

MADRAS RECORD *Department,*

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 923	Press Mis.
336.337	
Dated	28.5.19-1863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23th May 1863.*

No. 336. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd May 1863,
No. 3,086:—

Read again letters:—

From Superintendent of Stamps, dated 13th February 1863, in Board's Proceedings dated 14th idem, No. 954.

From Collector of Madras, dated 20th February 1863, in Board's Proceedings dated 27th idem, No. 1,217.

From Acting Collector of Madras, dated 10th April 1863, in Board's Proceedings, No. 2,196, dated 16th idem

From do. dated 17th April 1863, in Board's Proceedings dated 20th idem, No. 2,266.

Read also the following letters:—

From the Honorable R. S. ELLIS, C. B., Acting Collector of Madras, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Saidapet, 30th April 1863, No. 137.

1. I have the honor to forward the enclosed explanation furnished by Mr. Jordan as required by the Board in their Proceedings dated the 20th instant, No. 2,266.

2. Mr. Jordan attributes the delay that has occurred in the case of illicit sale of Stamps to a great pressure of work at the time when the case was before him, which caused him altogether to forget the matter. I confess that this explanation does not appear to be satisfactory; for, as I stated in my report, Mr. Jordan after closing his inquiry on the 17th October 1861, must have been reminded of the case when he wrote to Mr. Balmain for the Stamps that formed part of the record, on the 11th November 1861, and again when questioned by Mr. Reade in December 1861, whereas the case was not actually committed until the end of January 1862.

3. As regards Mr. Jordan's explanation in paragraph 15 of the manner in which the Stamps were eventually found, Mr. Roberts informed me that when the search led to no results at first, he proceeded to Mr. Jordan's Office-room and himself suggested to Mr. Jordan that the Stamps were not likely to be in the office almirahs, but in some place of security, and directed him to open either his desk or table drawer, and in the drawer the Stamps were found.

4. Mr. Jordan has not in his statement accounted for not having made any inquiry into the result of the case after it was committed by him to Colonel Wilson in January 1862.

5. I cannot agree with Mr. Jordan's statement in paragraph 21 that a delay of ten weeks in committing a case was not very remarkable; the more so, as the case was, as far as inquiry went, completely closed on the 17th October 1861. The committal was not, however, made, as shown in my report, till the 29th January 1862.

6. With reference to paragraph 26 of Mr. Jordan's statement I have only to remark that paragraph 33 of my report is strictly in accordance with what Mr. Jordan himself stated to me.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. D. JORDAN, Esq., Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury Madras District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Saidapet, 29th April 1863.

1. Having been called upon to furnish a full and complete explanation of the cause of delay which occurred in the committal of the case of unlicensed sale of Stamps, I beg to submit the following statement for the consideration of the Honorable Board.

2. On the 5th October 1861, Lieutenant Gunning, Joint Magistrate of Saint Thomas' Mount, wrote to me, forwarding one Ameer Chund with ten stamped papers, which he was charged with selling without a license.

3. As usual, I waited upon the Collector for instructions. He desired me to inquire into the case. On examining Ameer Chund, he stated that he had bought the stamped papers from one Ackur Chund. On sending for Ackur Chund, he admitted that he had sold them to Ameer Chund, and alleged that he had bought them from one Soobroya Mudali. The latter denied having sold them; and this led me to suspect that the stamped papers had been surreptitiously obtained from the Stamp Office; and with a view of ascertaining this, I sent the stamped papers to Mr. Balmain, Superintendent of Stamps, for his inspection. He returned them on the 9th October 1861, stating that it was probable they were improperly obtained; and at the same time, he sent a writer from his office with the Register of several months. The Register showed that Soobroya Mudali had obtained stamps to the value of Rupees 1,105; my object in thus making a full and lengthened inquiry was to find out whether the Stamps had been stolen; but as no evidence to establish my suspicion was forthcoming, I closed my inquiry on the 17th October 1861, and gave Mr. Cunliffe a Memorandum of the result. Mr. Cunliffe forwarded the Memorandum to the Board of Revenue with a letter dated 21st October, asking permission to put the cases up before the Magistrates of Saint Thomas' Mount and Madras, respectively. On the 28th October 1861, the Board authorized Mr. Cunliffe to prosecute accordingly, and directed that he should report the result in due course. With a view of carrying out the Board's orders, Mr. Cunliffe himself, on the 29th October 1861, forwarded the Mount case with the record of my preliminary inquiry and a letter to Captain Gunning with a request that he would dispose of the case. The stamped papers were not sent to that Officer on this occasion as they had been forwarded by the Board to Mr. Balmain.

4. Lieutenant Gunning on the 4th November 1861, tried Ameer Chund for vending Stamps without a license, and though no one was sent from this office to prosecute, he fined the accused party 20 Rupees, without making any further reference to the Collector, and sent back the record of my preliminary inquiry to Mr. Cunliffe, by whom it was sent into his office, and kept there till it was forwarded by the Acting Collector, Mr. Reade, to Mr. Balmain on the 10th January 1862. Mr. Balmain returned the record on the 18th January 1862 to the Collector, who was then on Jamabundy, and by whom it was handed over to the late Head Serishtadar, and by him to the Record-keeper, who placed it in the Collector's Office, where it was found after one year in February 1863, when it was wanted for the purpose of prosecuting the charge against Ackur Chund.

5. On the 11th November 1861, I wrote to Mr. Balmain, asking him to return the Stamps forwarded by the Board, as "they were required in support of the prosecution about to be instituted against the party who sold them." The Superintendent sent them back with a letter of the 13th November 1861, which is the only one not entered in the Register. My letter asking for the Stamps will be found to have been duly entered.

6. The Stamps and the letter which accompanied them must have been handed to me at a time, when I was very busy, and immediately put away inside the drawer of my office table among a mass of papers. The circumstance afterwards wholly escaped my recollection.

7. In December 1861, Mr. Reade, then Acting Collector, asked me about these cases, and as far as I can now remember, I told him that the Mount case had been disposed of, and the Madras case would be investigated. He must have misunderstood me, when he wrote that it is understood that the Madras case is under investigation before the Presidency Magistrates.

8. I admit that at this time the subject was brought to my mind; but owing to a very great pressure of business, such as the disposing of Criminal cases, and the revising of the Income tax

imposed on the inhabitants of Saidapet in addition to other multifarious duties, this case was not immediately sent up for disposal.

9. From the 17th October 1861 to the 29th January 1862, my time was fully occupied in the disposal of 73 criminal cases, and 188 breach of contract cases, besides revising the Income tax assessed in 133 cases; with this overwhelming work in addition to my Treasury duties, I submit whether it is not possible that the Stamp vending case should escape recollection till this pressure of business had ceased.

10. On the 1st January 1862, I was placed in charge of upwards of 2,000 pensioners, and between the 1st and 15th, I had to go twice to Saint Thomas' Mount and Poonamallee to muster and pay the pensioners, and once to Palaveram, and once to Tripassore.

11. On the 29th January 1862, I wrote to Colonel Wilson informing him that Ackur Chund, Madras Sowcar, had confessed to having sold Stamps to Ameer Chund without a license, and had thereby rendered himself liable to the penalty prescribed by Section 35 of Act XXXIX, and asking him to take up the case. I also sent Ameer Chund to give evidence against the accused party.

