

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	623	<u>Press</u> <u>Mis.</u>
	41-42	
Dated	7-4-1918	

Not to be folded or roughly handled.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
9th April 1863.*

No. 41. Read the following humble Petition of NUMBURI NARASINGUM, late Zilladar of Vinnacotta Mittah, Gudivada Talook, Kistna District, to His Excellency the Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, dated 26th January 1863, No. 350 :—

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

That with reference to the Proceedings of Government of the 18th December 1862, No. 2,630, Petitioner begs to submit the enclosed Endorsements, being the orders of the different authorities to whom he appealed :—

1. Collector's Endorsement, dated 10th May 1858.
2. Board's Petition, dated 3rd Sept. 1859.
3. Board's Order thereon, 3 years after, dated 15th May 1861.
4. Government orders dated 19th Nov. 1861.
5. Do. do. „ 28th June 1862.
6. Do. do. „ 8th August „
7. Do. do. „ No. 2,337 of „

And Petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

No. 42. ORDER THEREON, 9th April 1863, No. 623.

1. The Memorial referred to in the foregoing Petition will be despatched to its destination.
2. Petitioner will be further informed that though the Government cannot interfere in a case which was decided so long ago and regarding which no appeal was preferred till 2½ years after the dismissal was ordered, they have no objection to his re-employment should the present local Officers see fit to give him office again.

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

*Compd
J D Sim*

*of the collector
in charge*

Translation of an order issued by J. J. Buck Esquire
Esq. Collector to the Tahsildar of Gudivada Taluk under
date the 7th April 1857. No 87.

On examination during the
Jumabandi Settlement of the current year
Samburi Parasaram Golladar of Vinna
collar Moolah in the said Taluk, having
uttered a falsehood on the most important
subject of fact derivable by Government,
to the effect that the land actually
irrigated by the ancient water, was
not so watered, I have considered
him to be untrustworthy and dismissed
him from his Office from the 1st instant.
In his place I have appointed
Sundari Malliah Golladar of
Madhavaram Moolah in the Pouta
pad Taluk, and directed the Tahsildar
of the latter Taluk to send him & you
you will therefore send for him, cause
the charge of the said Moolah to be
made over to him, and, & keep the
duties thereof done by him, enter
his name in the Pay Abstract from
the 7th instant -

Kandary: April 1857.

(Signed) J. J. Buck
Esq. Collector
(True translation)

Compt.
J. D. Lambhoff

W. Reid
Esq. Sub-Collector
in charge.

Excerpt from a Memo of St. Sashiah
Head Sheristadar.

Sunkershanapur a metropolis

The Murume wrote in the account
that C. 12. was watered by channel
& 2. 4. by other means. This appeared
very suspicious. The Gilladar, Tambury
Sarasingam, ^{first} reiterated the same. On search-
ing enquiring he admitted that 2. 4. was al-
watered by the Suba which is dug
from the Volerang codoo - This Gilladar
must not be retained in office. He is an
old rogue.

Quit Rent 110 - - about 1000
by 1000 1000 - 1000 of rental
Manual 1000 2. 9.

Net produce is 1000.

(See Enquest)

W. Reid
Off. Sub Collector
in charge -

Compd
St. Sashiah
No.

497

Endorsement

With reference to the Board's endorsement on Petition No. 2678, & 3143 of 1859, No. 196 of 1860, & No. 58 of 1861, the Acting Sub Collector in charge has the honor to report to the Board, that the Petitioner was dismissed from the Office of Gillasa of Vinuacota Mutak, in the Gudirasa Taluk, as per order dated 7th April 1857, from the 1st of that month. He was accused of a gross falsehood during the Jammabandi Settlement of 1857, in regard to the irrigation of certain lands from the ancient channels, in support of which an Extract from the Head & District Officer's Memo is enclosed.

