M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 513 Press ~~Mis.~~

136-137

Dated 14 - 3 — 1963.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th March 1863.

No. 136. Read the following Petition of VENTHOOLOOMILLY NAGAISWARA ROW, late Income Tax Clerk, Sub-Collector's Cutcherry, Kistna District, to the Honorable Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B., Governor, dated Mylapoor, 12th February 1863 :—

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That no any mistake was found whatever in Petitioner's service, that the Tahsildar wrote to him letters marked A and B about the house affairs, but that Tahsildar has been restored to his situation while the Petitioner who stated the true fact of the said letters, has been dismissed from service. Petitioner served the circar for about twenty-three years without any complaint whatever, but the Collector dismissed him from service on a trifling matter through misrepresentation caused by the lower employés of his Cutcherry. The Board and the Government confirmed the Collector's decision upon which Petitioner presented Memorial with original enclosures translated to Her Majesty's Privy Council for their perusal, in order that the Petitioner obtain justice.

I request your Honor's attention to the documents marked B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and R, which shows the grounds of my dismissal alluded to in the documents marked A to be false, I therefore beg to peruse the documents and render me justice.

No. 137. ORDER THEREON, 14th March 1863, No. 513.

Ordered that the Memorial received with the foregoing letter be forwarded to the Home Authorities, and that an intimation of the same be given to the Memorialist.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸಿಆಸುಇ ೧೦೦ ಸಿಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್ ೨೦೧೮

ಸಚಿವಾಲಯ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೨೭ ಜೂನ್ ೨೦೧೮

ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫)

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

1. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

2. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

3. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

4. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

5. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

6. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

7. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, ೧೯೬೪ (ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೪ ೧೯೬೫) ರ ಕಲಂ ೭೯ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ೭೯ ಬಿ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಾಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

Machilipatam & Guntur
Complains of the injustice
done him, notwithstand-
-ing the orders of Govt
in his behalf - & prays
for enquiry & redress -
Copy ma Letter to England
dated 16th March No 22 of 1860
transferred to the
Chief Secretary to
Government.

Pynder
Stainburne Ward
Private Secy.

Gr Bruce
19 July 1860.

From No 2136 of 1860.

V. Nagéswara Rão.
Sarvádhikárí's Gumásta in
the Collr's Kacheri of the
Kistna district - G. G.,
dated 23d May &
rec'd 9 June 1860.
with 3 enclosures

No. 16

States that while he was
holding the situation of
Record keeper of 30 Rs.
Salary, but doing the du-
ties of another post of
35 Rs without drawing
that salary, he was,
instead of being kept in
the Record keepership the
salary of which was made
40 Rs. under Mr Pelly's
arrangement, or promoted
to any other post for his
services, reduced to the
lower post of English
Clerk in the Guntur Sub
-Collectorate of 25 Rs salary
tho he is not acquainted
with English - in the ar-
-rangements Consequent
on the union of the D.

RETURNED UNDER THE REVISED PETITION RULES.
PARA 5.

అర్జీలనుగురించి ప్రవిరించబడ్డనిబంధనలు.

X. గవరన్మెంటువారు తప్పవద్దికివచ్చే అప్పీలులోదవకపుపుట్టించినలో
వట యేదయినాపకముఖ్యమయిన తాజావిషయము నమూపుచెయ్యబడిరుంటేతప్ప
అదేవిషయమై యివ్వబడే రెండోఅర్జీ ఆలోచనలోకితేవడములేదు.

Eyncaatt

Deputy Secretary to Government.

9th August 1860

in England dated 23rd November 1858 and in consideration of the injustice done to me, were pleased to reinstate me in my situation of Recordkeeper, the salary of which is 30 Rupees a month, with the arrears of pay. Finding that Mr [illegible] has fixed the salary of Recordkeeper 40 Rupees in the new [illegible] of the Collector's [illegible] removed me to another office [illegible] employ: ment of my former situation during [illegible] of [illegible] District, with a view that I may not bring forward eventually my claim to my former post.

Subsequently during the [illegible] the new [illegible] [illegible] by Mr [illegible] [illegible] transferred to [illegible] Collector's Establishment

[illegible] reduced pay of 25 Rupees [illegible] of being appointed to one of [illegible] Clerk situations of 30 Rupees each whereupon I have laid before the Board my petition 24th May, the injustice to which I was subjected.

The endorsement passed by the Collector of [illegible] District on the 15th January 1858 on my said petition [illegible] Revenue which was referred to him for disposal as well as another passed by the same officer on the [illegible] one on a petition previously addressed to the Board and Government are herein enclosed favorable [illegible] thereof will show to your [illegible] Government the injustice I have met with.

It will be clear to your

[illegible] debts [illegible] forcibly impressed by the Conclusion which
[illegible] the writer has drawn from the [illegible] to
[illegible] that he was induced by
the Circumstances stated to address you
[illegible] and
[illegible] that he has always
[illegible] trustworthy man; and that he
[illegible] to the duties of
[illegible] Collectorship
[illegible] at Inverness
[illegible] Rum
[illegible] Tobago
[illegible] Should
[illegible] Vacancy
[illegible] Therefore most earnestly
[illegible] to be favoured
with that Office
[illegible] 24th May, as well as many Freeholders
[illegible] and
[illegible] Situation
[illegible] Collectorship of Stornoway
[illegible] to favour me either with my
former Situation of Record Keeper

J. Grigson Esqr

[illegible] Commissioners [illegible] the
[illegible] Establishments [illegible] the Creation
of the Fifteen Districts directed to
the Collects to reduce the [illegible]
[illegible] Servants, whereas many other
Servants who are Junior to me
[illegible] Higher Salaries which Circumstance
[illegible] Government
call for a full Report of Services of
the existing Establishments [illegible]
the 25th of May last, under the Orders of

Salak is about to be abolished - Prays that he may be restored to his former situation of Record Keeper, or to either of the two situations within specified.

Transferred to the Chief Secretary to Government -

By order
Srinivasa Ward
Private Secy

Govt Office
27th July 1860

Jam
No 2202 of 1860.
12

V. Nagéswara Rão -

Sub Collr's office
Guntur, in the Kistna
District - 16. 7. 60.

16th July &
2d Augt 25th July 1860.

with 3 encls

No 43

Submits the Cond.t of the Collr of Guntur & recapitulates the circumstances of his former petition with reference to his having been reduced to a lower situation of 25 Rs. salary in the Guntur Sub Collectorate. States that he declined the situation of Salak Sarishtadar of Mangalagiri offered to him by the Collr. as that

RETURNED UNDER THE REVISED PETITION RULES.
PARA 5.

ఆర్డీలనుగూర్చి శుభింపబడ్డది.

No. Xవరన్నెంటువారు తమపర్తికివ్వ్చే అప్పీలుమొదలకాయితములు పుట్టించినమొదట యేపయినావకాశమున్నయిన కాజావిషయము నమూనాపత్రియ్యబడినంపేనేకప్ప అదేవిషయమై యిప్పుడే రెండోఅప్పీ ఆలోచనలోకితేవడమునలేదు.

Attested

Deputy Secretary to Government.

9th Augt 1860

Enclosure
Copies with
translations of
A to H E.

3

Enclosures

Copies with

translations

A to H

G. Thornhill Esq^re Acting Collector
of the Kistna District

To Vanmaluremaddy Nagaswer Row
Incomtaxe clerk in the Sub Collector's Office

The joint Magistrate being informed
that Cavoor Lutchmeen Row the Talukdar
who went to enquire into a Murder Committed
in the field of Sonnavaraptpaud, had Carried
on a Correspondence with you by Letters
in Order to know the Circumstances that
passed in the Joint Magistrate's Office
regarding the said Case, the said Officer
got secret Randhavey a Police Peon of the
said Taaluk who brought a Letter to
you and enquired him - He (Peon)
stated that he brought and delivered a
Letter to you from Lutchmeen Row
requesting you to inform him about
certain points in the Murder Case. The
said Peon also stated that Narasing
Bhan a Revenue Peon also brought a
Letter to you on the said matter and that

you

you had sent a Peon through the said Gursaroy Khan. Gursaroy Khan also stated in the same way From the enquiry made by the present Magistrate of your and your Sons Conduct is Evident to find out the truth of this matter it appears that you Concealed the Contents of the Letter said to have been brought to you by the said Peons; that you did not reveal the truth, Concealed the Letter first brought to you and produced Letter number 2 and by denying the enquiry called from you Sent for an Peon of the above Letters. From the Statements of your Son Ramoo Sudhoodan who is said to have seen and read the Letter numbered A (which was brought by Ramdhanny) both in the first instance and afterwards, it appears that he stated that it was mentioned in it that "no Letter was received from Sunday", where as in the said Letter no such wording was used. In Consequence of this, full suspicion is entertained towards you that you

Concealed

Concealed the Original Letter and sent for and produced Separate ones, that you Carried on a Correspondence with Lutchmeen Rao informing him the Circumstances that [illegible] in the Bazaar about the said murder Case; that you did not reveal the truth, and that you ~~did not~~ both gave false Depositions; With reference to the instances appearing on the Public Record about your Conduct, and as your present Post of Incumbrance Clerk is one the duties of which are to be discharged with much Responsibility and integrity the Sub Collector wrote a Letter No. 142. on the 11th Instant to the effect that your character is not so and that he cannot trust you at all to take work from you in your Capacity I perused the said Letter as well as the Circumstances about you as per Reports mentioned in Letter No. 119 (Magistrates Department) written by the said Office on the said date about your Son

Ramoo

Canon Sartoroloo as well as the Correspondence
Connected with the Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue No 2407 dated 18th May 1860
which are on the Record of this Office; also
the Correspondence referred to therein, regarding
your dismissal from the Office of Inland
dar in 1854. On a perusal of all the
said papers, I concur fully in the
Opinion of the Lieb Collector, Considered
that you should not be allowed to
remain in your post and accordingly
dismiss you from this date. You are
hereby directed to deliver over Charge of
your Office of Incometax Clerk according
to the Order of the Lieb Collector

Provincial Station
25th November
1861

(Signed) G Thornhill
Acting Collector

Acting Collector's
Order.

Dated No 2403 of 1861

Entered
Dy 26 Nov 1861

Copy in a letter to Capt
Office Mach Nov 27 of 61

[illegible]

That in consequence of the
petitioner's petitions stating that
Calder has been restored to her
situation while the petitioner is debarred
the benefit of the said letters he
terminated your service petitioned
the Board for redress in the matter
any complaint whatsoever, and the
Collector dismissed him from office
on a frivolous matter, through misre-
presentation caused by the Collector
Enclosures of his entering into [illegible]

From Walter Elliot Esquire Commissioner to the Northern Circars

To V. Nagaswara Row Acting Sheristadar Mahoutgar in the Collector's Cutcherry of Masulapatam.

I am under the necessity of asking you about some circumstances, I wrote to the Collector to send you to me, accordingly that Officer told to go to me, but you are neglect appearing me I am surprized you do not attend at my Hooppar at the sight of this order.

Bazavadah 4th February 1851

(Signed) Walter Elliot Comr

V. Nagaswarow

Seal

From Walter Elliot Esquire. Commissioner
in the Northern Circar

To V. Nagasawara Rau. Goomastah Collector
Cutcherry of Masulipatam.

You go to Goodyvada Talook and
send for Ryots and Curnums through the
Aetacy Talookdar and taking accounts or
enquiries are as follows.

You are to take Jaga accounts for 6
Years from fasly 1255 to fasly 1260 from the
said Ryots and Curnums and to take deposi-
=tion from them as usual.

You are also to enquire into the matter
Collections made by the Circar servants from
Moturpha Coalautee Ryots.

The Circar servants received Commissi-
=on per Rupee of the money paid in advance
and they have in some other places received the
whole advanced money for their own use. You are
therefore to take particular notice of the matter
in such Villages and deposition on the subject
, You are to take particular notice of the
frauds

Speed used in Repairs all works performed for
the above 6 years.

You are further to take particular
notice of the Circar Servants having received bribes
from Ryots either in Police power or other respects
and also dispositions from the Ryots.

You are also to take one of the Salaries
Commutation in necessity

Masulipatam 22nd October 1851

(Signed)
Henry Sherwin
Register

(Signed) W. Elliot
Commissioner

Seal No 127

From Walter Elliot Esquire Commissioner in the Northern Circar

To V. Nagaswara row Sheristah Maddutgar in the Collectors Cutcherry of Masulepatam.

I am in want of three years accounts shewing baiza expenses previous to the particular years of Baiziah accounts received from me from the Curnums Yaloor Talook consequently after your finishing all the business which you ought to do. you are to go to the Curnums of Yaloor Talook receive from them baiza accounts for three years and report the same to me as usual on the subject— I have sent a Yookoom to the Talsildar of the said Talook.

Masulipatam 20th December 1851

(Signed) Walter Elliot Comr

V. Nagaswaraw

Copy on a Letter to Collector of Masulipatam dated 22nd Jany 1852

(2nd Copy)
Letter from the Commissioner Mr Elliot to Mr Reid
Dated 29th Jany 1852
29th October

BB.

D 21/52

No 99

Seal

To Nagaisarou Gomestab under the Jurisdiction of the Kodjour

It being necessary to suspend the Tapildar of Kykalore Survottamarou with the matter of certain Complaints lodged against him, you are thereby appointed to act for him as Acting Tapildar & Head of Police of the Cause Talook, you are to take charge of the Talook from Survothamarou & report the same without delay

As the Special Appeal Court Mr Bird is entrusted with Investigation of the affairs of the said Talook & of the Complaints, you are to afford your utmost in effecting the said Enquiries & at Follow the Course of Policy short of the Extremities is to be fully enquired & Reported to the said Authority & Gentlemen Thereafter the Carriage Row, you will take the Rates to collect the Hire of the Carriage in without Contrary to the Regulations & impediments to the Alienation of the ensuing year.

Your Confirmation in your present acting appointment will & promotion will depend on the Diligence & punctuality with which you will discharge the duties of your office.

To
Lieut Col Cotton
Commissioner for the affairs of
Coorg &c &c &c

Bangalore 25th December 1834

CC

It is well known to you that several frauds are prevalent in this Tillak, some of which have been detected by your exertions & several Servants punished. You, who is aware of the circumstance, Omit any frauds, a similar punishment will be awarded to you too in preference to others

In Appointing you to act as Superviser of the said Tillak it is notified to you that you are not only to be careful in Circumspection but also you are not to receive any more than what is allowed to you in the Cowle. You will know that there will be no other Cause for me to be displeased at you than that you are engage to detect false Charges against anybody & that you will give informations to Government as regards the true matter.

Patna 1852 (Signed) L Cushington
Officiating Collector.

H Dayaram

Order of Government on the Petitions from Vaudreuille & Pagniewera Row, late Clerk Income Tax office, Kivalua District - Nos. 2103- 2133 - 2423 - 2551 - 2619 - 2825 & 2908 of 1882 -

The Government see no sufficient reason for interfering with the decisions of the local authorities and the Board of Revenue and resolve therefore to reject this appeal -

Fort St. George
21st Novr. 1882.

By Order
C. Martin
Dy. Secy. to Govt.

To
The Petitioner -

Petition of Vaudreuille & Pagniewera Row late Clerk Income Tax office Kivalua Dist. for Revision of Assessment

Rejected 22 Nov. 1882

D.D.

