicable. Where I have punished a public servant, I trust the records of this District will show, that I have invariably recorded the reasons. And had I considered it necessary on these grounds, in this instance, to go into details, I should have stated that I did not consider Kanugo Venkat Row in any way fit for the office of Tahsildar.

5. In conclusion I beg respectfully to bring to the Board's notice the state of the Sub-division under the Order under acknowledgment, in respect to relationship. There are three Taluks. In one the nephew of my Serishtadar becomes Tahsildar. In Ongole the brother of my Head Vernacular Clerk is Tahsildar. In Kandukur, the third, the Tahsildar is the close relative of the third Clerk in the Sub-division, and the Town Sub-Magistrate of Nellore. Relationship could scarcely go farther; and in requesting permission, as the head of the District, to place on record my protest against its being allowed to go so far, I beg likewise that the Board will be pleased to consider whether the Order under acknowledgment is in accordance with their Proceedings under date the

15th February 1861, No. 857, in which the Board regretted* to observe that the
* 10th paragraph. Nellore Huzuru Kacheri which a few years back "earned for itself a bad notoriety
† 3rd paragraph. in the matter of close relationship" is but little improved, and their Proceedings of the 21st February 1861, No. 976, in which they observed† that the "public
"service in Nellore should be freed as far as possible from the family influences of which Mr. "Dykes complains;" and the Board expressed their willingness "to give their best consideration
"to his suggestions that may appear expedient in the present state of things."

From the same Officer, dated Ulavapondla, 2nd December 1862, No. 308.

1. Since writing to you yesterday it has occurred to me, that the Board have misconceived the facts of the case in regard to Kanugo Venkat Row. The Order of Government, referred to by the Board, is not applicable.

2. The Order sets forth that a Tahsildar, after acting more than two months, is to be considered as permanently appointed. But this, I presume, means, if there is a vacancy; and in this case of Kanugo Venkat Row there was not.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 28th November 1862.

Despatched

Received

No. 7,850.

Commenting on the dismissal of K. Venkat Row from his Office of Tahsildar of Canagaherry, and directing that he be re-instated in his post.

3. When Kanugo Venkat Row was acting as Tahsildar of Kanigiri in 1861, and had been acting there more than two months, and I appointed nevertheless to that Taluk Vadlamudi Rangaya, the Tahsildar of Saidapuram, the revision of the Revenue Establishments was in progress.

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Chendaluru | 5. Sangam. |
| 2. Inamanamelluru. | 6. Tummalatalapuram. |
| 3. Davaguduru. | 7. Saidapuram. |
| 4. Kaligiri. | 8. Kota. |

In some instances it was the Tahsildars of the Taluks that stood that made way,

There was no vacancy. I had to reduce the number of my Tahsildars from seventeen to nine. The eight Tahsildars noted in the margin had to retire, because there was no vacancy; and the Board will see that, under these circumstances, the

Order of Government to which they refer, and on which their Order to "re-instate" Kanugo Venkat Row is based did not apply.

4. As I have already stated,* when I sent Kanugo Venkat Row to be a Serishtadar after acting more than two months as Tahsildar, I was not aware of the Order of Government making the appointment of Tahsildar an exception to the general rule. I have an indistinct idea that I had some way become acquainted with the rule one time or another, but it was not in my mind then, and, so far as I can remember, it was not brought to my notice by either nephew or uncle, a fact that puzzled me not a little when I wrote to the Board yesterday. But this morning it is all clear. On the receipt of the Board's orders, like the Board, I overlooked the fact that the revision of the Revenue Establishments was in progress when Kanugo Venkat Row asserts his claim to the appointment was disregarded; and when I remembered the fact this morning, it was easy then for me to see, and the Board will I doubt not see also, why Kanugo Venkat Row did not bring forward his claim at the time, and why Kanugo Venkat Row waited till I was away on leave in England.