2. In the order issued on the 21st April 1857, regarding the Jammabandi Settlement of the Taluk, it was stated that only 2-6-5^{1/2} of dry land was converted into wet, in Santarashana puram Agraharam, were entered in the Abstract statement, whereas 5-5-6^{3/4} had actually received ancient water, & that

Nos 2678-3143 of 1859-1967
1860 & 58- & 1234 of 1861-

The Board have received a
report from the Collector on the
subject of this Petition & decline to
interfere on Petitioner's behalf-

Revenue & Office

By order

Chhapra
15th May 1861

W. H. B. S. S.
Sub-secy.

Copy in a letter to Comptroller
of the day 18.39 of 1863

From Mr. H. B. S. S.
to Mr. H. B. S. S.
District -

Date 26th April 1864

Q. No. 2678-3143/59-
1967/58 & 58 of 1861

Extract from the Register of Politicians.

No	Name of the Politician	Rank of the Politician
1234	John Harrington of Haverham in Gladstone's Regt	Rank of the Politician
1851	Haverham's Regt from which he was re- moved by desertion. The then officer in charge to advise from for one of his comrades.	The Board have received a report from the Colonel on the subject of this Politician and decide to interfere on Politician's behalf. 15th May 1851. Haverham's Regt
Camp Hill		The subject

W. Hill
Sub-Secretary

2
Ann. N. 1907/1002

2. 10. 1851

2. 10. 1851

Copy in a Letter to Engt.
of 1st May N. 34 of 1863

298/1007/1002

N^o 1279

To Mr. Knox Esq.
Collector in the pillah of
Maulapatam.

The humble Petition of Nussuram
Nussuram the late pillahdar of
Dinnakota Moota appertaining to
Godevada Talook.

I most respectfully beg leave to represent to your honor
that when Mr. J. J. Knox was pleased to proceed
to the said Godevada Talook in Circuit lately at the time
of his settling the zamabundy accounts thereof the
gentleman was pleased to dismiss me owing to my be-
lieve under the ground that I have misapprehended about
the circumstance of water supplied to one of the villages
of the said Moota named Sunkarashanapuram
Dilmukta Agraharam as there is no any mistake

193
59
Pm

Copy ma Letter to England
of 1st May N. 39 of 1863

200 N 350 of 1863

N. 307/63

In N. 1612 of 1862

March 26/57

Collector in the village
Masulapattam

40/6061.1

1984

159

159

To The Honorable the President & Members
of the Board of Revenue
The humble petition of Annaswami
Narasimham, late Zilladar of
Tinnacotta Muttah, in the Gudur District
of the Masulapattam District

I performed my duties as Zilladar of
Tinnacotta Village in the Gudur District of the
Masulapattam District with great care and attention.
According to the Manual I submitted the cultivated
Accounts to the Tahsildar at the Suddanahally of
1266. At the time of the Suddanahally, I represented
that the cess of Saree (or village) paying 8000 and
Bil Muttah (or village) was Rs. 13000 and also
included of 13 villages. The Tahsildar of these lands
and Saree were found correct.
The Tahsildar of the village of Saree Kurshana
who was paying a cess of Rs. 1100 the Suddanahally
questioned me with reference to the cultivated
and Saree Kurshana I stated that I had
the accounts in accordance with the rest of the
rest of the villages according to the cultivated
accounts placed before me. The Suddanahally
being highly incensed, he thought that I concealed
the actual facts of the case and with anger
declared that I should be discharged. I said that
I did not speak a falsehood. The Suddanahally
demanded my deposition and I gave my deposition
agreeably to the accounts which I had previously
submitted and to the verbal statement I had
made to the effect that the said village

Collector in charge reported on
the subject.

[illegible]

159-7861

Collector in charge reported on

1. *Heat, Reproduction* 173

• 1st 2674243 71559
1969 126041858, 84
1224 71561

The Board have
received a Report
from the Collector
on the subject of the
petition & decline
to interfere, as -
Petition at Bristol.

15 May 61

2007/11/11

That I was lately employed
for several years in the capacity of Collector of the
Union in the Yorubaland District of the
Western District. I discharged my duties very faithfully

On a certain time when A. Tachibana
head Shiristadar of the Collectorate had occasion
to see & ask me about the supply & requirements of
the water supply from the Kishina irrigating channel.
He referred to the then acting Collector Mr. T. H. Jones
that he was acquainted with him & thus got me
unjustly dismissed from my post.