Collector's order confirmed
Petitioners to take
Action if advised

8/11/82

[illegible]

Copy in a Letter to Engd
Dd 16th March No 22 of 1863

E E

Govts Endorsement
Dated 21st November 62

To Her Majesty the Queen in Privy Council
England

The humble Petition of Ventoora
=mielly e Nagaiswera Row late
Native Record Keeper of the
Collectors office of Masulipatam
under the Presidency of Madras

Most Humble Sheweth,

This is an Appeal from the order of
Government of Madras under date the 29th
September 1858 on Petition No 2653 of 1858
returning it under Para 7 of the Petition Rules
as from the Government's endorsement
itself aforesaid it will appear that the
Government did nothing except Virtually
confirming the Board's proceedings which
goes also to confirm the Collectors order, your
Memorialist begs to argue on the impropriety
of the Collectors order &c.

2 Your Memorialist has served the
Company 20 years from inferior to higher grades
and acted with deligence and fedelity that
he merited the satisfaction of Honorable
Walter

Walter Elliot Esquire at present Councellor of Madras Presidency, while that Noble Gentleman was Commissioner for the Northern Circars; who in suppressing the bad Character of the Native officers of those Circars had received such information and aid from your Memorialist as suited to his Vigilancy- In proof of the fact, your Memorialists story will appear to be boasting on his part, hence certain Letters or Chits addressed by that Gentleman to him are herewith submitted with translation-

3 In your Memorialists continuing to aid the said Gentleman in his public business hundreds of the Masulipatam District who had acted detriment to the state and secured their own prosperity have been dealt with adequately & fresh officials nominated- and in compensation of your Memorialists ~~arduous~~ and unremitting exertions in aiding the objects that Noble Gentleman in March 1852 publicly recommended to the then Collector Mr. Washington to have him promoted to higher grade who accordingly bestowed upon him a Jaseelship* in which your Memorialist

continued

*Vide O N:o 15

continued to act as Carefully as his service can be still more merited with the satisfaction of his Employers- But some of the servants in the Hoozoor at the instigation of those who were removed by the said Commissioner upon your Memorialists information have in Memory of his having been informant of the Commissioner and after that authority left the District on other duty, Combined together and used their best to degrade your Memorialist and Caused several Petitions to be presented to the Special assistant Collector Mr. Ballard and this Gentleman investigated into those Petitions and upon the misrepresentation of your Memorialists Enemies fined him in one of the Cases upon suspicion- Upon your Memorialists appealing to the said Collector that authority remitted the fine and signified* his purpose of Reemploying your Memorialists- This will be proved to be true from the Commissioners' Endorsement N:o 8-

*Vide H N:o 8.

4 Your Memorialists Enemies, the Head Moonshee of the Collectors office, and some late Servants who were removed from service upon your Memorialists information given to the Commissioner for the Northern Circars having been thwarted in their attempts

attempts on seeing upon Memorialists utterly
unfit of Employ and upon Memorialists having
been once appointed as Native Record Keeper
in the Collectors office and a Salary of 30 Rd per
Mensem have resisted their attempts in such a
skilful manner as hereinafter particularized
as the Head Shirastadar and the Collector may
at once write on their stratagem and fulfil
the invention they aimed at thereby -

5 The Head Sheristadar of the Collectors'
office who was at variance with the Head
Sheristadar desired upon Memorialists to
present a Petition against that Sheristadar
to Govt but upon Memorialists declined to
accede to his invitation saying that to do so is
not honest act. Vexed at this the said
Sheristadar Pooddichosi Venkatanathnum pillay,
gathered same persons namely, Shrespaty
Gopalaroyadoo, Tammalapally Canakiah,
Soomiarayas, and Dasaracondah Nagamah
and instigated them to prepare and dispatch a
Petition to Govt against the Head Sheristadar
setting Forth Signatures thereon Viz Four thirds
and our upon Petitioners -

6 The said Petition being sent to the new
acting Collector Mr. T. J. Hinde for return-
of the Dr. Gopalaroyadoo who recently prepared
and signed it, and forged the signatures of your
Memorialists and 3 others thereon, became
Prosecutor and 3 others, witnesses before the
Magistrate with a view to state fair and an
account of the satisfaction of the Head
Sheristadar that upon Memorialists was the
identical persons who prepared and sent that
Petition to Govt

7 The said Shrespaty Gopalaroyadoo
stated in his Charge before the Magistrate
that he heard upon Petitioners forged his name
in that Petition.

8 The 3 witnesses upon being asked
have respectively denied that they know any
thing regarding the Govt Petition nor they know
who wrote it - 9 This is all the matter of the
Charge and the evidence thereto and the Magistrate
hereof clearly states in his Memorandum
that there is no sufficient proof to convict
upon Memorialists of the offence of forging

× Vide G No 7

† Vide E No 5
2

a Signature on a Paper containing Malignant falsehoods and reproaches which is of a Criminal Nature but in the same Memorandum that Authority takes much pain to say there is ample proof to shew that your Memorialist is a Man of bad Character and so Removed him from his public service.

10 The Charge which gave rise to the Removal of your Memorialist and the evidence adduced in Support thereof being of such no weight that a Servant as your Memorialist may not be made without Employ your Memorialist would respectfully point out that his Removal from office is under English law very unjust and that therefore he deserves the bounty of His Majesty by Reinstatement.

11 With regard to the 30 Para of the Collectors' Memorandum your Memorialist would due say that he assisted the Commissioner in his public business for which the Commissioner Letters marked A B C & D will bear testimony which Circumstance the acting Collector turns to shew that your Memorialist is in the habit of

Vide G No 7

No 8 - H

setting up always false complaints and that such his habits are warned in the order of Mr Cushington and Mr Ballard - A perusal of the former authority's order will shew a Word of the kind in as much as it shews that your Memorialist was appointed as Tahseldar in mark of consideration of his assistance afforded to the Commissioner in suppressing the systematic detrimental dealings of the Revenue Servants of the District - as respects the latter authority's letter your Memorialist need not to account for, for the Commissioners' endorsement shews that his proceedings have been annulled and your Memorialist declared to be reemployed -

No 5

12 In the 4th Para of the said Memorandum the Collector shews as if your Memorialist was removed from Tahseldarship and appointed as Native Record keeper - The Collector doing so was not upon such his opinion as Mr Rose shews it to be except protecting your Memorialist from the continued conspiracy of those who were banded hand upon his information to the Commissioner - His Mr Cushington's order will an perusal, more

induce the reader in that light which that authority (Mr. Knox) takes pain to impress on the minds of the Register tribunals —

13 On the 4th Para Mr. Knox accuses your Memorialist to have himself consulted with the Revenue Reshear or Moonshee Venecatanathenum Pillay to set up complaints against Head Sheristadar which individual has advised your Memorialist to assist in that measure — This the acting Collector Mr. Knox turned to his own the same plan against your Memorialist — To shew that it was not so as your Memorialist says, the Petition he addressed to the Commissioner, Mr Elliot and his reply thereto material Documents to weaken the Collector's imputation —

14 The opinion contained in the 5, 6, 7 Paras of the said Memorandum your Memorialist would say that the opinion or inferences therein expressed is nothing but mere supposition as the evidence adduced before the Magistrate is declared by himself not to have been sufficient to convict him of the charge of having addressed the

the Petition to Government against the Head Sheristadar —

15 From the foregoing reasons it would appear that your Memorialist was unjustly removed from his post "Native Record Keeper in the Collectors' office of Masulipatam" on no other charge but that he sent a Petition to Government against the Head Sheristadar that there is no evidence to convict him, and that his removal was only upon the suppositions — That your Memorialist in a confidential servant who assisted the Commissioner in his public business, that your Memorialist who secured the public interest according to the will of the Commissioner had lost his post by the misrepresentation of those who were punished for their acts detrimental to the state

Therefore your Memorialist prays that the Home authorities who are not less prepared to protect the Indian subjects under the recent change of its administration than they were by the late Honorable East India Company, [illegible] pleased to issue orders to the Madras authorities [illegible]

in order that your Memorialist may be restored to his Situation of Native Record Keeper from which he was removed by T. J. Venua Esqr. acting Collector of Masulipatam upon no proof whatever together with the arrears of pay from the date of his removal 20th August 1838 upto his reinstatement.

Madras
29th November
1838

Shall Ever Pray.
(Signed) P. Nagaiaroo

P. Nagaswarow

Copy of a Letter to Captain
Dated 15th March 1839

From P. Nagaiaroo
Memorialist to the
Board of Revenue
on Salary Claim
from Masulipatam

Received 18th April 1839

Pr Rotherg arroo

We are all well up to Friday and wish to hear news from you. My mind is not at rest by not having received any letters often from you. I expect you to write off hand letters frequently as I cannot understand if you do not write me. I have sent only a rupee, for which I send me very nice wheat.

The month of Karticai is approaching and about the marriage I did not yet receive any letter from the Country. As soon as I receive it will be made known to you.

(Signed) Tuticorin
Rose.

Brother garrow

We are all well here wish to hear from you absolutely and expect your welfare I have received last night the letter you sent by return of Jakhal and understood the contents of it. Write me if your obtained Copies of the Instructions stating my Characters and if it is convenient let me know what is said of me therein afterwards I Consider about the same Instruct.

I invited Mr Reed at one O clock P. M. on the 20th of this month in Purchor station, and gave him some fruits. He spoke with me kindly about half an hour being on platform. I did not take opportunity of telling him about Peerdo, but he kindly said that the new Gentleman will make a proper Arrangement in the mean while and told me that he will send you a testimonial

J.

15 JAN 1862

B

Letter from Captain Taylor Agricola

This letter bears A. (illegible) Gentleman's Copy

Received 15 Jan 1862

2

Answered 21 Jan 1862

Sales united Brandum - Nothing
particular to tell you should inform me
all particulars here. Cholera is prevalent
in Chilakaturipeta, Purushotapatnam,
Pusumarru, Rajapeet, Koppurru,
Chempully &c in the Villages belonging
to this Taluq, by which immense number
of men is destroyed every day, it is not
yet lessened. God only may preserve
them. I will let you know as soon as
I get any letter from the Country - I
did not enlarge as there is no anything
more to write.

(Signed) Lutchemmarow

Copy of a letter from Cheif Secretary to Govt. to all collectors &c
Dated Fort St George the 23rd Sept 1863

No 2138 of 1862

3

Cuttack 25th Nov 1862

Sir

(In reply to your letter
B no 3 of the 4th inst
(on the subject)

Extract from Column 6/Remarks/ of the Register of uncovenanted servants of the Huzoor Establishment in the Sub Division Kistna Distrcts -

"Veluturumalle Nagesh wara Rauu
"was for some time clerk in charge of the
"accounts - I made him Income Tax Gumasta
"the duties of which post he has performed
"satisfactorily. -

(Signed) Gth Reid
Officiating Sub Collr

August 8th /61
Guntur

/True Extract/

Sub Collr

16th Nov. /61

Compd
No Cert.

Letter from Consul Echeverria Bros Bilbao
to Messrs Jones dated 18th December 1863
Date of this year 20th Jan 1864

I am sir, Death at Santoña
wish to hear the news from you —
A Manilla letter [illegible] to my address
by Cadiz [illegible] but [illegible]
[illegible] have [illegible] the Contingency
many [illegible] herein written are to the Effect,
" I did not send him 500 ℔ at this time,
" then as I will take up the Rate to go
" to Santoña, Rufus shall be sent down
" to this place staff, but if you
" do not do so, with Resort to use
" other means, " This is the true Explication
of the said ambiguous words that he
will reduce the amount from the Rate
I specified & take care thereby that I
may not be confirmed in the Specific
Therefore I shew it to the Consignee
Letter with its translation in Engn
together with the Cover it came in.
If you will peruse this and shew the
to Gentlemen & please let me Know
what the Gentlemen said thereon —
I have no Money nor can I grant it
and tell the Gentleman that I do my duty
with

Bilbao Jan 20/64

Copy of a Letter Enclosed
No. 22 of 1863

Vice Consul

Encl in 24423 of 1863

Sessions Proceedings

Guntur Sessions Courts file case No. 200 of 1861

4. The Head of Police made his first Report to the joint Magistrate on the 24th August & after holding an enquiry and finding no evidence released the parties signed on the 25th Reporting the same to the joint Magistrate on 26th August mentioning at the same time that there was no suspicion against some of the persons, and promising to use further exertion to trace out the murderers.

After the release of the prisoners the joint Magistrate received an Anonymous Petition dated 3rd September, accusing the Head of Police of having received a bribe, and released the Prisoners in Consequence.

6. Many persons were sent for, and brought into the Huzur by the joint Magistrates, Daloyets and a reinvestigation of the Murder Case by the joint Magistrate Commenced

with such Evidence as could be had

[illegible] Sessions in person - [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] Petitioner the only Letter in English

You will know this with my thanks

Signed

Received 23 April

[illegible] has been shewn to Gentlemen

[illegible] on the afternoon of the 24th

[illegible] The original Gondalla Letter and its translation

[illegible] was kept by Gentlemen with

[illegible] Answer written to the Petition on the

24th June

Copy and Letter to Capt. Dalrymple dated 22 of 63

E

Commenced on 5th September or about
13 days after the murder has been
committed, and the Case finally sent up
to the Sessions Court on the 5th November.

33. As regards the false report
made to the joint Magistrate by the 8th
Prisoner about 16th Witness, Peon, whom
the 8th Prisoner had sent to Guntoor, there
is no doubt that whilst the 8th Prisoner
knew where the peon had gone, and has
actually taken off his belt that he might
attract's notice at Guntoor, he reported
to the joint Magistrate that he knew
not where he was and his explanation
in defence on this matter, is not satisfac-
tory, but it does not appear from the
Letters on Record, that the correspondence
between the 8th Prisoner and the man
in the joint Magistrates Office was
regarding the murder case then under
trial before joint Magistrate.

11. The other 4 alleged Eye
Witnesses, 3 of whom were examined
by

by the Head of police on 25th August, and
denied knowing any thing of the
murder, also retracted and denied before
the Court their statements, before joint
Magistrate on the 9th & 11th November
regarding Witnessing the murder as
acting they were so harrassed and impostuned
by the Retwal & certain Kurgur Doc-
: toyts to depose as the 1st Witness had
done, that they finally Consented, but
what they stated before the joint
Magistrate is false.

(Signed) J. Anslow
Sessions Judge

(True Copy)

Sessions Judge

Sessions Court
Stamp.

Deposition Returned before the Respectable Court of
Secundary Police Revn.