5. I have not the correspondence by me, but believe I am correct, in stating, that in my previous letter on this subject I requested that the Board would take notice of the falsehood told by Kanugo Venkat Row in saying I had "dismissed him," and the Board in their reply expressed their opinion that I had judged Kanugo Venkat Row harshly; that he had no intention of telling a story; and that he referred to the constructive appointment conferred on him by the Order of Government, on which the Board's order was based. May I beg the Board's reconsideration of this question with reference to the facts set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

6. And in begging that the Board will be pleased to reconsider their Order "re-instating" Kanugo Venkat Row as Tahsildar of Kanigiri, I beg that the Board will be pleased to consider, first, whether with reference to the extent to which relationship exists in this District it is desirable Kanugo Venkat Row my Serishtadar's nephew should be made a Tahsildar; and secondly, with reference to the grossly defective manner in which he has discharged his duties as Taluk Serishtadar, as set forth in my last letter, and his conduct has set forth in this, it is to the interest of the public service that he should remain any longer a public servant in Nellore.

7. Pending the receipt of the Board's reply to this reference, I have requested the Sub-Collector, demi-officially to take no further steps in respect to the orders of the Board under reference.

1. The Board observe that the Order of Government dated 19th May 1835, under which Kanugo Venkat Row was to be considered confirmed as Tahsildar of Conagherry at the expiration of two months from the date on which he was appointed to act, contemplates an actual vacancy in the substantive appointment in which an Officer has been appointed "acting." In the present instance the Tahsildar's office was vacant at the time K. Venkat Row was first appointed to act. If, after he had succeeded to the confirmed appointment, there was any necessity for reducing him to a lower office, in consequence of a reduction in the number of the Taluks in the Nellore District, it was open to the Collector to take that course; and in such a case it would be immaterial whether the officer reduced held a confirmed appointment or not. Any one reduced under such circumstances would lose his appointment because his office was abolished, but would have a just claim to be re-instated in a similar office as soon as a vacancy should occur.

2. On the present occasion, the Board, on referring to the annual List of Establishments for 1862, find that Puttam Venkata Kistnama Nayadu, the present Tahsildar of Guduru, was appointed to that Taluk on the 6th May 1861, about three months after K. Venkat Row was reduced. It is, therefore, apparent that Mr. Dykes, if any necessity existed for reducing K. Venkat Row to the Serishtadar's office for a time, might have replaced him in his old position on the above date. It also happens at the present time that the Tahsildarship of Conagherry, the office from which K. Venkat Row was removed, is vacant. The Board therefore request Mr. Dykes will re-instate K. Venkat Row in the vacant appointment, as they before directed, for this, in their opinion, is the proper course of proceeding.

3. With regard to the other points referred to by Mr. Dykes, the Board observe that the Petitioner explained in his Petition, as his reason for not having immediately applied to the Board, that he waited in the hope that Mr. Dykes would, of his own accord, have recognized his claim to an appointment equivalent to the one from which he was removed.

4. In reply to paragraph 5 of the first letter recorded above, the Board remark that in the Proceedings quoted by Mr. Dykes, they expressed their readiness to consider any suggestions he might make for relieving the Nellore District from the undue influence of a single family, under the circumstances Mr. Dykes described in paragraph 9 of his letter to the Board dated 2nd October 1860, No. 164; in which, after adverting to particular persons employed in his District who belonged to the Gatura family, he observed that it would be a long list, were he "to enumerate the other employes who belong to this same family and swell its influence." The Board do not consider that a District can be properly described as under this kind of influence, when only two of a single family are employed in it; nor do they think it necessary to prescribe that no two persons who are related to each other should be employed in the same District. They also continue of opinion that in the order reducing K. Venkat Row to the office of Serishtadar, Mr. Dykes should have specified all the material reasons on which that step was taken; and that no sufficient reason has been shown them for refusing to recognize K. Venkat Row's claim to a Tahsildarship on the general ground of unfitness.