I am not aware of having uttered any
falsehood. I have fully stated in a Memorandum
dated 24/5/57 all what I had to say about the
supply & assessments of the water I had abso-
lutely

Collector in charge reported on
the subject.

on the change.
The strength of
rank & ceremony
often diminished
with the supply of
water & distance
from the sea. And the
city, among the
Albion & the sea

2
 Jan 25th 1857
 No 2678 of 1857
 From Newbury
 Cambridge
 Late Yildar of
 Tinnesta Prostat
 in Goodmundalok
 in the Yildar of
 Macaulifatan

[illegible]

In Matt of 1862

Dec 16 1900

The need also
the fact, Carter
involving him
from the position

159-1861

then forwarded a measurement & roll of the
watered by the Krishna channels. When I put in
the collector Mr. D. Thorpe to enquire into my case
& restore me to my situation referring to the two
documents (Memo: & Measurements roll of the fields)
he did not take any notice of them - but
acted on the advice of the ^{record keeper} ~~record keeper~~ ^{who} ~~who~~
who in order to provide one of his creatures
with my post & got my case rejected from my
further enquiry.

I then applied more than once
to the ^{record keeper} who at last referred my application
to the collector for his report thereon.

Before the collector Mr. Thornhill could
reply to the Board's endorsement on my appeal
I requested him again that he in rendering
justice to my case should refer the ^{two} documents
Memo & Measurements roll which I sent in to
his predecessor, he accordingly sent a Memo. to
the record keeper directing him to produce all
the correspondence connected with my case.
The record keeper sent only the measurement register
of the fields & not the Memo: which he said he
will send hereafter.

In the mean time Mr. Thorpe
away to Madras on leave, the Sub Collector
in charge of the Collectorate in reply to the Board's
endorsement on my appeal, stated that he could not
find any other documents but only one & reported quite
unfavorably in my case & thus rendered injustice
to me.

While the whole correspondence of the several
years past were to be found in the collector's records
it is quite strange & surprising to hear the collector
reporting that he could not find out all the
papers connected with my case & referred to
in my several petitions. From these the govern-
ment may infer that I am quite unjustly
treated. I am a very poor man of large
family & depend on no other means of
livelihood but only my circus employment.
I am come from a distance of 400 miles
to get redress to my distressed circumstances
& I hardly get my livelihood here.

I therefore humbly pray that the government
will be graciously pleased to refer my case
to the collector through the Board, directing him
to enquire into my case & restore me my post.

For this act of great kindness I with
my poor large family shall ever pray.

I beg to remain

Most respectfully

Your most obed^t & humble servant

Madras.
Black Town
Christnapadaik
Appalam
10 October/11

(Signed) Kumbakonam Narasingam

Collector in charge reported on

No 1612 of 1862

His Excellency the Governor
in Council
Fort St George
Madras.

The humble petition of Annabatu
Narasimham, Late Jiltadar of
Vinnadeta Muttah, Cuddalore
Taluk, Krishna District.

Most humbly Sheweth

That having been most unjustly
dismissed from his office of Jiltadar of
Vinnadeta Muttah, he humbly prays
in the fervent and earnest hope that justice
will be rendered him, to suspend the appeal
from the decision of the Board and that of
the Board of Revenue, who without the
slightest enquiry or consideration re-
versed the orders of the Collector.

The charge on which he has been
dismissed was for uttering a false report
of the land revenue of Rs 12 66, relating
to the actual extent of land from a
channel of the river.

In reference to this charge the petitioner
would humbly submit the allegations of
his Excellency in Council to be following
facts.

Petitioner submitted a correct account
Collector in charge reported on
the subject.

No 2930 of 1861

Office

From
Commissioner of Revenue
Late Jiltadar of the
Vinnadeta Muttah
Cuddalore Taluk
Krishna District

Office
No 2930 of 1861
No 2930 of 1861
No 2930 of 1861

Office
No 2930 of 1861
No 2930 of 1861
No 2930 of 1861

Office
No 2930 of 1861
No 2930 of 1861
No 2930 of 1861

159-
1861

in his deposed Marshal Gahita on the 15th of
February 1857, that the extent of
land irrigated from the channel was
5-5 3/4.