About this 3 applied to the Tapildar to give me
Leave to go to Guntoor for my Sisters Marriage,
for 5 days - He gave me Leave & at the same
time gave me 1/2 Rupee & desired me to buy Wheat
for him & told that I am now Conversant of
the true Specis of the Wheat he gave me 1/2
Rupee to Attend to & Considered for that
purpose & returned the Letter to Nagaraw
& Nagaraw having paid that I would Return
him 1/2 Rupee & I can positively
say that through nearby the Letter & Thereafter
I got two Letters
In your Respective Depn the
Purport
Dispute
In your Respective Depn two Letters and here
Says you have always
only one
& Not to the Respondent
& Not the Letter & Peshcush
to tell that I brought two Letters I did Not
to Anti Stamp only one that I brought.
The Tapildar did not advise me how I am
to act on the subject of the Letter
Nor
Nor Are You to Falsely Depose me advise You
to do so -
& The Actual Enquiry took in the Anonymous
Petition

Copy of Letter to Collr Guntoor
Tapildar Clerk Rept

Recd 25 Feb 1852
Enquiry Petn

Respdt Exhibit
Petitioner

Petitioner is stated that Ingenuous in petition
is committee, that you brought Case private
treasonous letter threatened me I would
not say that I brought two letters Lunar
the Prisoner. Leaving at this I stated that
I brought two letters —
Q — When the Sapildar gave letter to you did he
say to you that he has not received any
letter from Nagaswara —
A — He did not — but the Cutwal Sir having
threatened me that I must tell as I knows
told to me he never tell me
at all that I would not show that letter
to any one — I brought the letter & delivered
to Nagaswara in the night of the 6th
& left Sir he have gone to Cuvery
not in the next Morning the 7th I do
not witness Cross me I have nothing to
the Charge — after the Cutwal Cutcherry
to there I went to Mr. Wood Sir what
Sir Cause here I Case I have to say
Sir Cause here I Case I have to say
Petitions at Gentoor I do not
Nagaswara Reach Sapildar gave
Nagaswara Reach Sapildar gave
Sir — The Gentleman to Memorandum
of what I Case by his own Writing

He further asked me why I came to
Case that I Sirvare not any more
Case above Regard orders that I have
be place in the Cutwal's Cautchy —
The Cutwal [illegible] at 2 O'clk threatened
me to relate as above stated or I will be
dealt with as adequately as is necessary.
I was guarding the Prisoners until
they were forwarded to the Court. and
ever since I am in the Cutwal's Cautchy
I did not see the Sapildar sent Nursing
Chanoo to Gentoor. As Cutwal advised
me to tell that as I would tell that Nursing
Chanoo came to here as is mentioned in
the Aforegoing Petition. but I did
not tell him I came to Gentoor

Signed Ramasamy

Solemnly affirmed before me
in open Court this 16 Nov 1865

Signed T Onslow
Sessions Judge

Seal

Deposition of Andrew Jackson Thomas Robie Reon
Defendant Appellant Court

I defend a Deposition against Defendant
Plaintiff. The Capitol Sisters sent me a letter
to the address of Hazardous. I came to Guntown
three Months to undergo the examination of
this Case but cannot Know exactly what date was
it. I gave my deposition before Squire
on the very day I arrived at Guntown -
I came to Guntown at 9 O Clock Morning Groshawn
Carson & Reon took me to the Barracks
Cutwal came the two carried me straight
Letter to Nazarous & Lawrence, Letter was
To what Nature Case are you bringing
Petition in come states that you brought
Letter to Nazareen you must therefore
affirm it or you will forfeit your Lemin,
Therefore at this Morning I stated before
the Squire that I brought Letter to
Nazareen - I did not come to Guntown
10 Days before I gave my Deposition
nor the Solicitors give this Deposition
but I came to Guntown 10 Days before
that - No one threatened me in this Court
as the Colonels & Quma did in the Magistrates
office I revealed the truth - I was guarding
me

Deposition of Andrew Jackson Thomas Robie Reon
Defendant Appellant Court

I defend a Deposition against Defendant
Plaintiff. The Capitol Sisters sent me a letter
to the address of Hazardous. I came to Guntown
three Months to undergo the examination of
this Case but cannot Know exactly what date was
it. I gave my Deposition before Squire
on the very day I arrived at Guntown -
I came to Guntown at 9 O Clock Morning Groshawn
Carson & Reon took me to the Barracks
Cutwal came the two carried me straight
Letter to Nazareen & Lawrence, Letter was
To what Nature Case are you bringing
Petition in come states that you brought
Letter to Nazareen you must therefore
affirm it or you will forfeit your Lemin,
Therefore at this Morning I stated before
the Squire that I brought Letter to
Nazareen - I did not come to Guntown
10 Days before I gave my Deposition
nor the Solicitors give this Deposition
but I came to Guntown 10 Days before
that - No one threatened me in this Court
as the Colonels & Quma did in the Magistrates
office I revealed the truth - I was guarding
me

3

Defendant Appellant
Andrew Jackson Thomas Robie Reon
Defendant Appellant Court

Plaintiff Appellee

Copy of a Letter to Capt. [illegible]
Dated March 22 of 63

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR CHARLES WOOD BART, K. C. B M. P., SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

THE HUMBLE MEMORIAL OF VENTHOOLOOMILLY NAGAISWARA ROW, LATE INCOME TAX CLERK, ON A SALARY OF RUPEES 35, IN THE OFFICE OF THE SUB COLLECTOR KRISTNAH DISTRICT, MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That your Memorialists dismissal is contrary to the Orders of Government marginally noted, and his Appeal to the Board of Revenue and the Government of Madras met with no justice. Therefore trusting that Her Most Gracious Sovereign would see justice done to him, your Memorialist herewith submits all the thirty-four Documents (Originals) and their translations connected with his case to the Sovereign's decision.

1. The 23rd, 24th 25th Paras of the Orders No. 214 and dated 2nd November 1827.
2. The 22d Para of the Act of No. 213, and dated 2nd November 1827.
3. The 8th Para of the Extract of the Minutes of consultation No. 421 and dated 8th May 1854.
4. The 11th Para of the Minutes of the Court of Directors of No. 840 and dated 8th August 1856.

I. That the grounds continued in the order marked A of the Collector of the Kristnah District as regards the dismissal of your Memorialist on the 25th November 1861, are unjustifiable, is hereby illustrated by public instances.

The Document A together with its translations.

1. That the Collecter entertains opinions hostile regarding your Memorialist is referred to in the 15th Para of the petition (Z)

2. That murder case in which the Tahsildar Lutchmen Row was alleged (in the anonymous letter (L) to have been bribed and to have mitigated the punishment of the criminals connected with it, was dismissed by the Sessions Judge and the Board were pleased to reinstate the Gentleman in his same appointment of Tahsildar.

Public Copy of the anonymous letter (L) together with its translation.

3. That the very peons viz., Ramthany and Nursing Bhan by whose means your Memorialist is alleged by the joint Magistrate in his orders (A) to have held correspondence with the Tahsildar in respect to the murder case, *have* before the tribunal of the Sessions Judge avowedly exclaimed (as in G and H) that the original depositions had been squeezed out of their mouths. That such a circumstance as this should have been allowed to pass unnoticed by the higher authorities prior to the decision for your Memorialist's dismissal is extremely unjust. The Takeed of the joint Magistrate about these peons in marked (P) and the Tahsildar's reply to it is marked (Q).

All the public records are with translation
G—Ramthany
H—Nursing Bhan.
P—Takeed
Q—Urzi.

4. That the joint Magistrate no sooner he was informed of your Memorialit's receipt of the letters of the Tahsildar than he got them from him and marked them himself (A and B) and added them without any objection whatever to his records. Such being the case and while they are even now being preserved in the records connected with the trial, is it not quite unjust to state that your Memorialist changed the originals ! Their public copies, together with their translations, with the marks (B and C) are herewith appended.

Public Copies of the letters and their translations marked B and C.

5. That in the deposition marked (R,) your Memorialist's Son Kamasastralu, state that no letter had been received from the Tahsildar after Sunday. This statement had never been brought under consideration and it is quite unjust. The public copies of your Memorialist's deposition (N) and his Sons (R) together with their translations are herewith submitted.

Public Copies of your Memorialist's deposition (N) and his Sons' (R.)

6. That before the commencement of the trial of the murder case at the Huzoor, the Tahsildar through friendship, wrote to your Memorialist the letters A and B) on some household affairs and which do not at all contain any circumstances that are alluded to in the Urzi marked (L) Though your Memorialist and his Son were subjected to be greatest restraint they deposed only what was true and instantly reported to the Collector of their sufferings ; and this having provoked the joint Magistrate he wrote to the Collector that your Memorialist did not deliver him the originals but some forged letters and that he could not be trusted and so on ; and upon which with the greatest injustice, the Collector also expressed his concurrence with his opinion.

7. That in the Proceedings No. 2,407 of the Board of Revenue of the 18th of May 1860 regarding the Kurnam Thumalapalli Somarajoo, there is a mention made of your Memorialist also ; but that Pro : was subsequently cancelled by the Extract of Minutes of Consultation of the Government, No. 129 dated 31st January 1859. That this Pro : should be referred to by the Collector in his orders (A) is contrary to justice.

8. That it is manifest from the Endorsement (J) that in 1854 when your Memorialist had been put out of the post of the Tahsildar, the Collector wrote to the Commissioner of the Northern Circars for the re-consideration of his orders as regards your Memorialist's dismissal, and restoration to his former post. Therefore how could the Board afterwards in the Pro : No. 2,407 write as if the Collector in 1854 had reported about the disqualification of your Memorialist for Circar employment. This is very unjust.

The original Endorsement of the Commissioner of the Northern Circars of 1854 marked (J).

9. That when in 1858, the Acting Collector of Masulipatam dismissed your Memorialist from his Office of the Native Record-keer, the salary of which was Rupees 30, your Memorialist Appealed at first to the Board and then to the Government as he ought to have done ; but their justice was similar to that in the present instance. On this he despatched, his Appeal Memorial marked (F F) to Her Most Gracious Sovereign through the Government on the 23rd November 1858 ; but the then Governor, Lord Harris, noticing this and on consideration, having found that your Memorialists' removal had been caused only through the malice of some junior servants of the

Appeal Memorial in Her Majesty's name (F F).

office who had become his enemies owing to the sum he saved to the Government in 1852, passed an order No. 129, dated 31st January 1859 for your Memorialists' restoration to his own former post Sir Charles Trevelyan who succeeded, on his arrival ordered the Pro : No. 3,533, dated 6th September 1859 your Memorialists' promotion ; and for the payment of arrears due to him for the days your Memorialist remained out of service, and also sent a letter to the Collector No. 837, dated the 25th June 1859 ; and all these may be clearly learnt from the Endorsement (I) that was granted him.

The original of the Endorsement of the Government (I).

The orders marked (A A) (B B) and (C C) of the Commissioner of the Northern Circars of 1851, which were founded on the Government Order No. 129, in which all the sum he saved to the Government, by your Memorialist is mentioned ; and the letter marked (D D) of the Collector in 1852 which he mentions also your Memorialists' services to the Governments together with their translations are herewith enclosed.

The orders of the Commissioner of the Northern Circars and their translations are marked (A A), (B B), and (C C) Collector's letter (D D)

10. That during your Memorialists re-occupation of the Native-Record-keepership, there arrived an order for raising the salary of the post. That your Memorialists' opposition party being then informed of this, and envious at his prosperity, secretly exercising their influence, caused the transfer of the Memorialist to another less lucrative post for no reason whatever is evident from the Collector's Endorsement (M) ; and that he had thence been degraded to another, whose salary is less than that of the other by Rupees 5, is evident from the Takeed of the Sub-Collector marked (S). Your Memorialist now and then continued affording timely information of all these misdemeaners of the officers to the Board and to the Government by means of Urzies to all of which the Board were pleased to favor your Memorialist with the Endorsement of the Collector, while the Government without noticing the circumstances embodied, only returned the Urzies having attached to them some printed slips of paper which contained the 5th and 6th Paras of the petition Rules—by post not paid ; the numbers and dates of which are severally noted down in the margin. Had the Government then and there noticed all these Urzies and passed the needful order on them there would need no troubles now on the part of the Memorialist.

The Collector's Endorsement on the Urzee to the Board marked (M) together with translation.
The Sub Collector's Takeed marked (S)

In 1859 No. 2872, and 3449.
In 1861 No. 1194, 2136, 2202, and 2719.

Two Endorsements (G G and H H) and herewith send.

11. That when your Memorialist requested the Government to grant him the Extracts of the Pro : of the Commissioner of the Northern Circars of 1852, and of the consultation No. 129 and other order of Government, they refused complying with the prayer in their Endorsement No. 2412 of 1860 ; and therefore your Memorialist is now unable to append here those papers also.

From the foregoing eleven Paras it is quite plain that all the circumstances laid down by the Collector as regards your Memorialists' dismissal are in the highest degree unjust and they can over defile your Memorialists' character. Therefore your Memorialists he is freely and lawfully entitled to continue in his former post under the Government.

12. On the dismissal of the murder case in which your Memorialist had been alleged to have had some concern, the Tasildar, as was alleged, the chief man who is to blame, was by the Board of Revenue declared not guilty and was ordered to take up his post back, subsequently your Memorialist sending his Appeal Urzies marked T, V, U W whose

Memorialists' Appeal Urzies to the Board marked T, V, U and W.

contents were no more than the grounds embodied in the preceding eleven Paras to the same Board met with a flat refusal ; for the Board, having obtained some report from the Collector, returned all Urzies with all their enclosures to him at Guntoor, with the Endorsements (X). All these originals are herewith appended.

Endorement is marked (X)

III. Since your Memorialist has no other means of support than t is service in the Circar, he has come down to Madras, a distance of 200 miles undergoing great deal of expenses and has, on his arrival, delivered Appeals marked Y and Z with enclosures to the Honorable W. Morehead Esquire the 2nd Governor, the Governor having then been absent at Neilgherrys. That Gentleman having accepted the endosures marked A, B, C, G H and R and having become fully acquainted with all his circumstances, his long service of 23 years, the large family of 20 persons dependent upon him and his dismissal through the grudge of the junior servants made the following attempts in your Memorialists favor.

The original of Government Appeals Y and Z.

1. He sent for the report of the Collector regarding the dismissal of the Tahsildar was alleged to have had some concern in instigating the punishment of the Criminals in a murder case. He also sent for the Pro : of the Board in favor of the Tasildar, and the Report of the Collector with regard to your Memorialist and for the Boards' Pro : about the same and inspected them all.

2. He also sent for the Appeal Urzie delivered by your Memorialist in the Government in the name of Her Most Gracious Sovereign and also the Extracts of Minutes of Consultation No. 129 as also of the Pro : No. 3533, and the Letter of No. 837 and all the Urzies written by your memorialist from the date of the resumption of his former post and the Endorsement thereon and perused them all.

3. He further, wishing to learn the truth of the enemity which existed between the Tahsildar and the Sub-Sheristadar on account of the former's refusal to pay the bribe of Rs 500 to the latter ; as also of the enemity that existed between the Sub-Sheristadar and Your Memorialist because Your Memorialist had not shewn, nor informed of, the Mahratta letter of the Sub-Sheristadars' own Manual that was sent to him by the Tasildar enclosed in the letter marked (E) to the Sub-Collector ; as also the truth of your Memorialist having held the post of Rs. 25 according to the order marked (O) and of having been promoted to the post of Rs. 35 as contained in the order marked (K) ; and also the truth of having favoured your Memorialist with the character marked (D) ; as all these formed the contents of the 7th para of Your Memorialist petition marked (Z) and as the then Sub-Collector Mr. W. Reid is at present holding the post of the Acting Sub-Collector of Bellary, he was asked to report on these matters, which was accordingly done. On which then being a search made in the records connected with the bribery case ; but before the arrival of the papers Mr. Morehead departed Home on the 29th October 1862.

Lutchmen Row's letters original translation with the mark (T)
25 Rs. posts' order and translation marked (O)
35 Rs. posts' order and translation marked (K)
Character marked (D)
Extra.

From the very endorsement made on your Memorialists' petition marked (Z) refering to 7th para of it to the Sub-Collector of Bellary, it is quite evident that all the other paras are true enough and approved of by the Government and that the 7th Para. alone needed to be tested on which the Honorable W. Morehead's intention was, to restore your Memorialist to his old station.