12. My reason for sending up the case to Colonel Wilson was that the Board had desired Mr. Balmain to place himself in communication with the Police, and I was probably reminded of the case by his letter to Mr. Cunliffe dated 28th January 1862. In my letter to Colonel Wilson I offered to get the record of my preliminary inquiry from the Superintendent of Stamps if he required it, not being aware at that time that it was sent to the Collector then in the District; but from a copy of Colonel Wilson's letter of 10th February 1862, and the Jawabnevis' statement, it appears that Colonel Wilson wrote to the Superintendent of Stamps for the record of the case.

13. That Ackur Chund, the accused party, did appear at Colonel Wilson's Office to answer to the charge is proved by the Jawabnevis' statement taken by Mr. Ellis, and should the Board see reason to have both Ackur Chund and Ameer Chund examined, this statement will be fully corroborated.

14. On the 30th January 1862, Colonel Wilson, in reply to my letter of the previous day, wrote to me to send a competent person to prosecute. I sent my Jawabnevis, because he had taken down the depositions, and was well acquainted with the cases: when the Jawabnevis came back the next day, I inquired what had been done. He said Colonel Wilson had questioned him about the case, and told him that he would get the record himself from the Superintendent of Stamps. I concluded from this that Colonel Wilson had taken up the case, and would go on with it, and under this impression I did not further interfere, conceiving that the case had thus gone out of my hands.

15. In February last, when Ackur Chund was taken up for a graver offence, Colonel Wilson for the first time sent for the Stamps, and Mr. Roberts, Acting Collector, asked for them. As more than 15 months had elapsed since they were received from Mr. Balmain, I quite forgot where they were, or who had them, and said I would search for them. Mr. Roberts offered to assist me in the search. I found them and the letter in my office table drawer where I had put them in November 1861, and handed them over to him.

16. Having then for the first time understood that the charge for vending Stamps without a license was still pending before the Commissioner of Police, and finding that the Jawabnevis, who, at Colonel Wilson's request, was sent to prosecute, had deceived me, I offered to appear personally before Colonel Wilson and prosecute the charge. Colonel Wilson wrote back to say that I or any one else might do so before a Town Magistrate. I went before Mr. Clarke and prosecuted Ackur Chund, who was fined 100 Rupees. Mr. Clarke observed in his judgment that I had "very properly put the case before the Commissioner of Police in January 1862."

4 Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th May 1863.

17. In a recent interview with Colonel Wilson I was informed by that gentleman that "the Jawabnevis affected ignorance of the case, that he, therefore, desired him to make himself acquainted with it, and come again the next day, and that he did not see him since."

18. Thus it will be seen that the negligence of the Jawabnevis led to the postponement of the case.

19. Colonel Wilson states that he sent a letter to me on the 10th February 1862, which I declare I never received, and of which no trace can be found. This letter may have been withheld from me by accident, or design, but it is to be regretted that Colonel Wilson did not issue a summons to the Jawabnevis, or address the Collector officially.

20. Such is a brief statement of facts or the cause of delay in the prosecution of the Stamp vending case.

21. Under ordinary circumstances a delay of ten weeks including the Christmas holidays (or from 13th November 1861 to 29th January 1862) in sending up such case would have called for little notice, and I submit that it cannot now be considered with reference to the grave and serious offence subsequently charged against one of the parties; but which at that time, was not suggested, and could not have been contemplated.

22. That the Stamps were put away in my table drawer and *bonâ fide* forgotten is, I submit, evident from the circumstance of their being subsequently discovered by me in the drawer, and produced immediately on such discovery; and that there was no intention of withholding the Stamps is evident from the fact of my letter asking for them being registered and of my having put them in my drawer in the office, which might have been opened at any time, and would have been the last place in the world to deposit them in.

23. Mr. Ellis has placed the draft of his report in my hands; and as I am not called upon to meet that report specifically, I shall content myself with submitting that there is no foundation whatever for the supposition that I was, or could have been, influenced by any one to delay the committal of the case to the Commissioner of Police.

24. It is admitted by Mr. Ellis (paragraph 30) that he has been unable to obtain any proof of my having been influenced, and it is obviously impossible for me, or any man to combat suspicions in the mind of another.

25. I have thus declared to your Honorable Board the true circumstances of the case. I repudiate the imputations conveyed by such suspicions, and I leave my character with confidence in your hands.

26. Though I admit that the delay in the committal of this case originated in pressure of business and forgetfulness, yet I by no means acknowledge that my mind is so seriously affected as to render me totally unable to discharge the duties of my office. Since my appointment to Saidapet, I have not taken a day's leave to relax my mind; and during the whole period of my service, I have had but six months' leave.

27. I have been 29 years in the service, and have earned high testimonials from several gentlemen, copies of which I herewith enclose. I deeply regret that at this period of my service, I should be placed in the position I am, and earnestly trust that the Honorable Board will give their favorable consideration to this statement.

From the Honorable R. S. ELLIS, C. B., Acting Collector of Madras, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th May 1863, No. 163.

1. In reply to the Board's Official Memorandum, No. 303, I have to report that the statement made by Mr. Jordan, in his explanation which accompanied my letter dated 30th April 1863, No. 137, is not borne out by the facts as regards the amount of work done by him during the period from the 17th October 1861 to 30th January 1862.

Criminal cases	47
Contract cases	78
Under Act XIII of 1859	0
Income tax cases	0
Misdemeanour	3
Assault and abuse	7
Theft	11
Possession of counterfeit coin	2
Adultery	1
Vexatious charge	1
Fraud or cheating	2
Breach of Trust	2
Dishonest misappropriation of property	1
Resisting Police Officer	2
Abuse of authority	1
Cattle stealing	2
House trespass	2
Being found a vagrant	1
Desertion	1
Illegal attachment	1
Causing hurt	1
House breaking and theft	1
Suffering a prisoner to escape	1
Administering stupefying drug and inducing a person to emigrate to the Mauritius	1
Disobedience to orders	1
Rape	46
Gang robbery and wounding	47

Defendants. Witnesses.
35 19
See letter dated 18th May 1863.

2. The actual work performed by Mr. Jordan during that period was as stated in the margin. The nature of the criminal cases is stated in the margin note a.* Of the 78 contract cases, eight were decided after inquiry, and seventy were decided by Razinamah.

3. The 133 Income tax cases alluded to by Mr. Jordan belonged to the second list of assessments of the Saidapet Taluk for the Income tax year 1860-61.

4. These assessments were confirmed by the Collector on the 14th and 31st August 1861; the usual time for appeal being allowed to the parties. From these assessments, forty-four appeals were made and referred to Mr. Jordan for decision. These appeals were disposed of by Mr. Jordan by the 10th October 1861; the final Takid to the Tahsildar being despatched by the 11th October 1861.

5. I regret that I should not have tested the numbers and nature of the cases set forth in Mr. Jordan's statement, but I took it for granted that he would be careful in a statement of facts made to the Board. Mr. Jordan attributes the error that he has made, as regards the criminal cases, to a misunderstanding on the part of his Gumastah, who furnished him with cases filed, instead of cases disposed of. As regards the period during which he disposed of the Income tax cases, Mr. Jordan states that he thought these cases were disposed of during the whole of September and October, whereas the

appeals were heard during the latter part of August, during September, and during the earlier part of October 1861.