Contradictory to Petitioner's Statement
the Revenue sent in a false Statement
that only 1-12 was irrigated from the
channel.

On comparing both Statements a
large discrepancy was found, and at
the inquiry which ensued, Petitioner gave
a deposition corresponding with his
Marshal Gahita.

Notwithstanding Petitioner's perfect
conduct, &c, from the animosity which
the British Government had against him, was
unjustly dismissed, whilst the real offender
the Revenue is still retained in Office.

Petitioner having sent in a correct
Statement a month before his deposition
was taken, there was no necessity for
inducement for him to perjure. He did
he perjure, as a comparison of
the Marshal Gahita sent in by him and
his deposition will convince your
Excellency.

Petitioner is given to understand
that his deposition has been concealed

the motive being, to prevent Petitioner's
innocence from coming to light.

Had the Board of Revenue sent
for my deposition and Marshal Gahita, they
would have been convinced of Petitioner's
innocence - but they did no such thing -
they simply, without inquiry and without
the smallest consideration confirmed
the unjust orders of the Coll.

The facts as above stated will
in themselves prove that the real offender
is the Revenue and that Petitioner was
most unjustly dismissed, whereby
he has been reduced to the greatest
necessity and want. He has a large
family and other relatives dependant
on him, but from his dismissal, they
are all in a starving condition.

In view of the foregoing facts,
Petitioner most humbly solicits your
Excellency in Council graciously to be
pleased to call for the Marshal Gahita,
& the deposition given by Petitioner, as also
for the Report of the Acting Sub Col. in charge
and after perusing them, pass an order
reversing the orders of the Coll. & the Board
of Revenue, and reinstating Petitioner in
his post of Gillasan. And the Hon. Secy in
duty, will be pleased to forward the same
to the Hon. Secy in duty.

13th June 1862

Collector in charge reported
the subject.

No 1612 of 1852.

The Petitioner's
petition is at last place
5 years ago. The Govern-
ment therefore decline
to take its propriety
into consideration.

Port St George 28th June 1852.

By Order

M. K. Williams

Esq. Dy. Secy to Govt.

అచటానుకు బరతానా అయి
గృహవత్సరములు అచటానుకు
గృహ. కాబట్టి కానియేమి కాని
యూరూపియనును గురించి
గృహమి. బి. వా. డ్యు. అలా
నాకు. వి. తెలు. లకు-

గృహ. అను. జూ. కె. అను. లకు
పి. పి. హి. బి. డి.
డి. కె. కె. కె. కె.

4
1909

59-
1861

misrepresented the
circumstances connected
with the irrigation
of certain land & prays
that on a reference to
the statement of account
submitted by him together
with the deposition given
by him, he may be
reinstated in his former
Post.

From Numbare Narayana
Singam, late Jiladar
of Simacotta Mullab,
Gudniada Taluk of Krishna
District.

Dated 13th June 1862.
Filed 13th June 1862.

With 3 Enclosures.

N^o 307/62
Appeals from the
enclosed order of the
Board of Revenue, declining
to interfere with the
decision of the Collector
dismissing him from
the situation of Jiladar
on a charge that he

Copy in a Letter to Eng^d
of 11th May N^o 39 of 1863

1909/1000

1861
159
Pm

His Excellency the Honorable
The Governor in Council.
Fort St. George.

The humble petition of Numbare
Narayana Singam, late Jiladar of Sim-
acotta Mullab, Gudniada Taluk,
Krishna District.