IV. On the arrival of the Governor from Neilgherrie's 5th November, your Memorialist presented him a Petition on the 14th in which he afforded the fullest explanation of the injustice done to him. Had he, sending for the Petition and all the Appended Records, gone through them and brought the case into consideration while in Council, your Memorialists' affairs would have been brought to a favorable conclusion. During the stay of Mr. Morehead he well exerted on his behalf from

the date of delivery application to him ; was not able to pass a final order ; and as a necessary consequence of which he still continues suffering.

V. Though are manifold ostensible grounds in your Memorialists' behalf from what had followed his dismissal and from the contents of the Records at the Huzoor from your Memorialist's own Petition to the Board and to the Government and from the report of Mr. Reid, yet because Mr. C. G. Master, who had been the Acting Secretary to the Board when the Endorsement marked (X) had been granted to your Memorialist, has on the 7th November last received the appointment of the Deputy Secretary to the Government, and because to correspond with his own former Endorsement and that of the Collector, I think he endorsed, that your Memorialists' Petition was not accepted by the Government as they found no proper reasons and so confirmed his former Endorsement on the day in which the Governor was not present in the Council and despatched it to your Memorialist on the 24th of the same month.

The Endorsement of the Government on your Memorialists' Petition on the 24th Nov. 1862, marked (E E).

VI. Though the Sessions Judge at Guntoor has in his Decree on the murder case of 1861 No. 20, condemns the Magistrate in his fourth Para. of the Decree for his having commenced the trial on 5th September upon the *anonymous* letter (L), and in his 6th Para. for having prolonged it for the space of 2 months, and in his 11th Para. for having tortured the parties concerned, witnesses, &c., and in 33rd Para. for his stating that the letters (A & B) contained circumstances as connected with the murder case while they in reality contained nothing of the sort ; yet to see none of the authorities notice in the injustice done your Memorialist and the tortures inflicted on him and his Son even when they actually complain to them, is extremely unjust.

The Extract of these 4, 6, 11, and 33 Paras. from the Decree is marked (F).

VII. The Tahsildar, upon whom the greater blame (of having received bribes for leaving the parties concerned in the criminal case leniently punished) had been attracted and who had been consequently committed to Court, was finally declared not guilty and has been them forward continued in his former post ; while so how very unjust and unlawful is your Memorialist's being kept without employ should be considered by your Honor your Memorialist is merely caluminated with having kept up some correspondence as regards the criminal case with the Tasildar while it was truly no more than some particulars with the family affairs of Lutchmen Row, and this is quite evident from the letters (A & B) which were the only letters I received.

VIII. Unutterable is the injustice done in your Memorialists' case, when he considers the position of the man who is really to blame. The Sub-Sheristadar who did actually demand a bribe of Rs. 500 from the Tahsildar and was ready to receive it provided the Tahsildar's would have given it, and which circumstance had all well been proved by the Sub-Sheristadars' letter in his own Mahratta Manual and by the depositions of Lutchmen Row even in the presence of both the Collectors, that man is unpunished and is still allowed to enjoy his old station and honors in spite of all his crimes and misdeamours ; while so, why should a needy servant like your Memorialist who had boldly brought to light the underhand dealings of that rich Sub-Sheristadar and on the consequent anonymous letter prepared and sent by *him* against your Memorialist through *malice* be deprived of a post which your Memorialist held for the space of 23 years.

Your Memorialist therefore most benignly solicits that your honor will kindly and graciously be pleased to take into your deep consideration all the circumstances and injustice here above alluded to not only in the body of this Urzi but also in all the papers referred to and enquiring the Honorable Walter Elliot under whom the Memorialist served in 1852 and consequently knows the value of his services, and also enquiring Sir Charles Trevelyan and Lord Harris, who in 1859, when similar troubles occurred to your Memorialist, after a just trial got him restored to his former post, and also enquiring the Honorable W. Morehead, Esq. who is acquainted both with the past and present states of Your Memorialists affairs and able to give as much as possible an exact account of his conduct and services and see him justly treated by restoring him to his former post ordering the payment of arrears that is now due to him for the days he has been without employ, and return all the records herewith appended.

Your most obedient and
humble Servant.

MADRAS, 22nd December, 1862.

V Sogoswaraow

Copy in a Letter to Engr.
Dy 16th March A.D. 63

1

Memorial to the
Secretary of India
Government from
V. Nagaswara Rau.

Enclosures 34
Original & its
translation

Ex 13/8/63

Copies sent to Collectors
of the Districts of Cuddapah
Nellore Chittoor & Bellary

Memo No 1423 of 1861

Dated the 15th March 1861

Commissioner

I do certify that the Copy of the Letter
from the Secretary to Government
Public Department No 1423 dated
15th March 1861 to the Commissioner
of Ceded Districts is a true Copy
of the original

Secretary to Government
Public Department

Copy in a Letter to England of 16th March No 22 of 1863

J

R 81/59
2

In No 2653 of 1855

Endorsement on Petitions No 601. 609. 162 & 840 of 1854. 1620. 1621 & 1678 of 1853. 1704 & 1830 / 1853

Dis No 1450/62

Amt 24 23 of 1862

The Collector having remitted these papers inspected upon Petitions by the Ryots and ... and dignified his purchase of 13 employing Petitions for these orders appear to be called for.

J. Goldingham
Commissioner

Commissioner's Office
Vizagapatam
13 July 1855

No 283 - Seal

To the Huzzoor Clerk Nagaiswara Row

You are hereby appointed to Act for the Income tax office Clerk on 35 Rupees Salary per mensem from 6th December 1860, you will therefore read the Acts & rules of that Department & continue the duties thereof with more confidence & truth.

24th December 1860.
Guntoor } (Signed) L W Read
Actg Sub Collr

S. Nagaiswara Row

To the Sub Collector of the
Kistna District

Petition of Ankanaiah and
Row / Anonymously sent /

The Tapildar while in the village of Moolka
pa attached to Enaction Solook having received a Report from
the Village Monsiff of Jonnavaram Padoo that
a Murder took place in that Village, he, Tapildar
proceed to that Village, and holding an inquest
in the presence of the Head men of that & other
Surrounding Villages and gave permission that
the Corpse might be burnt - Altho in Enquiry
there was no direct evidence that the man
was murdered by such yet took evidence by ex
have deliver'd Depositions stating that they
& the deceased were at long enmity with each
other and Confessing that they & Appointed him
But the Tapildar & his Police Cavabungy who was
Substitute at the time & who was his brothers
widow, received Rs 150 from the delinquents
as well as the Peons & some other officers who
accompanied the Tapildar receiving sum &
bribe and setting aside the records first
passed, obtained fresh records & then let the
delinquents at large. It is understood
that the Tapildar has forwarded such illegal
proceedings to the Hoozoor - On the receipt
of the Hoozoor orders on the subject the

Tapildar

Sapeldam without publishing it to the Court Notice
Ex Colony in his own house defied the Lawful
Authority Tumbrow Govindin Mootah to go
& fetch the said Scobbereddy Pillay, but them
but to stock on the 31st August last year order
on the next day that the stock be taken &
on the next day that the Stock be taken &
would be established by the Depn & Interpreter
of the Colony - In the hours after Pillay
appearing before the Koorgoor & relating the
the hardship they met with, Gone Nayor
deputed a Koorgoor Delegate with orders to go to
the Village Chargé and bring the delinquents
& witnessed to the Koorgoor - the Delegate gone
to the Village & taking Pillay with them came
to the Sapeldam at Mantoor in the Morning
of the 2 September at 6 A M, and there Speaking
or consulting with the Sapeldam upto 12 O'Clk
Statee from thence at one o'Clk taking the
Whole of the Prisoners to Gentoor - In
this matter of the Murder case, Your honour
would proceed to the Village Charged and
enquire the matter, the after removing the
Sapeldar & Interpreter, the fact adduced &
will be proved by Witnesses & Pillay
In the event of your honour not being disposed
to proceed thither in person, if the Sapeldar
& Faculty talook were ordered to go & enquire
after the occurrence, there is reason
to believe that the matter will be established
Therefore it is requested that orders should
be issue accordingly - The Sapeldar Kutchemmun
Ex Committee number up to Nagaiwarapalem Aetto
since he came to this Talook - Enquiries
be made the fact will be known - As
Ex Nagaiwara Nayor who is in Koorgoor in prison
to this Sapeldar, he in every matter is in
habit of writing Post letters to the Sapeldar
daily and to what papers in the Koorgoor &
It is understood that the Sapeldar separately
sent the Peon Nanayasbam to Gentoor giving
a letter to the address of the said Nagaiwarapalem
desiring him to speak with Privately keeping
& with such others so that he may not be
brought into risk in this Murder case -
If your honour institute enquiry in this matter
the fact will be clear - Besides this, an
horse was seized as having strayed at Pasoomarru
& placed in the Circar Bundobast - The Horse
is a Stuart & will be worth Rs 25 - in Knocking
down the animal in August the Sapeldar
left him to his savabaniga for a short price
at Rs 6. The horse is now at Gavaravarla
village, and if seen, the fact will prove
true.

Ramanna's Signature

3 September 1861.

by Nagaiwarapalem

7

Collector's Endorsement on Board of Govt Petitions
Nos 814-2977-V 3618 of 1859 & No 192 of 1859 presented
by Vaitoormilla Nagaswarow.

Read the above Petitions they having been
referred to the Collector for disposal as required
the Board's proceedings of the 5th March 1860,
together with their endorsement thereon of the
16 April 1860.

Upon the Districts of Guntoor & Nandigamma
being incorporated and denominated as Kistna
District, the Petitioner was appointed to Sheristah
Muddudgar office of equal emolument which
he was in the receipt in the office of Record
Rajah & Chellapully Venkatachellumnaidu who
was receiving Rs 35 was changed to Record Keeper
post of 30 Rs salary. The Petitioner is informed
that the Board approves the alterations stating
that the Arrangement is consistent with
the orders of Govt:-

Dindge
20th June 1860-

/Signed/ J Thorx
Collector

V. Nagaswarow

M

Copy sent to Petitioner
by Post 26th March M. 22 of 63

Copy of Petition
Nos 814 & 2977 of 1859

Copy of Petition No 192 of 1859

Copy in a Letter to Engd
Dd 16th March A. 22 of 63

Ann. Cor.

M

Collectors Endorsement
on Bond & Condition

28th June 66

13

Bond No. 2103 of 1862

told him that if he would come by the 10 o'clock
boat on Saturday I will get him the Wheat.
Then the Peon leaving his Cloth & umbrella on a wooden
nail in my house went off. The Peon did not
come to me until I took my meal at 9 o'clk
came to me until I took my meal at 9 o'clk
set out to go to office on Saturday. I told
with my desires to tell the Peon that I will
desire the County to give him Wheat & that
if he comes to office I will give him letter
In the Evening on my coming home, the females
told me that the said Peon came with Dother
Peons and took away the said Cloth pc. The
Peon did not pay me the half Rupee which
he brought to buy the Wheat. I now produce
the same letter. Which is as follows.

"To Sir R Anagaroo Gunnidhee.

"Vannakkam with many prostrations.
"I am in good here until Friday & wish you
"will write yours there. Your repeated letter
"being received from you I am utterly in
"uneasiness. As I am unable to manage the
"Domestic affairs unless you write me,
"I wish you will always continue to write
"me. I send now half Rupee for which
"you will send me Wheat of good quality.
"The Month of Cattick is approaching but
"no letter as yet been received from the Country
"as regards the Marriage affairs. I wish write
"to you as soon as they are received.
"This is all with many prostrations."

"Received 6 letters the 2
"inclosed Cadrapore
"Friday night 10 O'clk
"delivered by Maistry Pandi

The above letter was written by the handwriting
of Sutchamma Row (Copildee). Just on Rams
coming at 10 in the night I suspected who was
he but on seeing the letter the suspicion was
removed. But the Peon after meal not having
had the ½ Rupee I wrote a memorandum on
the letter as set forth therein. The same Peon
Ram[illegible] delivered me only the said Telugu
[illegible] to Mattha one. I forgot on
[illegible] the language. The Peon said
on [illegible] he itself that if the ½ Rupee
being [illegible] was given him, he would
start from Guntoor to Madras at one O'clk
next day. I did not send the Wheat.
nor did I again write reply to Sutchamma
Row. With the exception of the letter B (which
came before A) which bears the receipt of
21st August the Saturday 4 decem[illegible] month
Dhruvana, no other letters were received by
me from Sutchamma[illegible]. Any females
came that came Peon delivered it. The
Peon Narsingham now before this office
has ever delivered any letter to me nor
did I see him from the 1st of that month.
but I do not know whether my son
delivered the letters or not to the Peon.
No letters had ever been sent to my son
by Captain Proctor my son send them
to him.

[illegible] [illegible]

No 28 Cent

To the Income Tax Clerk Nagarisuwara Range

The Collector in his Circular of the 7th February 1861, No 835, states that in the event of your present Income Tax Clerkship being abolished or dispensed with, you have claim to 25 Rs situation with which you were formerly -

Signed J Du Pre
Actg 1st Collr

Gentor
13th February 1861

D Nagasundaram

Collector's Office
Received 15 Feb 1861
No 1028
Nagarisuwara

Document 1/4.

No 132 To The Head of Police of Harbour Div.

Where is the peon Ramdhan attached to the division and if he is then let us know. This person should be sent to us and if he is not there where is he, if absent on leave who gave him it for how many days, for what purpose he got leave and whether on substitute or without

If he went on leave whether did he go with his belt or not were he togs without his belt, by what Officers order he went without it. If he is sent on Govt business by you from 1st September to the Evening of the 5th Instant, where and to whom you sent him. The Answer should immediately be sent to this without delay by the person that brings the Jaked containing all the affairs.

The date and time should be marked on your Answer both of the receipt & despatch.

On

Entered
Letters & Papers
Harbour Police Station
Port Louis 4th Dec 1864.

Copy of a Letter & Enquiry
of the 4th March No 22 of 63

15

Encl No 2113 of 1864

On which occasion I the Peon
Narsingputtam attached to the Division
from the 1st to the 6th Proximo.

See the Calculogue and acting Dabba
dar State on your Answer.

I is required to send the three Answer
of this of the above mentioned persons
1861 at 12 Oclock P. M.

(Signed)

Compared by Desaraju
Cashagerrow Magistrate
Clerk.

(Signed) T. H. Sullivan
Joint Magistrate

(True Copy)
(Signed) T. H. Sullivan
Joint Magistrate

(True Copy)
(Signed) T. Coulson
Defaison Judge

(True Copy)
V. Nagaiaroorrow.

Defaison Court Kandi

Copy in a Letter to Collr
Dy 10th March 1862 No 63

True Copy
P. Venkayya Criminal
Jarabdarsi.

Recd 24 March 1862

Chastes order
to Tasildar

P

send them to any one on Error happening from
the 1st to 6th September

The Revenue peon Narsingputtam
is on the Jabuk and is doing service.

There are two Police peons by name
Boochumah Kistnum of whom one is at
Kommalapaile Ghaty and is not on the
Jaby & the other went to Masulipatam
with accounts and has not yet arrived.

Those who are present according to Rochundabala
1 Revenue peon Narsingputtam
1 Do Sambhasingu
1 Jeboolitute Peon.

3 These three persons I have sent with the care of
Boche Dandee Mahomed known to your honors present
I beg to state that the letter is dispatched at 12 Oclock
P. M.

(Signed)
Ramiah Varadarajulu
Peon

(Signed in Marhatee)
Konuru Subbanarrow
Head of Police

I is written by Devarakonda
Venkata Narsingham Jababnavis

Defaison Canal Kandi

True Copy
P. Venkayya Criminal
Jarabdarsi.