5. Mr. Dykes will be so good as to inform the Board on what date he applied for their sanction to the appointment of Puttam Venkata Kistnama Naidoo to be Tahsildar of Guduru. It does not appear from the Board's records that any correspondence has passed between the Board and the Collector in regard to this appointment.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. W. B. Dykes, Esq., Collector of Nellore.

Ed: J. Wright.

Directing for reasons stated the re-instate-
ment of K. Venkat Row as Talsildar of the
Canaherry Taluk.

No. 8,179.

OC 157/63

Received

Despatched

Dated 15th December 1862.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

1862. Department.
Circular No. 2 in a letter from
the Collector of Malabar to the Secy,
to Govt. Revenue Department, dated
22nd December 1862 No. 40.

It seems to me necessary in this case to uphold the Board's order - It is always
undecidable that a Collector should be called upon to supply a man of whom he
does not approve, but the course taken by Mr. Bykes presents the Govt. for supporting him.
He did not obey the Board's repeated orders & then appeal - he has thus isolated a standing
rule & is in open defiance against superior authority - Very strong grounds would
be necessary to justify such conduct which is subversive of administrative order & discipline
and I find no sufficient justification - Mr. Bykes may think indifferently of the Govt. but
in comparison with other applicants for Subsidships, he has been so prominent as to be
T.O.

Revenue Department
These papers re-
-late to a difference be-
-tween the collector of Malabar
Mr. Bykes, and the Board
of Revenue as to the re-
-appointment of one K. Ven-
-kat Row as a Subsidar
in that district.

It appears that
Mr. Elton appointed Ven-
-kat Row to act as Subsid-
-dar of Pooor on the 18th
October 1859 - Mr. Bykes
joined the district on the
26th idem and made no
change, save that on the
18th November being eva-
-lued to give Mr. Venkat
Row the full pay of the
office, he did so - The new
Police was subsequently in-
-troduced and the Pooor Sa-
-book being merged in
another Mr. Bykes on
the 25th June 1860 transferred
Venkat Row as acting Sub-
-sildar

Siddar of Kunnigherry a newly formed Salook in the sub division. The revision of the Salooks is meanwhile continues, (the number of Salooks being thereby reduced from 17 to 9) and ultimately on the 25th February 1841, Mr. Sykes reduced Venkat Rao to the post of Shristadar appointing an old Sahildar (who had lost his Salook in the revision) to the Sahildary of Kunnigherry.

In July 1842 Venkat Rao appealed to the Board who after receiving the collector's explanation have ordered his reinstatement as Sahildar of Kunnigherry which Salook is now again vacant.

The collector objects to this, and appeals to Govt.

In forwarding the appeal the Board remark that they directed Venkat Rao's reinstatement on two

designated, viz through incompetency & through relationship to another high officer in the District, when Mr. Sykes himself paid him the full salary of Sahildar in Beour, & afterwards appointed him to the Beour Salook? The latter rule

was forwarded by the Board upon grounds of incompetency

Mr. Sykes complains of Venkat Rao remaining silent for 18 months after he had been put down to a Shristadarship, but this does not show that he acquiesced in his degradation. It merely argues that he had not moral courage to appeal against the head of the District while still in the spot of authority. I cannot blame Venkat

Rao for this, but after such delay the Board might have declined to interfere & told Venkat Rao that he must try to rise again by gaining the approval of his immediate superiors. This would perhaps have been better than putting Venkat Rao back in the Collector's hat & the Board thought that justice to Venkat Rao demanded a different course & as their order has been disobeyed Mr. Sykes has placed himself in a position where Govt. cannot support him. Beour is in the sub. div. division, but when an opportunity occurs it will be well to send Venkat Rao to a taluk in an adjoining District. G.M.

two grounds - first, that Mr. Sykes was not at liberty to treat him as an officer who had not succeeded permanently to the Sahildar's office, secondly that the changes made in his Salook establishment did not compel him to reduce Venkat Rao permanently.