Respectfully Sheweth,

In resubmitting the enclosed petition
and Government order thereon, Petitioner respectfully
begs to bring to your Excellency's kind notice,
that the Government endorsement on his petition
N^o 1612 of 1862, states that because Petitioner's
dismissal took place 5 years ago, the Government
decline to take its propriety into consideration.
Petitioner was dismissed from service on the 7th
April 1857. He appealed on several occasions
to the Collector on the injustice of his removal but
to no effect. Subsequently the Collector granted
an endorsement on the 10th May 1858 that "one dis-
missal is enough." In this Petitioner appealed
to the Board of Revenue under date the 3rd September
1859 as will be seen by the enclosed petition.
The Board's final answer was not before the
15th May 1861. On which Petitioner appealed to
your Government and the endorsement is
that the dismissal took place in 5 years ago.
Petitioner respectfully begs to bring to your
Excellency's kind notice, that tho' his dismissal
took place in 1857, he has not been idle in
the

Collector in Charge reported on
the subject.

preparing his complaint

According to Petition rules, Petitioner could not appeal to Government previous to his obtaining the endorsement of the Collector and the Board of Revenue, and the endorsement of the Board of Revenue was not passed before May 1861, more than 20 months after the date of his appeal. Under such circumstances the delay in appeal to Government cannot be justly attributed to Petitioner, who respectfully begs your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to reconsider his deplorable case and in consideration of his being a poor man encumbered with a large family and unjustly deprived of his post, pass an order reversing the orders of the Collector and the Board of Revenue and reinstating him in his post of Jiladar, since several appeals have been taken into merciful consideration tho' the appeals were made many years after dismissal from service, and Petitioner is induty bound

I shall ever pray

Yours faithfully

159-
1861
Pm

Immediately on his dismissal, Petitioner, addressed
the Collector, as also frequently of his agents, but
to no avail. On the 17th May 1858 that authority
granted him no redⁿ declaring that "his dismissal"
is "enough" without considering whether the Petitioner's
dismissal was just or not. Hearing that he would
incur the anger of the Ruler of the District by
appealing to the Board, Petitioner continued to
wait on the Collector month after month in the
hope that his case would be taken into consideration.
But failing in his endeavors, he was necessitated to appeal
to the Board of Revenue which he did on the 3rd Sept^r
1859. His success with the Board was no better.
Had the Board sent for and inspected the Survey
Account & deposition as requested by Petitioner,
his innocence would have been at once proved.
After the lapse of 1 year & 8 1/2 months, the Board were
pleased to find him a final redⁿ under date May 1861
confirming the Collector's decision. All this while,
Petitioner was undergoing the severest distress
mentally & bodily. In the midst of all, Petitioner
referred his case to your Excellency in Council
when Gov^t declined to interfere for the reason
viz. that his dismissal took place as far back
as April 1857, & that the Revenue Board had
confirmed his dismissal. From what has
been stated it will be apparent, that Petitioner,
all along, from the date of his dismissal up
to the present moment, has continually brought
his unfortunate case to the notice of the
Collector, the Board of Revenue and Gov^t.

and that there was no wilful or unnecessary
delay on his part. It will also be seen that the
Board confirmed his dismissal, without calling
for his Survey accounts and deposition which if
they had done, they would have acquitted him
of the charge and reinstated him in office.
But it was Petitioner's misfortune that his
request was not complied with. He now humbly
prays and beseeches your Excellency in Council
to send for the above said documents, a comparison
of which, Petitioner feels firmly assured will
convince your Excellency in Council that Petitioner
was unjustly dealt with. He is a poor man, having
a large family dependant on him, & all of whom
have suffered great privations since his dismissal.
He implores your Excellency in Council to
commiserate his case & direct his restoration
to his post of Jilassan.

And for which act of goodness
and justice Petitioner is in
dutiful regard

2nd September
1862

Shall ever pay
most grateful

Collector in charge reported
the subject.

1861
59-
Pm

Mr. Excellency
The Honorable the Governor
of the State of Georgia
Savannah
J. M. D. & S.

false & his dismissal
is unjust, may be sent
for re-examination & he
may be restored to his
office.

Emr 352 of 1863.
N 2337 of 1862.

From Nambur
Koradungum
Jelladar of Chinnicut
Mittah Gudam
Tadag & District
District -

Returned under
Rule 5 with
reference to the
endorsements on
petitioner's former
application.

Dated 2 Sept
Recd 4 Sept/62
P 301/62.