6. A copy of the letter of the 23th January 1862, is enclosed for the Board's perusal. This letter furnishes a complete explanation of how it happened that Mr. Jordan did at last put up the Madras illicit Stamp sale case before Colonel Wilson on the 29th January 1862. Mr. Balmain's inquiries regarding the result of the case rendered any further delay on Mr. Jordan's part impossible.

7. This letter is not in the records of my Office, and although it is alluded to in paragraph 2 of Mr. Norfor's letter dated 9th February 1863, Enclosure 1, Proceedings of Board of Revenue, dated 14th February 1863, I had no idea, until I had seen the copy of it which Mr. Jordan obtained from the Stamp Office when preparing his statement for the Board, of the importance of this letter as indicating the reason why the Stamp case was finally committed. In sending Mr. Jordan's statement, I thought the letter mentioned by him in paragraph 12 was a letter connected with the Board's Proceedings of the 28th October 1861, in paragraph 4 of which the Superintendent of Stamps had been desired to place himself in communication with the Police. Mr. Jordan did not show me the copy of Mr. Balmain's letter, which he obtained from the Superintendent of Stamps, when drawing up his statement to the Board; or I should certainly have remarked upon its affording an explanation of Mr. Jordan's conduct. I first knew of the nature of the letter when preparing this answer to the Board's Official Memorandum.

8. In explanation of this letter not being in the records of my Office, I have to explain to the Board that this letter was received while Mr. Cunliffe was on circuit. Mr. Jordan had been desired by Mr. Cunliffe to open all the official letters, and to dispose of those relating to matters connected with his, Mr. Jordan's, own duties, and to forward all other letters to Mr. Cunliffe.

6 *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
28th May 1863.

9. In this manner Mr. Balmain's letter dated 28th January 1862 was opened by Mr. Jordan, and caused him to commit the case to Colonel Wilson. The letter was not forwarded to the Collector's Office on circuit, nor was it placed in the Huzur records.

10. It was retained by Mr. Jordan, and is missing from his records. Mr. Jordan cannot account for its disappearance, but as the records of his office have been very carelessly kept, the loss of the letter may very possibly have been the result of accident. I am disposed to think this from the circumstance that Mr. Jordan himself has directed attention to this identical letter, by procuring a copy of it from the Office of the Superintendent of Stamps.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From W. BALMAIN, Esq., Superintendent of Stamps, to B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of Madras District, dated 28th January 1862, No. 846 of Fasl 1271.

With reference to the remark in your letter to the Board No. 7,053 of 17th December 1861, as to one of the persons implicated in the sale of stamps being under trial before the Town Magistrate, I request the favor of your informing me in what Court, and what has been the result of the trial; I have addressed all the Magistrates, but have been unable to ascertain.

Forwarded to the Deputy Collector of Madras District, Saidapet, with reference to his letter 29th April 1863.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) R. S. ELLIS, Acting Collector.

1. Ordered that the above papers be submitted to Government, in accordance with the provisions of Act VII of 1857.

2. It will be in the recollection of Government that a charge of organized forgery of Stamps was lately tried at the Sessions.

3. One of the parties most gravely implicated in that charge, named Agur Chund, had been previously charged so far back as October 1861, with illicitly dealing in Stamps under circumstances of grave suspicion; and the Board's formal permission for the criminal prosecution of the charge was obtained by the Collector of Madras (after a preliminary investigation by the Deputy Collector Mr. Jordan) on the 23th of that month.

4. It came out on the recent inquiry regarding the alleged forgeries, that this former charge had not been prosecuted, and coupling this fact with the former suspicion regarding the channel through which the Stamps illicitly sold, had been obtained, and with the evident necessity of some such system of unlicensed sale to obtain the profits of any systematic forgery of Stamps, the non-prosecution of the original charge assumed a serious aspect, and rendered necessary a thorough investigation.

5. The result has been to place Mr. Jordan's conduct in a very unsatisfactory light, and Mr. Ellis expresses his opinion that under the most favorable view of the circumstances, it can hardly be advantageous to the interests of the public service that Mr. Jordan should retain his present position.

6. The Board consider that Mr. Jordan has by no means satisfactorily accounted for his negligent conduct of the case and failure to prosecute the charge entrusted to him; but they will confine themselves to placing the facts before Government, and leave them to draw their own conclusions.

7. On 5th October 1861, the Mount Cantonment Magistrate sent to Mr. Jordan certain Stamp papers which had been seized at the Mount, with the request that the charge of unlicensed vend being more capable of satisfactory investigation by Mr. Jordan than at the Mount.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 7
28th May 1863.

8. Agur Chund was charged with selling to Ameer Chund, and the latter with selling to a third party, in both cases without license.

9. On 8th October 1861 Mr. Jordan sent the Stamps to the Superintendent of Stamps with a letter stating that Agur Chund declared he had bought the Stamps from one Soobroya Mudali, who had purchased them with others from the Stamp Office, but that Soobroya Mudali utterly denied having so purchased, or sold them, and that, therefore, there seemed reason to suspect that they had been surreptitiously obtained; and he requested the Superintendent to inquire on this point.

10. The Superintendent replied on 9th idem, that the system of stamping private materials precluded him from identifying stamp papers as having been properly or improperly obtained, and he forwarded his Registers for some months which showed that Soobroya Mudali had obtained Stamps to the value of Rupees 1,105.

11. It was subsequently stated to the Board that this man was the Gumastah of the Abkarry Contractor, and that the Stamps were ordinarily required in large numbers for documents to be executed by the sub-renters, while if they should prove not to be so required on any particular occasion, it was not improbable that an attempt to recover a portion of the value by re-sales without license might be made, although such sale, if detected, was penal.

12. It is, however, evident that proof of regular purchase of Stamps in large quantities would afford a convenient explanation of the possession of any suspicious store, and that if fraudulent abstraction or fabrication of Stamps on a large scale was being carried on, the investment of even Rupees 1,100 to obtain this security would be in no way extraordinary.

13. On 17th October 1861 Mr. Jordan closed his preliminary inquiry. On 23rd idem he addressed a lengthy Memorandum to the Collector, recommending that the Board's permission to prosecute the criminal charge should be obtained, and that further inquiry should be made in the Stamp Office as to the sufficiency of the system there pursued to guard against fraud, for which purpose he stated that copies of the depositions taken by him would be forwarded to the Stamp Superintendent.

14. On 24th October 1861, Mr. Cunliffe applied for the Board's sanction to prosecute one case at the Mount, and the other before the Presidency Town Magistrate, forwarding Mr. Jordan's Memorandum and the Stamp papers, and on 28th idem the Board sanctioned the prosecution, and directed that the result should be reported. They at the same time forwarded the Stamps to the Superintendent, and ordered him to submit a full report on the practices in his Office, adverted to by the Deputy Collector.