(True Copy)
T. Coulson
Defaison Judge
(True Copy)
V. Nagaiaroow

To

A. W. Sullivan

Joint Magistrate of

Kristna District

The humble Petition of

Koviru Lakshmanarow, the

Head of Police of Martoor

Division.

Respected Sir,

In acknowledgement of your two letters dated the 7th Instant, I have the honor to state that I received them this day at 11 O'clock P. M. and understood the contents.

The Police Peon Ramdass of this Division is not here at present. he was here till the evening of the 5th Instant. I gave him leave of 5 days from the 6th Instant on his own private business without substitute and he started from the 11 on the afternoon of that date it is not known where he is now. His belt is here, because As I told him that he must not go with it on his own business. he obeyed me. I did not send

Lapilldarry Aizer, to the Subjt

In No 21039 of the Copy in a letter to Eng? of 7 March 22/63

[Deposition] of [Cama Sastry] before the [Joint] Magistrate of [Kistna] [District]

I have seen the two Peons of Martoor being now before this office. One Ramdass on the night of Friday the [illegible] came & knocked the street door while we were sleeping my house people would have opened the [door] my brother told me that some Peon man brought letter from Martoor. I rose & came out of the room I myself opened the letter by the light of the Lamp. It was therein stated "no letters have been received from after Sunday. No letters are as yet received regarding the marriage of the Children & as soon as they are received the matter will be made known. 1/2 [illegible] is sent for which wheat should be sent." The letter is the one which is addressed to my father by the hand writing of the Lapildar [illegible] Sitharamiah. It was written on half [illegible] of the white Goa paper. I recollect that paper [illegible] written on the very paper folio [illegible] with black sealing [illegible] it was [illegible] not put into separate cover [illegible] I read that letter & kept [illegible] separate situation. my father presently took & read it down & kept it with him. The Peon said that he must go to [illegible] & that we must give him leave. I asked why cannot he

people at Old Guntoor [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] it is too late & that he will [illegible]
[illegible] Having had no rice [illegible]
[illegible] it was brought from neighbour [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] the Rice & Butter milk
[illegible] some Chetty - he did not
take his [illegible] [illegible] house but gone out
[illegible] I [illegible] going [illegible] of the street door the
Peon gave me a letter on half sheet saying
that it was given to my address by the
brother in law of the Tapildar - it was
directed to me & sealed - I carried it inside
& read it. it was written that 1/2 Rupee
wheat should be sent - thinking that the
demand may have been made by women
I presently destroyed the letter - the 1/2 Rupee
is with Ramdany himself - I & my father
read the letter in the Entry. Ramdany said
that wheat should be delivered to him
whenever he comes - the Peon said that he
started from Martoor in the betimes & arrived
here - My father while going to office at
[illegible] next day he said to the Conicoply to
give wheat for [illegible] the Martoor [illegible]
the Peon - After my father [illegible] the letter
he kept it in his [illegible] nothing more
speech passed between my father & that
Peon except the demand of the wheat.
I did not entertain any suspicion
for the Peon having come at [illegible]
the

the [illegible] - the letter which Lutchmunrow
wrote to my father stating that he saw
Mr Read was received by post - I never saw
the Peon Nursingbhaw bring letters to the
address of my father - the letter aforesaid
was written on half sheet of paper - My
father told me that the portion of the paper
in which directions was, has been torn by
children - No letters have been received from
Lutchmunrow between the interval of the
ones which my father received as regards
Mr Reads visit & that which the Peon
Ramdany brought - nor did my father
write him - My father did not write letter
to Lutchmunrow from Sunday the 1st instant
nor do I know if my father wrote any letter
to him since Sunday - nor do I know if
Nursingbhaw has brought any letter from
the Christians - nor did I deliver to that
man Camphor & the bundle of [illegible] to be
delivered to Lutchmunrow - I saw this
Nursingbhaw only at Martoor but not
at Guntoor in this month - I recollect
that it was written in the letter brought
by Ramdany "no letters have been come
from Sunday"
I have seen the letter B this is the letter
which Lutchmunrow wrote to my that
he saw Mr Read - I have also seen
the letter A [illegible] This is the letter, which the Tapildar

7

Ex. Feldar wrote, which was brought by Ramdasy, which my father & I read when Ramdasy took their letter & read it. Ramdasy - I took their letter & read it yesterday or the day before yesterday taking it from the desk of my father but I did not see it from the time it came & its [illegible] in the Cross state —

2 — You stated above that you will recollect that it was written in the letter delivered by Ramdasy that no letter has been come from Sunday last & you state now that the letter A is the same which Ramdasy brought which your father read & which you took from his desk and read yesterday or the day before yesterday - You read now the cause [illegible] & there is no mention therein of the word "Sunday" — You have written while so what made you state with such difference — I did so by mistake A — This is the letter but I told so by mistake thinking that the word Sunday may be therein —

12 Letter 1862 [illegible]

Examination

R

Deposition taken before me this 13th September 1862

Collector & Magistrate

Letter sent Ex. 2193 of 1862

Collector's Office Cuddalore 12th Sept 1862

No 102. Cuddalore 61

To Soundrommilli Nagaswara Row.
Mootah Peadaiyar

You are now in the office of Mootah Peadaiyar in the Mootah office on a salary of Fo 30 per mensem - but in the arrangement made with reference to the present order of the 11th April 1860, Fo 5:30, you are appointed Clerk in the Sub Collector office from the 25th May on 25 Rupees salary per mensem - You will continue carefully in your duty.

1st June 1860. [illegible] Sub Collector.

No 3465
3/2/62
Copy under

To the President & Members of the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

The humble Petition of
Vaittoorenatty Nagaiswara
Row late Income tax Clerk in
the Office of the Sub Collector of
the Pulney District. by his
Authorized Wakeel P. Parriaugoo

Sheweth.

That is an Appeal to this Honorable
Board against the Orders A of the Acting
Collector Mr. Thornhill Dt. 27 dated 25th
November 1861, removing me from the Office
of Head Clerk in the Income tax Department
under the Sub Collector, on mere suspicion
that "I received some letters B & C from
a Jupidar Lutchmeenarow, and replied to
him on the subject of a Murder Case
and that my former dismissal is likewise
the same Nature &c."

The Chief point to be Considered
and determined by this Honorable Board is
whether

Endorsed
Petition of Vaittoorenatty Nagaiswara Row late Income tax Clerk in the Office of the Sub Collector of the Pulney District. by his Authorized Wakeel P. Parriaugoo
Copy in a Letter to Collr
Dt 15th Jany 63
Recd 24th Jany 63
No 2103 of 1862

whether the confession was attached to me by the joint Magistrate and Acting Collector or by the Acting Collector only or was not fully brought to bear against me & whether the Local Authorities are justified to order any removal upon such vague & irrelevant matter as embodied in the Order (A) under Appeal, whether any Native Officials are prohibited from Corresponding with each other on any Domestic matter, Whether the letters B & C which have been received from Lutchmanrow Canteen any public matter or private Requirement & Whether there is least proof on the record that the letters B & C were concealed & others sent for and placed in lieu, and whether the Local Authorities are justified in calling into question my Conduct on former Occasions which was quashed off by the Honorable Board and Government in their Proceedings of the 4th July 1859 & 18th May 1860.

Being highly aggrieved by the Acting Collectors decision A in which he coincides in

59

in Joint Magistrates partial or base information I (Your Petitioner) humbly beg to assure this Honorable Board that had I or the Joint Magistrate and Acting Collector Sapoldar and sufficient him with any informations, I would not be disposed to appeal to them, nor teaze them with unnecessary details, but the precise cause, which gave rise to the impeachment under the Stamp whereof I have been cast with even a fetepul burdership, being as hereinafter explained, it is most necessary for me to put this Honorable Board in full possession of how the impeachment in question came to be thrown over my head, as follows.

I (Your Petitioner) was entertained in the Sub Collectors Office as Head Clerk in the Income Tax Department on the 24th December 1860 and continued to discharge his duties to the satisfaction of the Offending Sub Collector Mr. Reed

until

vide the 8th August 1861, as would appear by the accompanying Document D.

2 While thus I was in Office Lutchmanrow Acting Jafoldar of Martoor Jaloog who is my friend has written me a letter E on the 20th April 1861 giving Cover to a Maratta one which was addressed to him by the Boogoor Sheristadar Cuddapah Rastna stating how requiring him to pay him 500 Rupees or he will adopt other means to get the Money and requesting me to bring the Circumstance of that Matter to the notice of the Gentleman, I have done Accordingly and Mr. Reed took the Original Maratta letter and kept it with him.

3. Mr. Reed Shewed his displeasure towards the Sheristadar for his illegal demand made on the said Jafoldar Lutchmanrow and the Sheristadar knowing that the Jafoldar being in intimacy with me would have brought his letter to my notice and thro me to that of the Gentleman desired me to withdraw the matter but on my not

and acceding to his request has been reflecting how to revenge me, and the Jafoldar Lutchmanrow - Thus being the said Gentleman was removed from the District and Mr. Sullivan took Charge of the Office.

4. Thus being a Murder was Committed in the Taluka in which the said Lutchmanrow was, and the persons apprehended were released by that Jafoldar that there was no evidence to send them to Court.

The said Sheristadar Rastnarow taking the advantage of this Murder Case and the acquittal of the innocent persons, has prepared and caused to be sent to Mr. Sullivan an Anonymous Petition stating that the Jafoldar received a bribe of 450 Rupees and acquitted the real delinquents &c. - With reference to this Anonymous information the Joint Magistrate tried the Case and satisfying him that the case was proved has forwarded it to the Court. The Sessions Court discovering that the trial of the Case was

defendan

dependent on Anonymous Petition and that there is no proof against the prisoners. vide Deposition Proceedings F.

The said Sheristadar during the trial before the Joint Magistrate did not fail to throw suspicion on me by reporting to the Joint Magistrate that the Jafsildar sends letter to me to enquire of what is going on in the Hoozoor as regards the Murder Case. The Joint Magistrate desirous of discovering the fact called and asked me and my people uphold the matters stated in the Anonymous Petition but on my denying that I know any the same Authority asked me if any peons of the Jafsildar brought me any letter and if answered him. I owned that the Jafsildar will write me any letter for Domestic Matter, and I will answer him. This induced the Joint Magistrate to conclude that with Reference to the Case alluded to above the Jafsildar would have written letters to me and I would have supplied him

with the information.

To the supposed Story mentioned in the Kelang Collectors Order now under appeal was invented by the Joint Magistrate and the same having been observed by the Kelang Collector and thereby myself having been removed from Office it is therefore highly incumbent on this Honorable Board to weigh the Documents on the record and Testimonie whether the Suspicion attached to me is of a correctly or of existence.

The letters B. & C are the ones sent to me by the Jafsildar which on perusal will shew that they contain nothing as the Joint Magistrate infers to be them save Domestic Requirement which is often commonly write and which I am justly comply with. Vide for the Joint Magistrates telling that Jafsildar

another

another was in their hands on being
on the person by whom the delivery
The Peons namely Rowandavy and
Narsingadhan who brought the letters
B & C have been examined by the Grand
Jury & they declare that forever
that on the morning the Petitioner was leave
he brought letter C on the 1st September
1861 and the letter, the letter B. On the
7th the Peon Rowandavy was taken
before the Grand Jury & sworn and asked
to the letter B he brought and on the
same morning & he showed the same
letter and the one C. The Peon identified
the letter and said that it was the one
he brought, which was returned to be
kept with one. I kept it and the other
letter C in the Collectors box. When
the said Peons were regularly examined
on the 13th of the same month they
respectively declared that they were the
same letters [B & C] which they delivered
to me, and which were first seen by

Rowandavy

Rowandavy on the 7th. While the letters
B & C were in the Collectory box from
the 1st to 13th and identified as those respectively
brought by them how can the Grand
Jury petitioner be justified to infer that I
tampered the letters at first received and
put other in lieu, and to attach
criminality to my having intimate to the
Petitioner. The Deposition G & H
of the two Peons aforesaid before the
Sessions Court will show that the
Grand Jury petitioner examined thereupon
the Counterfeit Petition and that they
found no other proofs than Common
Domestic Correspondence.

I need not say so for the acceptance
of Anonymous Petitions and found
any decision as inspiring the confi-
dential Officials, for, this Honorable
will not feel to remember its (Anon-
ymous Petitions) little force.

Peons Petitioner would also put this Honorable
Board in Memory of the Government
Orders

Order of the 2nd December 1861

Rule 72 Paras 23, 24, 25 & 26 Rule 213 of 1891.

Which Requires the various Authorities not to Remove their Officials upon slight fault as the Power under Appeal. Even the present Suspension was not established by Proofs on other Concurrent Evidence. Hence the Removal of same from Office is altogether unwarrantable.

Therefore I Your Petitioner Crave leave to pray that the Honorable Board will direct on the face of the Acting Collectors Order A, or, if necessary upon calling for the Records be pleased to order my Reinstatement with orders that I may be favored with arrears of my pay, from the date of my Removal.

And Your Petitioner Shall Ever Pray

1st February 1862

[signature]

To the President & Members of the Board of Revenue

20450
10/2/62
Income Tax
Executive

The humble Petition of Ceentoorngelly Nagaiswara Row late Head Clerk in the Income Tage Department in the Collectorate of the Vizagapatam District by Profession a Native of Bankote & Residing at Vizagapatam —

Sheweth

That your Petitioner in obedience to a Notice issued to him by the Honorable Board bearing date the 1st February instant, presented himself before the Honorable Board on the 7th instant and submitted for their consideration Copies of the papers A B C D E F G & H the translations of which have been filed herewith — Also the authenticated Copies of some of the papers which were referred to in the orders stated in the above Petition & now submitted marked I J K L M N & O — all of which are requested to be considered when the said Petition receives the gracious consideration of this Honorable Board and returned back after perusal

And Your Petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray

10th February 1862

Received No 270

A 1345 of 1862

Inward No 2133 of 1862

From Nagaiswara

Dated the 10th February 1862

Petition for the restoration of Salary as Head Clerk in the Income Tax Department

Copy of an Order to Govt Dated 22nd Feby 1863

Complaining of the Collector for improperly withholding from petitioner his pay from the 1st Decr 1862 to the 10th Feby 1862 and praying that the same may be restored to him

Read Letter from Govt No 328 dated 22nd Feby 1863 transmitting petition of Nagaiswara for restoration to office

Copy sent to the Collector for information

Recorded

Secretary

Head Sheristadar

Head Accountant

Accountant

Cashier

Clerk in charge of Pay Bills

Clerk in charge of Income Tax Cases

Clerk in charge of Records

Rec'd Dec 4th 1862
Mr Attorney General

To the Honorable the Members of the Board of Revenue
in Council

The Petition of Vincent Pollero of Vicksburg
Warren County Miss
Humbly Sheweth

That Petitioner has Left in the Keeping
of Messrs Collingsworth Votrie & Co
Factors upon Commission Votrie Collins & Co
the Following Described Cotton to wit
Marks Numbers & Weights as follows
Viz

Marks	Numbers	Weights
P V	1	4
	2	4
	3	4
	4	4
	5	4
	6	4
	7	4
	8	4
	9	4
	10	4
	11	4
	12	4
	13	4
	14	4
	15	4
	16	4
	17	4
	18	4
	19	4
	20	4
	21	4
	22	4
	23	4
	24	4
	25	4
	26	4
	27	4
	28	4
	29	4
	30	4
	31	4
	32	4
	33	4
	34	4
	35	4
	36	4
	37	4
	38	4
	39	4
	40	4
	41	4
	42	4
	43	4
	44	4
	45	4
	46	4
	47	4
	48	4
	49	4
	50	4

That the Cotton was Left at the Store of
Messrs Collingsworth Votrie & Co on the
Levee in Vicksburg on the 15th day of
March 1862 and was Delivered to Petitioner
on the 15th day of November 1862 at
Vicksburg aforesaid

That Petitioner has Applied to the Collector
of Revenue at Vicksburg aforesaid for a
Permit to Ship the Said Cotton to Memphis
Tenn but the Collector refuses to Issue
the Permit unless Petitioner Complies with
the Requirements of the Treasury Circular
of the 28th day of October 1862 and
Petitioner Cannot Comply with the Requirements
of Said Circular for the Reason that
Petitioner has not Received the Cotton
from Messrs Collingsworth Votrie & Co
and Cannot Obtain the Same from them
for the Reason that they are Now Within
the Rebel Lines

Petitioner Therefore Prays that the Collector
of Revenue at Vicksburg aforesaid be
Directed to Issue the Permit Applied for
Without Requiring Petitioner to Comply
with the Requirements of Said Circular
and Petitioner will Ever Pray &c

Vincent Pollero

2

In N° 2133 of 1862

U

Petition of the
Board of Revenue

Copy on a Letter to Cuy[o]
of 16th March N° 220 of 63

Rec'd Nº 201
Nº 150 of 1862
From V. Nagoisun
R/o the late Head
Clerk in the
Treasury Dept
in the Sub Collrs
Office in the
Lisbon District
presented by his
Agent Perrouze
Dd 10th
Rec'd 10th Feb 1862
with 15 Exhibits
for Contents
see minute of the
Authenticated Copies
of certain Documents
the translations
whereof had been
enclosed in his former
Petition - together with
certain other papers -

Regd No 202

No 559 of 1862

From Nagaimara
Río late Head
clerk in the Income
tax Deptt in the
Sub Coler's Office in
Lisiwa Destrict

Dd 19th
Rec 20th Feb 62

Prays with reference
to his former Petition that
he may also be re-employed
as the Tahsildar, who
was dismissed with
him on a false charge of
bribery, may been ordered
to be restored with the
arrears of Salary.