With reference to the
Endorsement passed
on his former Petition
of 1876 of 1862, prays
that the survey account

15 Sept 1862

RETURNED UNDER THE REVISED PETITION RULES.
PARA 5.

అర్జీని పరిశీలించి ఫలితం ప్రకటించుట.

గ. గవర్నరుగారి కమిషన్ కిచ్చే అప్పీలునామకమును పుట్టించిన
దళం దేవుని నామకమును పుట్టించిన దళం దేవుని నామకమును పుట్టించిన దళం దేవుని
అదేమిదయినది దేవుని అదేమిదయినది దేవుని అదేమిదయినది దేవుని

Deputy Secretary to Government.

This is a memorial from Nambur
Koradungum, formerly Jelladar
of the Vinnacottah Shostah, Gud
rada Taluq., Havulipatam
District.

Memorialist seeks either
restoration to the post from
which he has been dismissed
or that he may be otherwise
provided for.

From the translation of
an order issued by Mr. J. J. Knox
on the 7th April 1857. it ap-
pears that memorialist "having
uttered a falsehood on the most
important subject of dist. de-
rivable by Govt., to the effect
that the land actually irri-
gated by the ancient water, was
not so watered" was ordered to
be dismissed from his post of
Jelladar as untrue & wrong.

Memorialist appears to
have appealed to the Board of
Revenue in 1859, 1860, and 1861.
In April of the last mentioned
year Mr. Reid, the Acting Sub
Collector in charge reported on
the subject.

26 April/61
No. 97.

159-
1861

Memorialist ~~was~~ was dismissed, it
would appear, in consequence of
the opinion expressed of him by
the Head Sheristadar N. Sashiah,
who, in a Memoir of protocol written
furnished an extract, styled
the Zilladar "an old rogue" because
when the curum of the Pan-
shanapuram Agraharam wrote
in the accounts that 1¹/₂ of
land was watered by channel
and 2¹/₄ by other means (a sus-
picious looking circumstance)
he (the Zilladar) at first made
the same statement but after-
wards acknowledged that
the latter extent was watered
from a particular branch
channel which he named.

Mr Reid went on to say
that in an order issued on the
21st April of the same year
(1857) regarding the settlement
of the Taluq, it was stated that
only 2¹/₆ 5¹/₁₆ of dry land con-
verted into wet in the above-
mentioned Agraharam had
been entered in the Abstract
statement whereas 5¹/₆ 5¹/₁₆ 6⁹/₁₆
had actually received Riceh

water, and that the Zilladar
was dismissed from office
the said offence having been
considered to have been com-
mitted by him.

Mr Reid further remarked
that neither the abstract state-
ment referred to above, nor
the Zilladar's deposition, were
forthcoming, but that in the
Mashah-Zabital presented
by ^{the Zilladar} him on the 18th February
1857 (or a month prior to the
alleged false statement)
^{showing} the entire area cultivated
in Fash 1266 in the said
Agraharam, the correct
Area of 5¹/₆ 5¹/₁₆ 2¹/₁₆ was entered.

He therefore forwarded
the available records to the
Board without any expres-
sion of opinion.

The Board thereupon
* 15 May/61 declined to interfere on the
Appellants' behalf: and
* 19 Nov/61 on his appeal & Government
a similar endorsement was
passed.

*Feb. 1862

In 1862 the memorialist again addressed Government submitting that in his detailed mashat-zabitah of the 18th Feb 1857 he had entered the extent of land irrigated from the channel as 5¹/₂ 9/16 ~~acres~~; that in consequence of a false statement of the curium, that 1¹/₂ only was irrigated from the channel, an enquiry was instituted, when he (memorialist) deposed in accordance with his mashat-zabitah, but that nevertheless he was dismissed for perjury while the curium was retained in office. He asserted that a comparison of the mashat-zabitah and his deposition would prove his innocence, and also that he had learned that his deposition had been concealed in order to keep the truth from coming to the light.

*d/28 June 1862.

The endorsement passed on this, apparently in ignorance of the former endorsement of 19 November 1861, was that as Petitioner's dismissal took place 5 years ago the Govt declined to take its propriety into consideration.