The first objection is based on an order of Govt. dated 19th May 1835 which declares that "no officer, except for special cause shown to the satisfaction of the Board of Revenue shall be continued 'acting' Sahildar for a longer period than 2 months and after that time shall be considered, as confirmed in office and entitled to the emoluments of the office." This order they admit is inapplicable to persons appointed subsequent to the order of Govt. dated 3rd April 1840 but they point out

out that Venkat Rao
was nominated Acting
Sahildar by Mr. Elton
prior to the latter's
order and was continued
in that and similar
offices by Mr. Sykes until
February 1861. Mr. Sykes
meets the objection by
admitting that he was
not aware of the order
of 1835 - and urging that
the order is inapplicable
in as much as when Ven-
-kat Rao was nominated
there was no actual va-
-cancy - and that it is
superseded by the order
of April 1860. The Board
deny the assertion of
there having been no
vacancy - but it seems
to me that Mr. Sykes'
admission of his having
been in ignorance of
the order of 1835 and
the fact that he appointed
Venkat Rao

Venkat Rao only to
act when he might
have confirmed - or
him, under this
objection of no
real weight. Mr. Sykes
ought to have been
acquainted with the
order but as he
was not, the Govern-
-ment can scarcely
- by, I think, confirm
a claim thus ac-
-quiesced by a mere
oversight. Mr.
Sykes, it is to be
observed, expressly
- by states that he
found

found Venkut Row
"acting" when he
joined the district
and allowed him
to continue though
he did not approve
of the appointment
on account of Venkut
Row's relationship
to the Sheristadar.

The second
objection is that
the reductions in
the Labok establish-
ments did not com-
pel W. Dykes
to reduce Venkut
Row permanently.

I do not see that Mr. Dykes
urges the impossibility of
making Venkut Row a
Tabildar. He says, indeed,
that when Venkut Row was
acting in "Kannagherry" there
was no vacancy, "but the
context shows his meaning
to be that as there were 8 old
Tabildars to be absorbed or
otherwise provided for there
was no vacancy for mere
acting incumbent as Venkut
Row was in his view. In
fact the very office in which
Venkut Row was acting ap-
pears to have been vacant
till February 1861 - when one
of the reduced Tabildars
was confirmed in it. Mr.
Dykes line of argument
seems to me to be that

Venkut

Vencut Row was not en-
titled under the orders quoted
and circumstances stated
to be considered a permanent
Tahsildar and that there
are valid objections to his en-
holding that office whether
so entitled or not.

It seems to me that
the Board have failed to
make good their position
that Vencut Row has a right
to be restored to the grade of
Tahsildar - and even had
it been otherwise his rein-
statement must depend
on his fitness for the post.
The testimonials of his in-
efficiency which the Board
submit, even with such
support as his employment
as Tahsildar for two years
afford

afford them do not seem
to me to outweigh the
Collector's reiterated asser-
=ances of his incapacity...
The Board do not appear
to have any personal acquaint-
ance with Vencut Row while
the Collector after two years
experience of his qualifications
declares emphatically that
he does "not consider Mr. Vencut
Row in any way fit for the
office of Tahsildar" - that he
is "wholly unworthy of the
position in which the Board
would place him" and that
the Sub Collector is equally
opposed to his employment
in that capacity.

Against such testi-
mony the reinstatement
of Vencut Row seems to me

impossible

impossible - especially when
the sole ground would be
his "constructive" appoint-
ment as before explained.