15. In accordance with this sanction the Mount case was forwarded by Mr. Cunliffe on the 29th October to the Joint Magistrate for trial, and on 4th November Ameer Chund was fined 20 Rupees, and the fine being paid, the prisoner was released. The record of the preliminary inquiry was sent back to the Collector's Office as had been requested.

16. On 11th November Mr. Jordan re-called from the Superintendent's Office the Stamp papers connected with the case for the purpose as he stated of using them as evidence in the case to be prosecuted in Madras. His draft letter asking for them was not placed on record (according* to Mr. Ellis,) nor was the Superintendent's

* Mr. Jordan declares that his letter was recorded. reply dated 13th November 1861, with which the Stamps were returned. The Stamps them-

selves when received were kept by Mr. Jordan in the drawer of his desk.

17. On 9th December 1861, the Acting Collector, Mr. Reade, reported to the Board with reference to their Proceedings of 28th October, that the Mount case had been disposed of, and that the other case "is, I understand, in course of investigation before the Presidency Magistrate;" and he requested to be furnished with copy of any report from the Superintendent of Stamps of the result of his inquiries.

18. It is not disputed that this letter was written on information supplied by Mr. Jordan. It was forwarded on to the Superintendent of Stamps on 17th December.

19. On 24th December the Superintendent of Stamps requested the Board to cause the records of the inquiries held by the Deputy Collector or Joint Magistrate to be communicated to him or to the Commissioner of Police, as beyond the papers communicated to him with the Board's Proceedings of 28th October, he had received no particulars from the Collector.

20. On 4th January 1862, the Board directed him to communicate directly with the Collector; and it appears that on 10th idem, Mr. Reade forwarded to him the records of Mr. Jordan's preliminary inquiry, which papers were returned on 18th idem to the Collector who was in camp, and handed over by him to the Scisistadar, who sent them to the Record keeper. On 28th January 1862, the Superintendent of Stamps addressed Mr. Cunliffe requesting to be informed in what Court the Madras case had been tried, and what had been the result of the trial, as he had inquired of all the Magistrates on the subject, but had been unable to ascertain anything regarding it.

21. This letter reached the Sydapet Office when Mr. Cunliffe was in camp. Mr. Jordan had orders to open all letters and must have opened this one in ordinary course, but it was not forwarded to the Collector on circuit, nor was it placed on the Huzur records. It must have been retained by Mr. Jordan, but the original is not forthcoming.

22. On 29th January 1862, Mr. Jordan instead of committing the case to a sitting Magistrate as Mr. Cunliffe had expressed his intention of doing when he asked for sanction to prosecute, addressed the Chief Commissioner of Police requesting that, as sanctioned by the Board, he would cause Agur Chund and Soobroya Mudali to appear before him to answer the charge of selling Stamps without a license, and mentioned that Ameer Chund was forwarded as a witness to prove the sale by Agur Chund, and that the records of his (Mr. Jordan's) preliminary inquiry were with the Superintendent of Stamps, but would be obtained if required.

23. The Stamps which as above-mentioned had been re-claimed by Mr. Jordan to be used in evidence, were neither sent nor alluded to in the letter as being available.

24. On 30th January 1862, Colonel Wilson wrote back to Mr. Jordan that he should send a competent person to prosecute the charge, and on the same day Mr. Jordan replied that he sent for that purpose his Jawabnevis, one Kistnasawmy Iyer, who had taken down the depositions in the preliminary inquiry.

25. It appears that this Jawabnevis when he appeared before Colonel Wilson, on 30th January, professed to be so ignorant of the particulars, that he was directed by Colonel Wilson to make himself better acquainted with the case and to return the next day, and on 10th February 1862, Colonel Wilson wrote again to Mr. Jordan, informing him as above and adding that the Jawabnevis had never returned.

26. This letter Mr. Jordan states that he never received, and he further states that on questioning the Jawabnevis on his return from the Police Office, he was led to believe that the Commissioner of Police had taken his examination, and would conduct the further prosecution himself. The Jawabnevis himself states that he did not pretend ignorance of the matter, and that he was not told to return; that the Chief Commissioner of Police ordered the records, Stamp papers, and decision of the Deputy Magistrate to be sent to him, and intimated that they would be examined, and that a person must then appear to prosecute the case; that he accordingly as desired, communicated this to the Deputy Magistrate; and that as Mr. Jordan gave him no further orders he did not stir again in the matter.

27. This statement in the face of Colonel Wilson's assertion and letter is evidently wilfully false. The Jawabnevis bears a very bad character, and should be dismissed for his conduct in this matter.

28. The result of the foregoing facts was that from February 1862 to February 1863, the case remained in abeyance, until the more serious charge of forgery against Agur Chund re-called attention to it, and the true state of affairs came to the knowledge of the Collector through the Superintendent of Stamps and Commissioner of Police.

29. On the breaking down of the forgery cases, Agur Chund was prosecuted for the illicit selling, convicted and fined Rupees 100. Soobroya Mudali was acquitted.

30. That the Forgery cases broke down is not to be wondered at, when the evidence was that of approvers.

31. That an organized system of forgery existed, the Board see little reason to doubt. The implements and the forged papers themselves were seized, and evidence was obtained of unexplained consignments of Stamps in large quantities to distant localities, and of their sudden recall when the inquiry commenced.

32. Whether these papers were forgeries or not, there is no evidence to show; but the traffic itself is suspicious as it could not return a profit except in connection with some fraud.

33. The party who was proved to be engaged in it is one Kalu Ram, who stood security for Agur Chund in the unlicensed sale case and gave evidence for the defence, and who it appears is an intimate acquaintance of Mr. Jordan.

34. Mr. Jordan in his explanatory statement protests against the case of illicit dealing being viewed in connection with the more serious charge of forgery which recently arose, but it must be remembered that at the time in 1861, the case of illicit selling was generally believed to be connected with some organized system of fraud, as otherwise the traffic could not possibly be profitable to those engaged in it, and there can be little doubt that if the papers were not forged they were fraudulently obtained from the Government Stamp Department. In either case it was desirable for the interests of the parties implicated to keep the inquiry out of the Madras Town Courts and to suppress the Stamp papers which had been seized.

35. How far Mr. Jordan's conduct was calculated to aid these objects may be judged from the following facts.

36. He made an elaborate inquiry with the probable intention of disposing of the charge himself; for it was unnecessary if the cases were to be communicated to other Courts for inquiry. He delayed from 29th October 1861 to 29th January 1862, to take any further step whatever in the prosecution of the cases which had been entrusted to him, and this not only without any sufficient reason, but in spite of his attention having been twice specially re-called to the case in that interval. He failed to place on record correspondence which would have established this fact and his prolonged neglect till 29th January 1862. He suppressed the Stamp papers themselves making no mention of them in his letter to the Commissioner of Police. He sent up the case eventually in a most imperfect manner without the record of his own inquiry for which he referred the Commissioner to the Superintendent of Stamps, although it was then lying in the Collector's records as he might easily have ascertained had he inquired. He failed to forward to the Collector or to place on record the letter to the Collector's address which he opened, and which would have brought his prolonged neglect to the notice of that Officer, and the letter itself is not forthcoming. He sent the case to the Police Commissioner instead of to a sitting Magistrate apparently without any sufficient reason, although the course was certain to involve further delay; and finally he utterly failed to prosecute the charge to a conviction although he was expressly entrusted with this duty, and he allowed the matter to remain in abeyance for a whole year until it was again brought to notice in another quarter.