Pet. 1876 and 1909, 1862.

Petitioner then attempted to show cause for the delay in his application to Govt but unfortunately (or more probably wilfully) neglected to state that his appeal

to Government had been made, and was rejected, a few months after the Board's refusal to interfere on his behalf. These Petitions were rejected.

In the memorial addressed to the Secretary of State now under review, he recapitulates his story, ascribing his dismissal to the animosity of the then dead Sheristadar, and accusing the native Officials of the District of concealing the ^{statement of} ~~abstract~~ ~~statement~~ and deposition, from which, if forthcoming, his innocence would be clear.

I request orders on this case. In the absence of the two documents alluded to by the memorialist, ^{it is difficult to say} whether or no he was really guilty of falsehood in this particular case. The dead Sheristadar's memo. and the Collector's order of 21 April 1857 do not agree as to the cause of dismissal. The circumstances mentioned by Mr Reid are certainly in memorialist's favor: but the principal papers on which to come to a conclusion are reported to be lost.

Will the Govt use to refer to the District again and order a careful search for the missing papers?

Letter on memo-
rial

1120/1200/1853

-yes- but there seems no objection to his re-employment. Should the present local officers see fit to give him office again

He was dismissed by the Com in April 1857 - he ap-
peared 8th 18th in Sept 1859.
In prison since then made but
the African then in charge, owing
to the absence of his assistant
J. H. H. still not forth coming/cont.
there is no opinion on the matter.
The inquiry now is likely to be
that have successful &
it seems true well &
order camp - He must take
the consequences of his own
delay. J. H. H.

1812 of 1863 -

C. J. Mellers Esq^r.
Deputy Secretary to Gov^t.

Honored Sir,

With reference to your
Official Memorandum of the
13th inst. I beg most humbly and
respectfully to state that I am
but a poor man, dependant for
my daily food on the bounty of
strangers. To furnish 2 more copies
of the different Orders passed in in-
crease, would be virtually to preclude
me from obtaining justice from
the same authorities, because I
would be unable to pay the
copyist. But should your
honor insist on my furnishing,

the copies, I will beg favour
to do so, and have it effected
whatever my difficulties may
be.

In this case it will be necessary
that the originals which I
have laid in my Memorial should
be given me from which I shall
take a copy, having none
other in my possession

I beg to remain

Respected Sir

Your most Obedient and

very humble Servant

~~Very Obedient~~

Muzas
20th March
1863

[Sd] Numbur Narasingam
Late Jelladar of Vinnakottu
Gulamada Taluk

W. L. Masters Secy. ^{re}
Deputy Secretary & Clerk
of the C. of Commerce
M. W. C. S.

enclosed in his
Memorial may be
returned to him as
to enable him to
prepare copies of
the same & submit
them.

V 812 of 1863.

From Numburi
Narasimham Late
Zilladar of Ummacota
Chudwada Taluq
Puducherry District
now at Madras -

Dated } 20th March 1863
Recd. }

With reference to
the official memo-
randum sent to him
on the 13th Instant
states his inability
to furnish the copies
of different orders
passed in his case
& prays that the
originals which he

Recd
9th 1863

22

Rev. 18 Dec 1862 No 254

1. The Memorial referred to in the foregoing Petition will be dispatched to its destination.
2. Petitioner will be further informed that though the government cannot interfere in a case which is already decided so long ago and regarding which no appeal was preferred till 27 years after the dismissal was ordered, they have no objection to his reemployment should the relevant local officers see fit to give him office.

9th Dec 1863. M. H. M. J.
C. J. March 1863 M. H. M.

Rev. 18 Dec 1862
From Mr. D. S. S. S. S.
Narasimham late
Zilladar of Vinna-
Kottar Nittak in
Gundivada Taluk
Mistna District
Dated 26th Jan 1863
Recd 31st Jan 1863
with 6 Enclosures

Submitting all papers
connected with his case, called
for by G.O. of 18 December 1862
No. 2630.

No. 623-7th April.
With an Order.
Copy in a Letter to Engr.
of 1st May. No. 39 of 1863