3
From No 2133 of 1862

V

Petition to the Board
of Revenue

Copy on a Letter to Govt
of 16th March No 22 of 63

case with extent & defiance of both your petitioner and Petitioners relations. This will be manifest from the accompanying copy of the anonymous petition (Enclosure 1 to 10) on which I.—

5 Your petitioner has been faithfully discharging the duties of Incumbent Head Church with secrecy and he has nothing to do with the suggested or previous Inquiries. Your petitioner was not present in the trial of such cases.—

6 Your petitioner came to Jaffna 18 months ago on duty in the Sub Collectors Office and there is no one concerned with him, it is therefore evident that Petitioners can have no interest against your petitioner who has himself no connection with the Sub Collectors Office &c. &c.

7 It appears from Answers of the Registrar General that the Joint Magistrate commenced the trial of the anonymous case on the 2 th September 1861 and concluded it the 5th November 1861

8 On the night 6 th September the Police found at Mr Arthur Thirunam Nadchani who came on leave for 6 days to Jaffna brought a letter written by Petitioners regarding to Lord Jesus which for shelf & Police and to write Jesus then came now of his pulpit.—

On the 7 th September the said Jesus was taken to the Joint Magistrate who then sent for your petitioner to his house and desired Jesus to show all the letters sent by Petitioners to your petitioner who accordingly took all the letters and showed them to the Joint Magistrate who from their contents being read and ascertained from the boat Nadchani regarding letters brought by Jesus and petitioner then to your petitioner directing them to produce them on the trial.—

9 On the 13th September the Joint Magistrate sent for your petitioner, ordered him to be seated on a mat when Sachiranjan Bapiah who came to assist on the trial of Dacharajan Sashyshanan Magistrate Clerk persuaded him to speak against Petitioners and afterwards took a deposition from your petitioner who stated the said letters which were marked A 1 to 12 — the copies of the letters and the deposition are herewith enclosed

10 The Joint Magistrate on the same day took a deposition from your petitioners son who said the very truth the compulsion was used towards him, and therefore the Joint Magistrate struck off your petitioners sons name from the list of the Volunteers, and objected an Letter prohibiting the admission of your petitioners son in any public Office.— The copy of the said Letter marked and list of your petitioner dated petitioners marked I are herewith enclosed

11 The Joint Magistrate examined your petitioner and his sons as 24th & 25th witnesses but did not think to bound with the other witnesses. The Joint Magistrate and continuing with his recommending to the Acting Collector of the removal of your petitioner to another seat proceeded himself to Manepay and found the Acting Collector for your petitioners dismissal

12. A perusal of para 11 of the Report bounds ourselves in Ls 20 of 1861 will commence the forced that compulsion was used towards the witness and likewise your petitioner and his son were compelled to state in some different manner.

13. It is quite required to say on the handsome of your petitioners dismissal that he had concealed some letters which your petitioner presented voluntarily and which he had no opportunity for concealing any of them

14 Para 33rd of the said session courts sentence clearly shews that nothing was mentioned in the letters marked A & B regarding the murder case which para your petitioner begs to append together with some letters (paras) 4th, 6th, and 11th marked K. No. 11

15. Your petitioner further begs to request the Boards kind perusal of the accompanying copies of the depositions marked H. No. 2 F. No. 6 G. No. 7 D. No. 4 E. No. 5 which clearly show that your petitioner was unjustly dismissed and that all the statements made by your petitioner are quite true.

16. Your petitioner has also sent in Documents marked L. No. 12, M. No. 13, and N. No. 14 which will convince the Board the upright character of your petitioner in consequence of which he was promoted to the responsible post of Vernacular Clerk.

17. Since the Sub Collector assumed the charge of his Office your petitioner was discharging the duties without a single fault for 4 months and therefore the Joint Magistrate is not justified in saying that he cannot trust your petitioner in the absence of any charge against him; your petitioner is at a loss to know what induced the Joint Magistrate to speak of him so.

18 Your petitioner further begs to enclose the Government Endorsement on their minutes of consultation &c marked O. No. 16 Q. No. 17 R. No. 18 and W. No. 22 as it is manifest from these Documents that your petitioner was acquitted of all the charges formerly brought against him and that he was declared innocent by the Government by ordering than his reemployment with the arrears of Salary.

19. Your petitioner also encloses document marked X. No. 23 the endorsement on the petitions presented by your petitioner to the acting Collector.

70

20 For all foregoing reasons your petitioner most humbly craves your honorable Board may be pleased to order the restoration to his situation on a kind consideration of the long and faithful services especially rendered to the state by your petitioner during the late investigation into Bribery cases by Mr. W. Elliot.

Forwarded to the Collector and reference to the 3d Undersecretary

Petition V. 345 of 1862

Balder

Mackell

Undersecretary

Rec. 3d Office
Govt Yard
11 March 62

Rep. 10 2/4

No 930 of 1862.

From V. Nagaiswara Rao Clerk in the Accountant Office in the Nellore District.

Dated 29 Feby

Recd 26 Feb 62

Subject Telugu Petition

Praying in reference to the Petitioner's representation for certain Land more specifically mentioned in the Petition to restore to him the Office from which he was unjustly dismissed

4

Rep. No 2193 of 1862

W

Petition to the Board of Revenue

Copy in a Letter to Engo dated 10th March No 22 of 63

Endorsement on Petitions Nos 345, 450, 559, 636, 861, and 963 of 1862.

"On a full consideration of the circumstances of the case as reported by the Collector, the Board determine to reject the appeal made by V. Nagaiswara Rao, whose dismissal from Office was, in their opinion, justly deserved."

By Order,

Revenue 3d Office, Madras, 11th June 1862.

C Gluckstein

Acting Sub Secretary.

Copy in a Letter to England
dated 16th March No 22 of 63

X

Board's Endorsement
dated 11 June 1862.
Confirming the
decision of the
Petr V Nagaisa
Row.

8

Encl. No 2133 of 1862

To His Excellency the Governor in Council
Fort St. George

The humble Petition of Vaichommille
Nagaiswara Row late Income
tax Clerk in the Sub Collector's office
Nellore District.

Sheweth,

That being aggrieved by the accompanying
Endorsement of the Board of Revenue 11 June 1862,
made on Petitions Nos 345 - 450 - 559 - 636 - 684 & 983
of 1862 declaring that His dismissal was in their
opinion justly deserved under the Circumstances of
the case as reported by the Collector, Your Petitioner
respectfully appeals therefrom on such Lawful
grounds as your Lordship may be leniently disposed
to cancel the decision of the lower authorities,
and issue orders that he might be restored to
his office, submitting the papers connected with
the case (marked A to E)

2nd. Before your Petitioner dwells upon the subject
matter of the case in which he was met with
the hardship now under appeal, he thinks it
necessary to remind your Lordship a few circum-
stances - that is, your Petitioner having in 1857 or
1858 been so fortunate as to obtain office under the
late Northern Circar Commissioner Walter Elliot
Esquire as the interest of the State ought be
secured in every respect by giving correct and
faithful

factful information to the Board authority
to Petitioner at last became sport of his own
Dept by the heart-burnings of his fellow officials
and by their instigations to the European authorities
that on his appealing to the Board they affirmed
the interior authorities' decision as at present
they did; that on your Petitioner appealing to
the Government, they quashed both the orders of
the Collector & Board considering that the impeach-
ment imputed to him was owing to nothing
than the heart-burnings of the other servants.
In proof of this assertion Govt No. C. R°729-31st
January, General Proceedings R°537-25th June, and
R°3533-6th September 1859 now on the Govt record,
will bear testimony if referred to there-

Under the foregoing decision of Govt, your
Petitioner was in 1858 Reinstated in his former
office of Native Record Keeper on 30 Rupees, but
since changed to Sheristah Mudeegar on equal
salary, and then as Clerk in the Guntoor Sub
Collectors' office on a reduced salary of 25 Rupees.
your Petitioner thinking that the Reduction of the
emolument is not a thing, & that remaining in
employ with proper time at any time, continued
in the same post; but the Sub Collector Mr Read
considering that the reduction with the
the opinion of the upper authorities, promoted
him (Petitioner) to the Income tax Clerk in
his office on 35 Rs per mensem on the 6th Dec.
1860. In which Petitioner continued & discharged

its duties as regularly & faithfully that he
Read favoured him with a Certificate D 74
The same gentleman also sent your Petitioner
a Taukeed stating that he has a claim to
25 Rs per mt in the event of the Income tax
Clerk office being abolished.

While your Petitioner continued in the same
office, the Sub Collector Shanmadaw Cuddapah
Krishna Row, who is aggressor of receiving bribes
in detriment to the Circar business, attempted
to receive a bribe of Rs 500 from the Tapildar
of Mantoor taluq, Lutchamma Row, and has
accordingly written a Maratta letter to that
Tapildar for that purpose. The ambiguity
of that letter will inspire all authorities
to think that it is for the bribe-
the said Tapildar being Direct Name and
thereby unable to pay the amount demanded,
but apprehending that the Shanmadaw will
in one way or other annoy him, has
addressed a letter to your Petitioner giving
cover to the one written by the Shanmadaw
to him requesting him that he would
take the same letter to Mr Read & make
known to him the Compulsory demand of
Rs 500 - For remembrance sake your Petitioner
accordingly made known the Circumstance
to Mr Read, who took the Maratta letter

V

& kept it with him. The Petitioner wrote to the Tapildar of what passed. Mr. Read entertaining great distrust in the said Sherishtadar, asked him in the presence of the head Collr. and the Sherishtadar admitted the Maratta letter. Before finally checking the matter Mr. Read having been removed to other District, he recorded in the office Book at length that the Sherishtadar is great devourer of bribes neglecting the Circar business. The Sherishtadar was too heat towards me & the Tapildar for having brought the circumstance of his letter to the notice of the gentleman and ever begun to shew his resentment or ill will towards the both.

6. — On Mr. Sub Collr. Sullivan's arrival, the said Sherishtadar was seeking opportunity to annoy both your Petitioner & Tapildar. There being a Murder took place in the Tapildar's jurisdiction & the offenders apprehended have been set at liberty by the Tapildar that there was no proofs against them. Ossa report being submitted to the Tapildar the Joint Magistrate sent for the same offenders so acquitted as well as the Ossa referred to in the Documents herewith kept and kept them under examination. The Sherishtadar taking advantage of this Case in memory of the Maratta letter being brought to publicity and

and determining to revenge [illegible] the Tapildar caused an Anonymous [illegible] to be sent to Mr. Sullivan on the [illegible] [illegible] the Tapildar receiving a [illegible] Rs. 250 from the delinquents acquitted [illegible] & that your Petitioner receives & writes letters from & to the same Tapildar giving information as to what passes in the Huzoor in the said Murder Case — This Mr. Sullivan trusted to be true and then instituted enquiry as to the letters from the Tapildar to your Petitioner's address & as to who brought them to him. Whereupon the Joint Magistrate seizing the Peon Ramdany who had come to Guntoor on leave, & ascertaining from the Anonymous Petition that a Peon Nursiahwhan was the man that brought letter to your Petitioner asked him (Petitioner) if he received any letter from the Tapildar. It was in the 7th Septr. that that gentleman asked him so. Your Petitioner said that he will be receiving letter on Domestic affairs [illegible] letters to that gentleman [illegible] taken by the gentleman of which only two were taken [illegible] for the purpose [illegible] Domestic letters [illegible] by his own hand [illegible] (for the present C) [illegible] to keep them in [illegible] them with orders [illegible] my office [illegible] examined your Petitioner & his [illegible] Depositions [illegible] taken from your Petitioner [illegible] letter were taken from your Petitioner [illegible] the same date by the Joint Magistrate. The

7 The Court Magte founded the Murder Case to the Sessions Court as also committing the Tapildar on a Charge of having Received bribe illegally against the offended.

8 During the trial before the Sessions Court the Peon Ramadang & Kuriya Khan respectively declined Depositions, the former, saying that he brought the letter which is marked by the Court Magistrates own hand as A containing domestic matter pie "to send in Wheat" and the latter, that he ever brought letter to Petr, and both stating that they were tortured in the Court Magistrates office on pain of putting them in stocks were they not to admit that they previously brought & delivered letters to the Petitioner & to support the Anonymous Petition.

9 The Sessions Judge acquitted both the offenders in the Murder Case and the Tapildar on that of Bribery, being of opinion that there is no proof against them.

10 Then the Court Magte considering that the Tapildar was tortured by Sessions Court & recommended to the Govt that the Tapildar might be ordered to be removed that your Petitioner might be changed to other post.

11 The Collector in opposition to the Magte's opinion ordered the other removal of your Petitioner upholding the Collector's view as no ground is given by him for Cause which had been fully decided

cleared by Govt as stated above.

12 The Board of Revenue, to whom the Collector recommended that the Tapildar should be ordered to be removed, have justly remarked that the Charge having been dismissed by the Sessions Court against him, he Tapildar should be permitted to return to his office

13 The Tapildar in whose case your Petr was disinissed on suspicion of having held Correspondence with him in the Murder Case, is to this moment in his office, whilst your Petitioner the Secondary or innocent accompany, is loser of his post.

14 Your Petitioner appealed to the Board with every particulars but they say that they are satisfied with a Report from the Collector in affirming his dismissal

15 It is therefore most incumbent on your Lordship itself to reverse the following Court ground order the reinstatement of your Petitioner together with the payment of the arrear of her salary, &c.