10 *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
28th May 1863.

37. In explanation of his inexcusable delay Mr. Jordan pleads forgetfulness and press of other business. That Mr. Jordan is careless beyond excuse in the conduct of business seems to be the fact; but the plea of forgetfulness cannot be admitted in face of the fact that his attention was certainly twice specially called to the case in the interval between 29th October and 29th January, the first occasion being when he himself re-claimed the Stamps from the Superintendent's Office, the second when Mr. Read reported to the Board, and as Mr. Jordan admits, questioned him as to the position of the cases.

38. In support of the plea of press of business, Mr. Jordan states that between 17th October 1861 and 29th January 1862, his time was fully occupied in the disposal of 73 criminal cases, of 183 cases of breach of contract, and with the revision of Income tax assessments in 133 cases in addition to his regular Treasury duties, and that between 1st and 15th January he was further closely engaged in paying the Military Pensioners at Palaveram, the Mount, Poonamallee, and Tripassore.

39. Mr. Ellis states that the actual fact is that in the period in question Mr. Jordan was engaged on 47 criminal cases, and on 78 breaches of contract, of which 70 were settled by Razinama, and that he had no work whatever in the revision of Income tax assessments.

40. The Board observe that the delay was really from 29th October to 29th January; but whatever might have been the pressure of business there does not appear to them reason to believe that the case was viewed by Mr. Jordan as one so trivial, that it could have passed out of his memory not only once, but repeatedly. His suspicions as to the existence of fraud in the Stamp Office had certainly been aroused, as is shown by his original Memorandum, recommending further and thorough investigation there, and his subsequent neglect and want of interest in the final issue of the case are wholly inexplicable, and are not at all met by the excuse pleaded by him.

41. He argues that the non-destruction of the Stamp papers and correspondence connected with their return is evidence of his innocence of intention, but it is obvious to remark that the temporary suppression of the Stamps answered every purpose if they were not forged, as there seems no reason to believe they were, and that their destruction would have involved very serious risk to the Deputy Collector for ultimate detection would never have been impossible unless the correspondence in the Superintendent's Office could also have been destroyed.

42. The Board believe that in consequence of independent inquiries at the Stamp Office, it was ultimately discovered that the Stamps had been returned to Mr. Jordan on his application in 1861, and that the papers and correspondence themselves were found in his desk, after a long and necessarily unsuccessful search for them by him, in the presence of the Acting Collector in the Record-room, where he professed to believe they must be.

43. Against the blame which must in any case attach to his conduct in this matter, and against the suspicion which it is calculated to arouse, Mr. Jordan pleads his previous good character as evidenced by numerous testimonials, and his long service of 29 years. The Government will doubtless allow full weight to these considerations, and the Board need scarcely say that it is with much regret they find themselves called upon to report in so unfavorable a manner of one who for many years did good service in their Office, and left it by selection for the important grade of Deputy Collector and Magistrate with a reputation for strict integrity.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 11
28th May 1863.

No. 337. ORDER THEREON, 28th May 1863, No. 923.

1. The Government have carefully considered the Board's report and its accompaniments on Mr. Jordan's conduct in the trial of Angur Chund for selling Stamps without a license.

2. The Government see no ground for imputing corrupt or improper motives to Mr. Jordan, and his character for integrity and honesty of purpose during his long service of 29 years precludes such a supposition.

3. But his proceedings throughout evince such a total absence of business-like habits, and such unaccountable carelessness and neglect of duty, that his longer continuance in the public service is out of the question. On a recent occasion the Government animadverted severely on the manner in which he dealt with certain cases of breaches of contract, and the Collector states, that "negligence and want of memory, which would be extraordinary in any other Officer, have lately not been unusual with him." Much as the Government regret it, in the case of so old and, previously to these occurrences, deserving an Officer, they have no resource but to direct his immediate retirement. At his age and with his failing powers, transfer to another District or to a less onerous situation would be useless.

4. The Government will be prepared to consider Mr. Jordan's claim to a pension on his submitting the prescribed Medical Certificate.

5. The Jawabnevis, Kistnaswamy Iyer, should certainly be dismissed. He has evidently been guilty of falsehood, and he "bears a very bad character."

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

No. 954.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 14th February 1863.

Read the following letter from R. W. NORFOR, Esq., Superintendent of Stamps, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 13th February 1863, No. 682 of Fasli 1272 :—

1. I have the honor to enclose copy of a letter this day received from the Collector of Madras relative to the Proceedings in 1861, against Ameer Chund or Komeer Chund, who was tried at the Mount, and the charges against Augur Chund which seem not to have been investigated; the letter leaves the matter much where it was.

2. It seems very necessary as Augur Chund is now accused of forging that the reason for the former charge against him having been allowed to drop by the Deputy Collector of Saidapet, should be fully explained. Judging from the past correspondence it does not seem possible to arrive at any conclusion on the point without a formal inquiry held on the spot, and I would respectfully submit my view of the case for the consideration of the Board.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From R. W. NORFOR, Esq., Superintendent of Stamps, to B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of Madras, dated 9th February 1863, No. 659 of Fasli 1272.

1. Referring to letter from the Acting Collector of Madras to the Secretary Board of Revenue dated Saidapet, 9th December 1861, No. 445, I have the honor to request that you will furnish me with the particulars referred to in paragraph 2 of that letter, regarding two cases of illegal sales of stamped papers, one of which is mentioned in paragraph 1 of that letter, as being in course of investigation before the Presidency Magistrates.

2. The particulars mentioned in paragraph 2 are not filed in the Office of the Board of Revenue or in this Office, and the Superintendent of Stamps at that time having failed to trace any charge as having been laid before the Presidency Magistrates referred back on this point to the Collector of Madras, but no reply from him is on record in which the grounds are given for the supposition that the case was to be investigated at Madras.

3. The two men then charged with illegal selling are now on bail on a charge of having forged stamps in their possession, and it is important that the result of the old charge against one of them Augur Chund should be known. I shall be glad therefore if you will give me the information asked for at an early date.

4. One man "Ameer Chund" or Komeer Chund seems by letter above mentioned to have been tried at the Mount; the other Augur Chund may possibly have been tried at Saidapet, there being no trace yet found of a trial at Madras.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) R. W. NORFOR, Superintendent of Stamps.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of Madras, to R. W. NORFOR, Esq., Superintendent of Stamps, dated Saidapet, 11th February 1863, No. 8.