The office of Tahsildar
is now one of great importance
both to Government and
the people and it is essen-
tial that Collectors should
be held responsible for the
appointment of fitting
men to the post. It is
right for the Board to en-
take care that in their ex-
amined to procure well
educated men Collectors
do not disregard the just
claims of old servants who
possess every qualification
except that of an English
education which was not
obtainable in their ^{you. th} youth

and

and which may very ex-
probably be amply com-
pensated by matured ex-
perience and lengthened
judgment and lengthened
experience. but on this oc-
casion the claims of the
person whom the Board
have ordered the Collector
to reinstate seem to rest far
more on the accident of an
old order having been over-
looked than on the more im-
portant consideration of
thorough efficiency.

Mr. Dykes has on his
part laid himself open to
censure by not re-instating
Venknt Row pending the result
of his appeal according to
standing orders.

J. S.

There is a difficult question
to decide as all parties are
in the wrong -

It appears to me that
Mr. Hughes' judgment of
the capacity of Kencala Row
backed as it appears to
have been by the Lake
Collector ought to have had
greater weight with the
Board than they have
chosen to put it. - Then
does not appear to be
ground to suppose that
Kencala Row has had
strong claims upon
the Govt. as to justify
the Board in forcing him
back upon the Collector
in opposition to his ex-
pressed opinion & wish
or that other hand Mr. Hughes
has placed himself alto-
gether in the wrong by
refusing to carry out the
directions of the Board -
to decide in favour of
Mr. Hughes would be on
point of fact - equivalent
to a concession that he was
justified in acting as he
did - that cannot do, for
he acted most improper-
ly - on the other hand I
differ from the decision of
the Board. I place a man
in office whom I have good
reason to believe is unfit

for it. - Still however I must think I am well enough
advised the Collector wrong - The Board however should be
informed that they have acted unjustly, and that the only reason
why the Govt. has affirmed their decision, has been the accident
of Mr. Hughes in not obeying instructions given to them -
directions they should be given for the removal of Kencala Row
from the district with as little delay as possible.

I concur in the above decision of the

President -

JP

Proceedings of the Madras Govt. No. 232.
Under date the 4th July 1873.

Read the following Resolution
Directing the Collyer of Bellary of the Board of Revenue.
on receipt of this Pro. at once to
re-instate K. Venkata Row in the
office of Tahsildar of Kamageri.

Here enter the 14th Jan 1873 No. 212

The pt. have carefully
considered the papers
submitted by the
pt. and are of
opinion that when
by the judgment
of the ~~case~~ finali-
fications of K. Ven-
kata Row for the
important post of
Tahsildar - supported
as that judgment
appears to have been
by the pt. (Mr. - ought
to have had greater
weight with the Govt.
than they have printed
it. The person at

MR
YK
JP

claims of K. Ven-
kata Row as they were 18 months after his removal to a
lower appointment. -

appear to the fact
sufficiently strong
to ^{have called for} ~~justify~~ his
reinstatement were he
in that important
office in disregard
of the C.M.'s explicit
declaration of his
unfitness for it.

But the course
which Mr. Dykes
has seen fit to
pursue places it
out of the power of
fact & support him
in this instance.
The fact cannot per-
mit the order of
the W.D. to be per-
sistently disobeyed
and thus in this
case the assertion of

the W.D. authority
compels the fact to
re-instate ~~re-instated~~ ⁱⁿ
~~restore~~ a person, whom
they will they would
not have ~~re-in~~ ^{prefer}
-ferred, they ~~accept~~
this to the alterna-
-tive of seeming to
countenance de-
liberate disobedience
of order.

Mr. Dykes will
for the with the stone
K. Venkata Rao
in accordance with
the W.D. instructions.

The W.D. will
arrange with as
little delay as
practicable for the
transfer of K. Ven-
-kata Rao to a corresponding
officer in Men 2 in an
agony district.

Revenue 1863 Dept^d
Pro: of Govt for February

N. 233.

Pro: of the Madras Govt^d
D^y February 1863.

Proceedings Board
of Revenue directing
the Collr of Madras to re-
instate H. Venkat Rao
in the Office of Tahsildar
of Kanagiri, with orders
thereon.

N. 21 & 22.