16 Because the whole burden of the case upon which the Local authorities decision was founded lies that the Tapildar K Petitioner corresponded with each other affording information to the former by the latter as regards the Murder Case & the Anonymous Petition, as stated in the Letters A & B with Envelope C all

the percent of

all doubts that they do not contain such passage as the Court appears speak of except some Domestic Concernment.

II Because the St Magte's assertion that your Petitioner placed another letter written by the one in his charge, is not borne out by records except that an Court's ideal supposition. Even to admit this there must be some what strange or Concurrent possibility in effecting the Resolution. Such is not the Case. Or the 7 the letters were shewn to the St Magte & they were marked by him with Dominical Letters A & B. by his own hand. To this day the same letters remain on the Record with the same marks. How can it be said that they had been taken & others placed by Clerk.

III Because the Petitioner & Lapidus are equal sharers in the Act imputed to. The one (former) was acquitted & declared eligible to employ & the other (latter) left to suffer the ill fate. Which is not just.

IV The letter A marked by the Court Magte & B at present is identified by the Peon who brought it to be the same which was by him brought. The letter which was marked by Court Magte & C at present is about Cotton. Referring to the statement of your Petitioner

Collector dismissing
them.

Represents the circum-
stances under which
he was on a former occa-
sion discharged from the
office of Native Record
Keeper & was restored
to his place by the order
of Govt. -

Submits a list of papers
connected with his case.

Prays to be restored to his
office after a mature
consideration of his case.

Copy as a Letter to England
No 16 March No 220 of 1863

Y

No 2103 of 1862.

From Conetoorneille Nagaisuera Rows late Clerk Income tax office Vizianagram District

Dated 8th August 1862
Rec'd 11th August 1862

Enclosures 19
A to S.

States the circumstances under which he was dismissed from his post as a Clerk in the Income tax Department. -

Sets forth that the Board of Revenue have confirmed the order of the

To

The Honorable the Governor in Council.

The humble appeal petition of
Varoothooroomelle Kuppuswara
Row the late Accomptant Tax Clerk,
Sub-collectors Office, Trichinopoly
District.

Most respectfully sheweth,

1. That your petitioner, after 23 years service, on a salary of Rs 35 per mensem, on pretence of a slight guilt reported by the Sub-collector, has been dismissed by the Collector of the District, on the 25th of November 1861. On this, your petitioner, with proper grounds, appealed to the Board of Revenue on different dates viz. 1st, 10th, 19th, and 21st of February 1862; having also sent all the necessary and explanatory records for reference. On the 24th February of the same year, that is 1862, the honorable Board transmitted all the proceedings and records to the said Collector, for his report thereon; but the Collector made his report, after a long delay of 4 months; and of which report your petitioner is entirely ignorant. The honorable Board, upon this, having confirmed your petitioner's dismissal, sent their proceedings and endorsement dated 11th June 1862, to the Sub-collector of the District, who delivered them to your petitioner for his information. Immediately on the receipt of the indorsement, which was on the 1st July 1862,

Your

your petitioner hastened to Madras, a distance of nearly 300 miles from his own, and has presented this petition, with all the desirable references and records, to be placed before the honorable Council for consultation, for cancelling the orders of the Collector as regards your petitioners dismissal, and for the payment of the arrears due to him for the period without employ.

2. When the honorable Walter Elliot came to the late Masulipatam Gillah Committee as Commissioner, your petitioner informed him of all the disturbances and their real sources; for which act, the gentleman, being much pleased with him and his abilities, rewarded him with the post of the Tasildar, in the District. As the Commissioner, having discovered the real culpates and inflicted on them suitable punishments, reinstated your petitioner with this high post (for he had been the reporter of the evils and the man who caused them) the criminals, and again, those who had escaped punishments by the intercession of the Collector himself, brought some false accusation against your petitioner; on which though the Collector had, at first, deprived him of his post, yet on his appeal to the Commissioner, and on his despatching the appeal application and other records for the report of the Collector thereon, then the Collector, your petitioner knows not why, remarked, that he was entitled for having his

his post back, and that at ought and the power him. So your petitioner had been reinstalled in some employment. From this time forward, the persons, who had been the real culpates, and who were punished through your petitioners means, continued their trials and attempts in displacing him from whatever post he holds; and similarly they have now done. As a proof of all the above, the document marked (g) on which the endorsement of the Collector is seen, is enclosed herewith.

3. In 1854, the criminals referred to in the 2nd para, of whom some only are still employed, having instigated the inhabitants of Dokepurre of the Purgunah of Vamnoocottah, to bring a suit against four of us namely, Collector Lushington, Special Assistant Collector Baird, Commissioner Chukrapany Row, the shexistadar, and your petitioner himself, in the Civil Court of the Masulipatam Gillah, in Nos. 72, 73, 74, and 75 in the year 1854. Though your petitioner has undergone great deal of expenses by these complaints, in his answers &c., he has had them all recovered after his appeals to higher authorities.

4. Collector Lushington has been pleased

pleased to declare upon your petitioner's petition and the endorsement (9) of the Commissioner, the office of the late Record-keeper, in his Cutchery, late Maunlipatam Gillah, on a salary of Rs 30 per mensem. While in this office, some of the said criminals, who were in employ in the same Cutchery, having caused some others of their party to produce a charge on your petitioner, before the Collector, and having themselves stood as witnesses against him in their behalf, your petitioner was once more turned out of his post, on 20th April 1858. Then your petitioner appealed to the Board of Revenue, who, as in the present instance, having received the report of the Collector after a very long delay, approved of the orders of the Collector, and confirmed your petitioner's dismissal. On this your petitioner presented his appeal No 361, on Her Most Gracious Majesty's Address, on the 22d November 1858, to the honorable Government. Then the Government were pleased to go through it and all the appended records, to annul the order and decrees of the Collector, and to send to the Collector, through the Board of Revenue, the Extract of Minutes of Consultation, dated 31st January 1859 No 129,

in

which it was ordained, that your petitioner should have his own place restored, a letter dated 25th June 1859 No 837, for the purpose of clearing your petitioner's arrears, and the Proceedings dated 6th of September 1859 No 3533, intitling and recommending your petitioner for promotion. Then the Collector not only restored your petitioner to his former appointment, but also paid him the Company's Rs 323 4 9 3/4 in liquidation of the arrears due to him. Further, on your petitioner's application, the honorable Government were pleased to send him the endorsement No 2074, for what had passed about him, on the 4th of July 1859; and a copy of which, with the mark (9) is herewith enclosed. All the officers of the Collector's Cutchery, were very much displeased with the Government's decisions in my favour.

5. After your petitioner's restoration to the native Record-keepership, a vacancy of vacancies had occurred at various times. Your petitioner, though recommended by the Government for promotion, had not any given him. While so, the Chevildar, having been influenced by the evil Counsels of his servants, who were your petitioner's enemies, and who were jealous of his

of two getting the increased salary of Rs 40 in the Pollys arrangements, got himself transferred to another of equal emoluments to his then situation, on the 16th December 1859. Soon after on the amalgamation of the two Gillahs of Gunter and Kistnah, your petitioner had been transferred to another of a lower salary of Rs 25 in the Cutcherry of the Sub-Collector; as the brother of that Goomastah was then servant in the Collector's Cutcherry and wished to have him removed to the Office in which he himself was, through the favour of the Shereistadar, who accordingly did on the 21st of May 1860. Then your petitioner informed both the Honorable Board of Revenue and the Government of the injustice and partiality shewn in the time of the amalgamation of the Gillahs, by means of his own petitions, having undergone himself the postage &c; and the Board returned them all through the Collector. The nos of these are in the year 1859:— Nos 814, 2977, 3618, 192. The Government have returned theirs directly to the petitioner, and the Nos of these are in the year 1859:— Nos 2704, 2872, 3440, and in 1860:— Nos 1194, 2136, 2202, 2412, and 2719. To all these orders, they attached some printed

printed papers, which contained and explained the [illegible] and returned these to your petitioner without having referred to the nature of the [illegible] and understood delivered to your petitioner by the Board of Revenue through the Collector as marked (Alla); and a copy of which is hereunto enclosed.

6th When J. W. Reed Esqr. assumed charge of the office of Sub-collector, he on examination, finding your petitioner a watchful, diligent and able servant in the office; and having procured permission from the Collector, a copy of the order is hereto attached and is marked (Ke), promoted and transferred your petitioner to the post of Income Tax clerk whose salary is Rs 35 per mensem in the 6th December 1860 as the establishment was then, your petitioner had to trouble in getting up with the accounts, and carry on the business entrusted to his charge, which was doubtless a difficult task. Your petitioner was authorized to assess the Income Tax of 9 Talooks under the Sub-collector, serve notices to the different villagers, and was able to realize the large sum of Company's Rupees

Rupees 2,000 for the government. The Gentleman placed to the utmost, not only expressed his satisfaction, but also a sense of duty bound, when he was substituted for another, wrote your petitioner's character and qualifications in the Office Book. I have obtained an extract of the same, and a copy of which is herewith enclosed, and to which the mark (2) is placed. A copy of the order of the Collector, granting your petitioner to hold his former post of Rs 25 per mensem, in case of the abolition of the Income Tax Office or his resignation, is herewith attached; and the mark (0) is upon it.

7. I beg to say that Kistna Row, the sub-sheristadar of the office in which I was, desired to have services of his own caste & religion in his own department; but to the Income Tax Clerkship, Mr. Reed did not choose to give him the hand he desired; as he knew quite well that your petitioner was an able, vigilant and correct man; he promoted him to the office. That the sub-sheristadar is one who greatly practises the system of

of receiving bribes can be well proved by the following. When Mr. Reed transferred Veeraroo Lutchmen Row, the Tasildar of Thummaroo Goodoo Taluk, to Mootoor Taluk merely as a substitute, than the said sub-sheristadar demanded Lutchmen Row, to pay him the sum of Rs 500, as the price of his aid in getting him appointed for the new post. But the Tasildar, without paying the sum, having brought the affair to the notice of the sub-collector, in private, left it for his own. Some time after the sub-sheristadar wrote to the Tasildar in Mahrattah Tongue about the sum of money; and the Tasildar, as directed by the sub-collector, when he fell in conversation with him in private, and when he expressed him, having enclosed the original letter together with its Telugu translation, along with the cover in one of his own, and having superscribed it in the name of your petitioner (because he could not directly to the sub-collector should be intercepted by the sub-sheristadar

sub-sheristadar) desired your petitioner to lay this before the sub-collector; and if wanted to deliver the original itself into his hands. So your petitioner has done; and as he wanted the letter itself, he delivered it to him. Because Lutchmen Row did not pay him the money he asked, and because your petitioner never informed him of the matter previous to the delivering of the letter to the sub-collector, the sub-sheristadar and his immediate servants are displeased with them both. In course of days, when the Collector came to Guntur, he and the sub-collector sent for the sub-sheristadar, the Tasildar and your petitioner, and tried the case. During the course of it, the sub-collector was transferred to Bellary as a substitute. He, therefore, having put down the character of the sub-sheristadar in all its real features; and as the trial was being conducted, having given all the records &c to J. H. Sullivan who came to act for him went to Bellary. The sub-sheristadar and the officers immediately under him

are all in opposition to your petitioner, as he did not show the letter to the sub sheristadar, and to the Tasildar as he refused to bribe him. A copy of the translation of the letter written by Lutchmen Row to your petitioner is herewith appended; and the mark(E) is placed upon it.

A few days after J. H. Sullivan had taken charge of his post of sub-collector, a murder case occurred in Somavarappadu, a village in Ellortoor Taluk. And as Lutchmen Row was the Tasildar, he having tried the case, and finding it not proved, acquitted all who had been arrested on suspicion and wrote to the sub-collector that he was making all the possible inquiries in detection of the dismissed case. The sub-sheristadar, as he was an enemy to the Tasildar, prevailed upon the new sub-Collector, to cause the case to be retried in Coocoor by informing the gentleman, that the Tasildar Lutchmen Row seems to have taken bribes; and for which purpose he and the necessary warrants and summons to the individuals who were declared on suspicion as having had a hand in the said case. In order to induce the Collector to place implicit trust in the matter or in his reports, he posted an anonymous letter dated 3d September 1861

1861 on Gentr, the contents of which are that the said Vaseldar had received a bribe of R. 450 for the purpose of getting that murder case disproved and dismissed; that your petitioner was a friend of that Vaseldar, who consequently is in receipt of timely information of what was then passing in the Hoosseor Cutchery from your petitioner; and that a Revenue peon named Narasingabhan was at your petitioner's to that through him the information is allowed conveyed. The Sub-Collector, as the sub-Shirastadar expected, confided in the anonymous letter and commenced the trial. But the anonymous letter never reached the Collector's Cutchery in Hoosseor, the trial was not at all commenced. A copy of the anonymous letter, the extract of which I obtained from the stamped paper on the Collector's Cutchery, is herewith appended with the mark(A) upon it.

On the 6th of September 1861, Hoosseor Division Police peon, named Ramasamy an acting private affairs, having taken leave for 5 days without any intimation was on his way to Bangalore, when he received a letter on your petitioner's name from Erode stating that the Vaseldar, who requested

wanted wheat for Re 1/2. The next next day the 7th September, the Sub-Collector sent for the peon and for your petitioner and tried; on this your petitioner delivered him both the letter brought by the said peon and another letter wanted by the Sub-Collector. After having heard your petitioner read those letters and having marked on them A & B, the sub-collector delivered both of them to your petitioner who preserved them in his record box. On the evening of the 13th September from 4 O'clock to 12 O'clock at night, the sub collector having sent for your petitioner and his son Ramasastrie, who though of 7 years' service, was obliged to volunteer his services, and left them both to some private place and left them in charge of Gentir Cottawal Narasingabhan and Hoosseor Deloyt Mohomet Ismael, who both teazed and tortured them great deal and extorted a promise from them, to the effect that they would give their deposition in coincidence with what was stated in the anonymous letter referred to in the above. But they deposited only as much of the real affairs as they recollected; and according to his desire they left the two documents with the sub-collector. Of the two letters, that marked

(A)

(A) it was shewn to Ramthauny, who acknowledged that that was the letter seached by him. Because your petitioner and his son did not give their deposition as the sub-collector wanted them, he dismissed your petitioner's son from the volunteer roll and issued out an ettiar to the effect. Your petitioner on the 14th September, and his son, after receiving the copy from the stamped paper on the 14th October, sent the information to the collector, who referred the same for the report of the sub-collector thereon. Relative to the murder case, that was tried before sub-collector, Lutchmen Row and others of the stamp were committed in the session Court of Guntur on the 5th November. The sub-collector then wrote to the collector that your petitioner should be removed to some other place, and that the ettiar about his son should be confirmed, on the 11th November. Having done so, he had been to Masulipatam to speak to the collector on the matter. As Lutchmen Row and others, who had been committed to the Court were declared not guilty, on the 22d November, because the case was not proved, the sub-collector gave vent to his fury in the dismissal of your petitioner on the 25th November 1861. The copy of the

the translation of the orders of the sub-collector for your petitioners dismissal is marked (A) and Lutchmen Rows letters B and C. That your petitioner and his son were ~~tortured~~ as plain from the 11th para of the decree of the Court as well as

10. The Session Court has condemned the sub-collector about the length of time he held in the trial of the murder case; and as the witnesses were not proved the Court dismissed the case altogether. The sub collector enraged at this wrote to the collector for the dismissal of the Tasildar, and the collector wrote to the Board of Revenue; who never acquiescing in the opinion of the collector gave order for the restoration of the Tasildar and the post of a goomastah to the late gave abouncer.