1. In reply to your letter of yesterday's date, No. 659, I have the honor to inform you that in October 1861 Captain Gunning, Joint Magistrate of Saint Thomas' Mount, sent the Deputy Magistrate some stamped papers with a request that one Ahmeer Chund may be tried for selling Stamps without a license. On the 8th October 1861 Mr. Jordan wrote to the Superintendent of Stamps communicating the result of his inquiries, and requesting to be informed whether, from the appearance of the Stamps he forwarded on other circumstances, he had any reason to think they had been improperly obtained from his Office. In reply the Superintendent of Stamps stated that he could not say that they were improperly obtained, as papers supplied by private individuals were stamped in his Office. On receipt of this information, further inquiry was made, and Ahmeer Chund was sent back to Saint Thomas' Mount to be tried by the Joint Magistrate there, and he was fined on conviction 20 Rupees by that Officer. Aucker Chund, the other Sowcar from whom Ahmeer Chund purchased the Stamps, being a resident of Madras, Mr. Jordan wrote

to the Commissioner of Police that he and one Soobroy Mudali should be tried for selling Stamps without a license. At Major Wilson's request the Deputy Magistrate's Javabneviss, Kristnasawmy Iyer was sent to prosecute, and nothing further was heard of the case till a few days ago when Auckur Chund was taken up in Madras on another charge, and as it was ascertained that the previous case had not been disposed of, Mr. Roberts wrote to Major Wilson desiring to know the result of the present inquiry, and whether it is intended to prosecute Auckur Chund on the previous charge. Colonel Wilson replied that the Jevabneviss, who appeared last year to prosecute was desired to make himself better acquainted with the case and to come again, and as he did not return, the case was not gone into, and that Mr. Jordan might institute proceedings against Auckur Chund after the present case has been disposed of.

2. After the omission of the Jevabneviss to attend, as directed, at the Commissioner's Office, Colonel Wilson, it appears, wrote to the Deputy Magistrate seeking his intentions as to the prosecution of the case, but as the letter never, as Mr. Jordan states, reached him, no further steps were taken in the matter by him.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) R. W. NORFOR, Superintendent of Stamps.

1. Forwarded to the Collector of Madras for full inquiry and report.
2. The circumstance of the missing letter should be fully investigated, and the Deputy Collector should be required to explain in writing how in any case he allowed the matter to drop, when he must certainly have been aware that the prosecution which had been instituted or contemplated at his request was not progressing for want of a properly instructed party to prosecute.
3. The Board request an early reply.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To B. Cunliffe, Esq., Collector of Madras.

Copy to R. W. Norfor, Esq., Superintendent of Stamps.

Exd. J. Wright.

Desiring the Collector of Madras to call upon his Deputy to explain why he allowed the investigation against certain parties convicted with illegal sale of Stamps to drop.

No. 954.

Depatched
Dated 14th February 1863.
Received

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

No.

1863.

Department

Enclosure of 1st in the Secretary of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Dept. dated 23rd May 1863. No.

Recd - 1208/63

No. 1,217.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 27th February 1863.

Read the following letter from B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of Madras, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Saidapet, 20th February 1863, No. 4:—

1. I have the honor to forward the explanation of the Deputy Collector on the subject of Board's Proceedings 14th instant.

2. From Mr. Jordan's statement, it appears that he was not aware, until recently, that the case committed by him in 1862 had not been proceeded with; and if the Javabneviss made no report to him, and if Colonel Wilson's letter did not reach him, I think that he need not necessarily have known of what had taken place in the Police Office.

3. It seems to me, however, not unlikely, that the subordinates of both offices combined to keep the matter from the notice of their superiors.

4. A search has been unsuccessful with regard to the missing letter. If suppressed in the office, it is not likely that any trace of it should exist.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. D. JORDAN, Esq., Deputy Collector, to B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of Madras, dated Saidapet, 19th February 1863, No. 47.

1. With reference to the Board's Proceedings of the 14th instant, directing me to explain why the prosecution against Acker Chund for illegal sale of Stamps was allowed to drop, I beg to state that under the authority granted by the Board of Revenue to you to prosecute, I was ordered to inquire into the case, and having found that the offence with which Acker Chund was charged had been committed at Madras, I wrote to the Commissioner of Police on the 29th January 1862, stating the facts elicited on the preliminary inquiry held by me, and requesting at the same time that Acker Chund and one Soobroya Mudelli, from whom Acker Chund said he had purchased the Stamps, might be tried on a charge of selling Stamp papers without a license. With this letter, I sent one Ahmeer Chund to give evidence in the case, and also mentioned in my letter, a copy of which I enclose, that the record of the inquiry made by me was forwarded to the Superintendent of Stamps, from whom I would get it back for him if required. In reply, Colonel Wilson desired me to send up a competent person to prosecute. On the following day I sent my Javabneviss Kistnasamy Iyer, he as had taken depositions from the parties and was well acquainted with the case. When he came back he told me that the Commissioner of Police had questioned him about the case, but never said that he had been directed to come again, and when now asked about it, he denies having ever been ordered to attend again. The case having thus been committed by me to the Commissioner of Police, and having in my letter of the 29th January 1862, furnished an abstract of the statements made by the parties before me, and having also sent the Javabneviss to prosecute, I beg respectfully to submit whether it was not the business of the Police at once to take up the case by summoning the parties named in my letter, and making the necessary inquiry with a view to putting the case up before a Police Magistrate. The case having thus passed out of my hands, and having heard nothing further on the subject, I of course concluded that the Police, to whom the case was handed over, had taken steps to bring the accused parties to trial. Had I been aware then as I now am that nothing had been done by the Police in the matter I certainly would have brought it again to Colonel Wilson's notice. As it is, I have done what I thought was necessary in the case, first holding a preliminary inquiry, then reporting the result both to you and the Superintendent of Stamps in a letter, a copy of which also I enclose, and finally, under your instructions, committing one case to the Commissioner of Police, and

Copy of the Stamps

17th February 1863

the other to Captain Gunning, Joint Magistrate of St. Thomas' Mount, in whose jurisdiction the alleged offence was committed. In the latter case, though no prosecutor was sent from the Cutcherry, Captain Gunning at once investigated the case and fined the accused party in the sum of 20 Rupees under the Stamp Act.

2. With regard to the missing letter, I do not recollect having received it, nor can any trace of it be found in my Office. I indeed regret Colonel Wilson did not write to me again, or ask you to send up the Jawabneiss a second time.

3. When Acker Chund was taken up lately for a graver offence it was discovered for the first time, that the charge pending against him before the Police had not been investigated; and with a view to its disposal, without further delay, I expressed myself willing to appear personally and prosecute if Colonel Wilson wished me to do so, but he wrote to say that I might appear and prosecute before a Police Magistrate after the case now under inquiry was closed.

4. From the above explanation it will, I trust be seen that the matter was not dropped by me, and that I took every possible step to bring the case forward, and am even now prepared to carry it further.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From J. D. JORDAN, Esq., Deputy Magistrate, to the Superintendent of Stamps, dated Saidapet, 8th October 1861, No. 73.

1. The Joint Magistrate of Palaveram has sent up one Ahmeer Chund, a Sowcar to be tried under the provisions of Section 31 of Act XXXVI of 1860, for selling Stamps without a license.

2. Ahmeer Chund states that he bought the Stamps from Acker Chund, a Sowcar in Madras. The latter, on being questioned how he got the Stamps, says that he bought them from one Soobroya Mudelli, who obtained these and several other Stamps from your Office. Soobroya Mudelli utterly denies having so obtained them or sold them to Acker Chund, a circumstance which leads to the supposition that they must have been surreptitiously obtained.

* 8 Stamps of one Rupee each.
2 do. of 8 Annas each.