11. In the orders given for the dismissal of your petitioner, it was stated that Narasingjabhan brought letters from Lutchmen Row and received a reply from your petitioner and that Ramthauny has accounted as having seen him. But this is an utter falsehood; for that Lutchmen Row when asked reported, even when in Tasildarship, that he had never sent Narasingjabhan; and this he stated in the article No 15th in reply to that of

the

the Sub collector's 1/32. When Narasingabhan and Ramchandy were both enquired before the Session Court, they said that the deposition they had given was a forced and an untrue one, and that Narasingabhan had never come hither. We herewith append the copies of extracts of depositions received from the stamped papers and marked J and K. The order is numbered 132 and is marked P. Urzi is numbered 158 and is marked (M).

12 Through the Sub collector, having sent for the letter that was brought to your petitioner on the 6th September about 10 O'clock at night, and having been fully convinced that that was the letter, marked it (A); and another of your petitioner's letter received through post marked (B); and though it is stated in the 6th para of the Court's Proceedings No 20, that the trial of the murder case had commenced on the day previous to that on which the letter (A) was received; and though the contents of the anonymous letter, had been disproved by the deposition of the person Narasingabhan, before the Court, as also by the reply of the Tasildar to the Sub collector's letter on the matter; and though the parties concerned in the murder case had not at all been collected at Hoosoor till the anonymous

murder case, it was no good to him to have written to your petitioner, as he had nothing to do really with that department of work; and therefore he ought to have had better means employed namely some of the magistrates or their officers. Such being the case, it is most unreasonable and unjustifiable to have dismissed your petitioner on this false accusation, and again it heightens the guilt because it was effected 3 months after the dismissal of the said case.

13 When your petitioners' son was asked to state clearly the contents of the letter marked (A) he, having related the whole, added something which was not in the letter. He said that it was in the letter "you never wrote since Sunday last", as your petitioner is in receipt of numerous letters from friends and relatives daily, it might perhaps have been met with in some letter or other, which your petitioners' son, being a boy, might have been confounded with, either because of his young mind or because of the sufferings and threats he met with

from

from the peons, into whose charge your petitioner and his son were left, and who continued (because they were ordered to parcel out words from man in their charge) to oppress and torture them most pitilessly in the dead of night; or your petitioner's son might have given a proper deposition but the servant or the goomastah who marked them down, in order to show his skill in the management of the particular task, might probably have set down things not in their own nature but somewhat varied as it might have pleased him. Thus your petitioner is obliged to state because, it was well acknowledged, that that was the letter written by Lutchmun Row and received by your petitioner and fetched by Ramchunny. All what the lad had told was the true account contained in the letter but that one thing, even which, after the hearing of the deposition, he denied by expressing that he did it inconsiderate. It is customary, in most important cases also, I mean such as would inflict even capital punishment, when such contrary statements are made, they cancel each other and the

very news letter had reached the office of the sub-collector, and though your petitioner bears no connexion whatever to the said murder case; and though the murder case commenced to be tried only on the 5th of September in the residence of the sub-collector himself with the strict orders to the entire exclusion of all; though there was nothing detected, in fact, nothing excited, in the Tasildar correspondence with the petitioner, about the imputed matters; though Lutchmun Row is a perfect stranger in respect of relation, and no other tie between himself and your petitioner than that of friendship; and though it was apparent that it was impossible for any to have held correspondence on the subject of murder case and its trial in the short interval of one day; which is the only time intervened the trial commencing day and the day of the receipt of the letter by your petitioner from the Tasildar through Narasingabhan; though your petitioner had never written to the Tasildar long prior to the date of the said case trial,

under

under such circumstances it is not
easy to discharge to hear the Sub-Collector
mention, that your petitioner corresponded
with the Tasildar but only suppressed them all, and produced all new
ones; and that your petitioner's conduct
therefore is suspicious. As the petitioner,
though under a great many oppressions,
never consented to give out his deposition in accordance with the anonymous letter; and further as he reported the same to the Collector, he
was falsely accused of the charges
laid above, and dismissed from his
post. On the very next day, that is,
within four hours from the receipt of
the letter by your petitioner, the sub-
Collector, having sent for it, and
another letter, marked them both
himself as stated above. How is it
possible for a man in so short a
time, and when the other, that is the
Tasildar is situated nearly at a
distance of 40 miles, to have exchanged
that original for another of a different
character. Had the Tasildar wished
to learn relative to the trial of the
murder

the parties are acquitted or escaped the
punishment; which they would otherwise
have experienced; and why not as this
which is nothing but very trivial. Your
petitioner finds no proper grounds for his dis-
missal. If strong suspicion alone, you
would say, the greatest reason, in any
case, why not the same be made applicable
to the other party also, who, ought to have
had a share in the blame, according to
your own way of reasoning. If you
say your petitioner exchanged the letter,
even it is, that the Tasildar ought to have
written a second for him. Therefore the
Tasildar is as much as, or perhaps in a
higher degree in the blame than the
petitioner himself. Since the nature of
events is such, he ought to have been
(according to your suspicion) treated
in the same manner as your petitioner.
Do it then on your part right & just
to dismiss your petitioner, an employee
of 23 years' service, and of a salary
of Rs 35 per mensem, only on suspicion,
while the other without even the
formality of a trial, is continued to

enjoy

enjoy his high post and the emoluments
thereunto upon it. This alone is sufficient
to shew the falsity of the charge brought
against your petitioner. Your petitioner
was not dismissed immediately but 3
months after the dismissal of the case
having no other proper ground to deprive
him of his post, he was made to suffer
because of suspicion, and because his
Lordship stated at random what was not
in the letter & even without considering
the impossibility of exchanging the letters
which had been marked by the Sub-
Collector himself A & B.

14. Once previous to this, all the
unjust and unlawful charges
against your petitioner were made
unexpectedly by the Extract Minutes
of Consultation, dated 31st January
1859 No 129, by which not only the
petitioner was declared not guilty,
& restored to his former post, but
also obtained the arrears due to him
for the days intervening the day
of the deprivation of his office &
the day of his restoration to the same

Dr.

on consideration of the above your
petitioner deems it not at all right
on the part of the Collector to have
made a mention of the case of Elumi
Thennyala Pully of Tamarapoo, in
whose favour there has been pro-
ceedings dated 18th May 1860 No 240
in the present orders for the decision
and therefore is of opinion that it
is done through indignity or and not
through any guilt on the part of the
petitioner.

15. Owing to the iniquity of the
servants of Travancore, your petitioner
not only was debarred from promotion
though he had a right for it, in con-
formity to the proceedings of the Govt
dated 6th September 1859 No 3533;
but also, the two arrangements was
substituted on less salary. Also
your petitioner discharged his
duties always punctually and with
attention, and no just causes
could be found for procuring
his dismissal, therefore the appointed

Servants

servants, through their ancient age, could only effect his temporary removal, without the knowledge of the Board, and thus causing some pain and the loss of some money on the part of your petitioner in attempting to get himself restored and feel themselves satisfied. The deprivation of his post without the order of the Board, is contrary to the 7th and 8th paras of Extracts Minutes of Consultation dated 5th day 1854 No. 421. The Board's confirmation of the acts of the Collector, on your petitioner's appeal, is a great injustice done to him. For when Walter Elliot came to Masulipatam as a commissioner to the Committee there, the Collector had been the Assistant Collector. The Salt Motar called Pondaik Nainmack (Cotaroo) was under the management of the Assistant Collector. The servants in the Cotar incurred great damage to the Circar and embezzled

embezzled much of the public property; in the detection of which your petitioner had rendered good assistance. During the trial the Assistant Collector had gone for on leave. Most of the servants were then duly punished and others were greatly disgraced. Thus the servants having borne in mind, waited for an opportunity to revenge. When the Sub-Collector on a trivial alleged fault wrote for transfer, the Collector by the evil and provoking counsels of these servants, and by their exaggerations of the guilt of the petitioner, much exasperated, not only ordered the removal of the man at once, but also was glad to report to the Board some things which were past and cancelled years ago. In obedience to the orders of the Government, when your petitioner obtained his employment back, and when he

reported

reported to the Board of Revenue of the injustice done him, the Board through their resentment, never consulted the matter found, even when appealed for justice, they confirmed the orders of the Collector. As the murder case had been dismissed before the Court for want of proof and as the Tasildar, the chief culprit, was, by the Board of Revenue's orders, restored to his former post, it is greatly unjust and unlawful to dismiss upon petitioner alone, on the sole consideration of the opinion of the sub-Collector, without the least regard to what had been passed before the Court. The 4th, 6th, 11th, and 33d paras of the Court's Decree is herewith attached; and all of them marked (H).

16 On dismissal by the Collector, your petitioner appealed to the Board of Revenue for justice. Then the Board requiring explanation from the Collector, and upon whose report (your petitioner knows not of what nature it was)

which was made after a long delay of 4 months, it is a great injustice to dismiss the appeal, without considering whether the Board have discharged their part well, whether the petitioner was really deserving the punishment and whether he was actually guilty.

17 That case, which has caused the dismissal of the petitioner, was also dismissed both by the Court and the Board of Revenue as it was not proved. Those who were concerned in it such as the Tasildar, the jawabdar, and the other goomastahs, all being acquitted, are in some employments, though not all in their respective cases. As it is common with all to unite to each other for their welfare, so Lutchmen Row wrote to your petitioner. and on being desired to shew them, it was done; and two of them without any dispute whatever, were marked A and B, and taken possession of by the sub-Collector what would have induced

duced him to deliver them? it's one containing nothing of the alleged criminal affair. To the effect it was stated in the 33d para of the boards decree No 20. It was quite plain that the petitioner never wrote any letter to the Tasildar from many days from the letter marked (A). Ramthaury and the peons Parasuraj Abhan, both in their depositions before the Session Court, said that they were forced to give out such statements. Because the peons have given such false depositions before him, the sub-collector dismissed them both at the instant. It is doubtless a great injustice to dismiss to dismiss the petitioner merely placing implicat trust on the words and depositions of such false witnesses, while men who were really blameable, and who doubly dealt with their tongues and who though confessed that they

they received bribes, are restored to their own posts. The petitioner's deposition from the sub-collector is marked (A) and that of his son marked (B) and both are herewith attached.

18. When the petitioner and his son were carried before the sub-collector for trial, the Gumdar Pattawal Parasuraj Abhan and the Assessor Daloyet Mohammad Ismail, have both troubled and tortured the falsely called criminals. Then your petitioner spoke personably to the sub-collector and wrote to the Collector on the matter; but they never inquired into it. It was even stated in para 1 of the boards decree No 20, that others who were present on the trial as having been similarly treated by the said two peons only; and about this also, as the depositions of Ramthaury and Parasuraj Abhan which are marked I and H. Keith the Collector, the Board of Revenue have

have made any inquiries whatever.

19. The Government, instead of rewarding the ex-Sheristadar for his demanding a bribe of Rs 500; from Coroorao Lutchmanen Rou, the Tasildar, are making their best endeavours to get him an increased salary of Rs 200 per mensem, while he that has discovered the underhand dealings of the sub-sheristadar, instead of being rewarded for his ability and correctness, was dismissed from his post. How far justice is concerned in this case, should be duly and well considered by the honorable Government, and do justice to your poor and humble petitioner.

20. When the Collector wrote that Pathara[illegible] Rainaseruney and Coroorao Lutchmanen Rou received bribes, and therefore ought to be dismissed, the Board of

of Revenue, contrary to the Law of the Gentoos, stated that they were not of opinion to act accordingly. But such is the case, it is very unjust and partial to have excused men who were really culpable and duly set to punishment, the humble petitioner, who had never had any such complaints against him, and dismiss him only upon a very slight cause and which never is false.

21. In the Tollys arrangements with regard to Rossoor & Talooka, contrary to the orders of the Government, the Sheristadar introduced new hands, and confirmed old hands, such as are related to him as brothers-in-law, uncles, friends, worldly people who strongly by support his caste and sect, though they were all very old, inattentive and not for losing in the receipts of pensions, while those whoever meritorious

meritorious to meet with such rewards and promotions, were, because they were not carrying as they, entirely neglected, and in instances similar to your petitioners, have even been degraded in their routes and stations and salaries. Though your petitioner reported this matter to the Government 23rd May 1860, they have not at all brought to their kind consideration and have returned me the endorsement No 2136 with his petition having attached to it the printed Digest Para of Petition Rules.

Therefore the humble boon of your petitioner is that the honorable Government should be pleased to consider about all the said matters, and all the proceedings and other records of the case of Gunden as hereunto appended.

appended. The records altogether amounting to 26, and cancelling the orders of the Collector as regards your petitioner's dismissal, grant not only his restoration in his former post, but also the arrears of his salary due to him for the days unemployed or out of employ.

5th August 1862
Sylhet

No 2133 of 1862.

Referred through the Collector of Bellary to — Mr J. H. Reid for early report on the allegations contained in Para 7.

By Order
A. D. Pinkerton
Sy Secy to Govt

Fort St George
8th October 1862

M. H.
11/10/62

Referred to the Acting Sub. Collector for early report.

[illegible]
Collr.

No. 573.

Ordered that the Memorial received with the foregoing letter be forwarded to the Home Authorities and that an intimation of the same be given to the Memorialists.

J. D.

Fort St. George
11th March 1863.

Telugu Enclo returned to Pr 24th July
Encl to Pr No 1737 of 1862 with
A to C. E. G. K. F. L. M. N. O.
P. 2. R. S. BB. 66. 4 22

Referred through the Collector of Bellary

No 2133 of 1862.

to — Mr J. H. Reid for early report on the allegations contained in Para 7.

By Order
A. D. Pinkerton
Sy Secy to Govt

Fort St George
8th October 1862

M. H.
11/10/62

Referred to the Acting Sub. Collector for early report.

[illegible]
Collr.

From Lieut. Col. Robert Patton
Commanding Nellore Field Force

No 2133 of 1862

To
The Secretary to Government
Fort St George

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith a petition from Dewan Venkata Row Garu Khajanchee of the Nellore Circle Nellore Zillah praying that the Government will be pleased to grant him the Inam Village of Kothapalli in the Nellore Taluq in consideration of the services rendered by his father Dewan Lutchmana Row Garu to the Government during the Polygar disturbances in the Carnatic.

2. The petitioner has been employed in the Collectorate for 30 years and has discharged the duties of his office to the satisfaction of his superiors.

3. I beg to recommend the petition to favorable consideration.

I have &c
(Signed) R. Patton
Lieut. Col.
Commanding Nellore Field Force

Camp Nellore
22nd July 1862

Received in Public Department 24th July 1862.

Referred to the Board of Revenue for report and recommendation.

By Order
(Signed) A. D. Pinkerton
Secy to Govt

Fort St George
24th July 1862

Copy sent to the Collector of Nellore for information by Letter dated 29th July 1862.

Copy sent to the Board of Revenue by Letter dated 29th July 1862.

Rev= 1863 Dep.
Rr. of Govt. Jonathan Varela
No. 387.

From.

V. Ragavaram

late Income Tax

Clerk in Kistna

Dist.

Dated 12th Feby

Received 13th of 1868.

Stating that a

perusal of certain documents

presented with his Memorial

to Secretary of State will

show Govt the grounds under

which he is dismissed

from his appointment.

No 136 & 137.

No 573 - 11 Inwards

W. Elder

27 Memorials to B.R.