3. The Stamps* are herewith forwarded for your inspection, and as they do not bear the endorsement prescribed by Section 21, I have the honor to request you will be so good as to inform me whether they were issued from your Office, or whether from their appearance or other circumstance you have any reason to believe they were stolen. I have further to request that you will be pleased to send up some one from your Office on Thursday at 10 A. M. to supply me with such information as may throw light on the case of supposed theft now under investigation.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. D. JORDAN,
Deputy Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From J. D. JORDAN, Esq., Deputy Magistrate, to Colonel W. J. WILSON, Commissioner of Police, Madras, dated Saidapet, 29th January 1862, No. 4.

1. The Board of Revenue having under the provisions of Section 37 of Act XXXVI of 1860, authorized the Collector to prosecute Sowcar Acker Chund and Soobroya Mudelli, both residing at Madras for selling Stamps without a license, I have the honor in the absence of the Collector to request that you will be good enough to cause the said Acker Chund and Soobroya Mudelli to appear before you to answer to the above charge preferred under Section 31 of the said Act.

2. Ahmeer Chund, to whom Acker Chund sold the Stamp is herewith forwarded, to give evidence in the case.

3. In the preliminary inquiry instituted by me, Acker Chund, the Madras Sowcar, confessed to having sold Stamps to Ahmeer Chund without a license, and has thereby rendered himself liable to the penalty prescribed by Section 31 of the said Act. The evidence adduced shows that Acker Chund purchased the Stamps from Soobroya Mudelli, who states that he got them from the Stamp Office. The depositions taken by me from the parties have been forwarded to the Superintendent of Stamps at his request; and if required, I shall obtain them for you.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. D. JORDAN, Deputy Magistrate.

1. The Acting Collector is requested to prosecute the inquiry into this matter, and to ascertain and report who is to blame for the non-prosecution of the criminal charge.

2. If the responsibility rests on the Jawabneiss or other subordinate, it should be brought home to him. The matter cannot be allowed to rest in its present position.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To C. A. Roberts, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 2,196.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 16th April 1863.

Read the following letter from the Honorable R. S. ELLIS, C. B., Acting Collector of Madras, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Saidapet, 10th April 1863, No. 114:—

1. In compliance with the Board's orders noted marginally, I have the honor to report on the delay that occurred in the committal of a case of illicit sales of Stamps, which was first brought to notice at the close of the year 1861.

2. In order that the Board may clearly understand the conclusion at which I have arrived in the case under report, I propose to lay before the Board a narrative of what occurred in connection with the delay which has attracted their notice.

3. On the 5th October 1861, Lieutenant Gunning, the Joint Magistrate at Saint Thomas' Mount, sent to Mr. Jordan, the Deputy Magistrate at Saidapet, certain Stamps which had been seized at the Mount, with a request that one Ameer Chund should be tried for selling Stamp papers without license. Lieutenant Gunning's object in sending Ameer Chund to the Deputy Magistrate, Mr. Jordan, at Saidapet, was because it appeared from Ameer Chund's statement, that he had purchased these papers from a Soukar Agur Chund at Madras, and Lieutenant Gunning thought that both Ameer Chund and Agur Chund could more conveniently be tried by Mr. Jordan.

4. Mr. Jordan held a preliminary inquiry into the case, which, it appears from the depositions recorded, terminated on the 17th October 1861.

The result of this inquiry is contained in a rather lengthy Memorandum addressed by Mr. Jordan to the Collector, Mr. Cunliffe, under date the 23rd October 1861.

5. In this Memorandum Mr. Jordan proposed to the Collector that the permission of the Board of Revenue should be obtained, under provisions of Section 37, Act XXXVI of 1860, of the Stamp Act, to prosecute these persons, Ameer Chund, the man sent up to Mr. Jordan by Lieutenant Gunning, Agur Chund, a Soukar of Madras who admitted selling the Stamp papers to Ameer Chund, and one Subroya Mudaliar, from whom Agur Chund professed to have purchased these papers.

Mr. Jordan in his Memorandum to the Collector, does not state before what Judicial authority he proposed to prosecute these cases; but this omission is supplied by the Collector, Mr. Cunliffe, in his letter to the Board of Revenue dated the 24th October 1861, in which, while forwarding the above mentioned Memorandum for the information of the Board of Revenue, Mr. Cunliffe asked the permission of the Board to put up the cases before the Magistrates of Saint Thomas' Mount and Madras, respectively, according to the jurisdictions within which the breaches of the Stamp law had taken place.

6. The Board of Revenue, in their Proceedings dated 23th October 1861, sanctioned the prosecution of these cases, directing that the Collector should *in due course report the result*.

7. In accordance with these orders, the Mount case against Ameer Chund was committed by the Collector, Mr. Cunliffe, on the 29th October 1861, for trial before the Joint Magistrate at the Mount, with the remark that, if it was found on the trial that the Stamp papers were sold to the accused by an unlicensed party within the limits of Madras, it would be necessary to proceed against such vendor, and for this purpose Lieutenant Gunning was requested to forward the record of the case after disposal.

8. Lieutenant Gunning on the 4th November 1861, sentenced Ameer Chund to pay a fine of 20 Rupees, or in default to be imprisoned for ten days. The fine was paid, the prisoner released, and the record of the case sent to the Office of the Collector of Madras as requested.

Enclosure of 12 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government of P. dated 13th May 1863 of 12

1863. Department.

No.

Dec-1208/63

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 27th February 1863.

Despatched

Received

No. 1,217.

Requesting the Acting Collector to prosecute the inquiry into the matter of the illegal sale of Stamps, and report who is to blame for the non-prosecution of the criminal charge.

In the case tried before Lieutenant Gunning, it was elicited, as was anticipated by Mr. Cunliffe, that the Stamp paper had been purchased by Ameer Chund from one Agur Chund, a Soukar residing within the limits of the Presidency Town of Madras.

9. It now remained for Mr. Jordan to carry out, under the orders of the Collector, the prosecution of the parties residing in Madras before a Madras Magistrate, as sanctioned by the Board of Revenue in their Proceedings dated 28th October 1861, in answer to Mr. Cunliffe's letter dated 24th October 1861.

10. It would appear that Mr. Jordan originally intended to have disposed of the case himself. I am led to this conclusion by the very elaborate inquiry held by Mr. Jordan before he wrote the Memorandum alluded to in paragraph 4, which would have been unnecessary if the case was to be put up before another Magistrate.

Mr. Jordan himself confirms this view of the case in a statement taken from him by me. He was however precluded from this course by the direction of Mr. Cunliffe, who pointed out to Mr. Jordan that the case had arisen beyond his jurisdiction. Mr. Jordan's inquiry terminated on the 17th October 1861, the Board's sanction for the prosecution of the cases having as stated above, reached this Office on the 28th October 1861.

11. Mr. Jordan's preliminary inquiry, and the Stamps supposed to have been illicitly sold, had been forwarded to the Superintendent of Stamps, Mr. Balmain, for his information with reference to certain inquiries which were being held by that Officer. On the 11th November 1861, Mr. Jordan sent for these Stamps for the purpose, as he states of filing them as "exhibits" before the Madras Magistrate. Mr. Jordan kept these Stamps in his possession, but took no steps whatever to commit the case.

12. In December 1861, the attention of the Acting Collector, Mr. Reade, was drawn to the fact that no report had been made on the subject of the cases of illicit Stamp vending, as required by the Board of Revenue in their Proceedings of the 28th October 1861, and he questioned Mr. Jordan on the subject. From Mr. Jordan's information, Mr. Reade on the 9th December 1861 reported to the Board of Revenue, that the case committed to the Magistrate at St. Thomas' Mount had been disposed of, and the parties punished by fine, and that the other case was *in course of investigation before the Presidency Magistrates*. Mr. Reade was misled by Mr. Jordan in thus reporting to the Board of Revenue, for, the case had not progressed one step towards committal since the sanction of the Board was received in October 1861.

13. Mr. Jordan took no further step in the matter until the 29th January 1862, or more than three months after Board's Proceedings were received. I do not understand why even then Mr. Jordan committed the case, and can only suppose that the return of Mr. Cunliffe, who had been absent on leave to this Office, induced Mr. Jordan to proceed in the case.

14. Instead of committing the case as was usual to a Madras sitting Magistrate, Mr. Jordan, on the 29th January 1862, sent a written communication to Colonel Wilson, the Commissioner of Police, in which that Officer is requested to cause Agur Chund and Subroya Mudaliar to appear before him to answer to a charge of illicit vending of Stamps.

It is stated in this letter that a witness is forwarded to the Commissioner of Police, and that Agur Chund, one of the accused, had in the preliminary inquiry confessed to the purchase of the Stamp paper from Subroya Mudali. The Commissioner of Police is also told that the depositions taken by Mr. Jordan could be obtained from the Superintendent of Stamps if required, but the Stamp paper itself was not sent, although it had been obtained, as is stated by Mr. Jordan, for that purpose; nor was any one sent to conduct the prosecution, and on inquiry, I have failed in ascertaining that even the witness alluded to above was actually sent with Mr. Jordan's letter to the Commissioner of Police.

15. The Commissioner of Police wrote back to Mr. Jordan on the 20th January, informing him that it would be necessary that Mr. Jordan should send a competent person to prefer the charge against Agur Chund and Subroya Mudaliar. On the same day, Mr. Jordan writes in answer

that one Kistnasami Iyen, his 'Magistrate Javabnevis' (the same person who had taken down the depositions in Mr. Jordan's preliminary inquiry) was sent to the Commissioner of Police to prefer the charge.

16. It seems that the Javabnevis, when he appeared before the Commissioner of Police, affected to be so little acquainted with the case, that the Commissioner wrote to Mr. Jordan on the 10th February 1862, to inform him that the Javabnevis, who had appeared before him on the 30th January 1862, could not afford sufficient information to enable him, Colonel Wilson, to prepare the Charge sheet.

Colonel Wilson added that the Javabnevis had been requested by him to make himself acquainted with the matter, that the Javabnevis had promised to return the next day, but that he had not done so, and that Colonel Wilson had not seen him since.

This is the letter which Mr. Jordan states was never received by him.

17. Mr. Jordan further states that, when the Javabnevis Kistnasami Iyer returned, he questioned him as to what had occurred at the Office of the Commissioner of Police, and that he was led to believe by the man's statement, that the Commissioner of Police had examined the Javabnevis regarding the case of illicit Stamp vending, and that the Commissioner intended himself to prosecute in the case.

18. From February 1862, until February 1863, not a single step was taken by Mr. Jordan to ascertain whether any thing had been done towards the prosecution of the case. It never seems to have occurred to Mr. Jordan to write to the Commissioner of Police on the subject or to call the attention of his official superior, Mr. Cunliffe, to the delay that had occurred in the disposal of the case.

19. The Javabnevis, Kistnasami Iyer, states that he did not pretend to be ignorant of the case; that Colonel Wilson asked him the names of the Defendants and of the witnesses; that as regards the latter, he had said that he must refresh his memory; that he was not told to return by the Commissioner of the Police, and that as Mr. Jordan, to whom he reported all that had happened, took no further notice of the case, he did himself not stir in the matter.

20. There is no doubt that no further notice of the case of illicit sale of stamps would have been taken, if it had not been for the discovery, early in this year 1863, that Agur Chund and others were concerned in counterfeiting stamp paper.

21. This led to an inquiry as to what had become of the Stamps illicitly sold in the year 1861, and also to the discovery that the Madras case against Agur Chund had never been disposed of. The Stamps were traced by Mr. Roberts, then Acting Collector to this Office, but on a search being made, they were not forthcoming. Mr. Jordan denied all knowledge of where they were.

22. By searching Mr. Jordan's records, Mr. Roberts ascertained that Mr. Jordan had obtained possession of the Stamps in question on the 11th November 1861. Mr. Jordan's letter asking for the return of these Stamps from the Office of the Superintendent of Stamps was not entered in the Register Book kept for this purpose, and the stamps themselves would not have been found, if Mr. Roberts had not insisted on Mr. Jordan looking for them in his desk, when they were discovered.

23. The case of illicit sale of Stamps was then committed before Mr. Clarke, the Police Magistrate, and Agur Chund was fined the full amount provided in the Stamp Act, the case of illicit vending being fully proved. The other accused, Subroya Mudaliar, was acquitted.

24. I have endeavoured, as did Mr. Roberts, the late Acting Collector, to obtain from Mr. Jordan an explanation of his proceedings in reference to this case, and have been unable to elicit any more satisfactory answer than that, throughout the period, from the 17th October 1861 until the end of January 1862, he failed to remember that the case had not been committed, as ordered, to the Madras Magistrate, and that when his Javabnevis returned from Colonel Wilson, in January 1862, he thought that all that was necessary had been done by him, Mr. Jordan, and that the case would be conducted by the Police Commissioner.

25. Mr. Jordan states that Mr. Reade must have misunderstood him when he questioned him about the disposal of the case in December 1861; on that occasion he told Mr. Reade that the Mount case had been disposed of by the Magistrate, Lieutenant Gunning, and that the Madras case had not, at that time, been finally disposed of by himself, Mr. Jordan.

26. After a careful consideration of the circumstances of the case, I regret that I cannot bring myself to believe that the extraordinary negligence, delay, and indifference, shown throughout by Mr. Jordan, arose from want of memory. Supposing that after his elaborate preliminary inquiry, which closed on the 17th October 1861, Mr. Jordan had forgotten all about the case, he must have been reminded of it when he wrote to the Superintendent of Stamps for the Stamps illicitly sold, and which had been sent to the Superintendent with the record of the preliminary inquiry. It will be remembered that Mr. Jordan has stated that he required the Stamps for the purpose of filing them as "exhibits" before the Commissioner of Police. Again, supposing that after receiving these Stamps Mr. Jordan again entirely forgot the case, he was again reminded of it when questioned by Mr. Reade on the 19th December 1861, as to the disposal of the two cases. Allowing that he did not intentionally mislead Mr. Reade, and that he was misunderstood by that gentleman, still it is natural to suppose that he would, after being questioned by Mr. Reade, at once have committed the case. I may here again bring to notice that the preliminary inquiry, which terminated on the 17th October 1861, was complete, and that not a single deposition was taken, or other proceeding held by Mr. Jordan, after that date, so that he could, at any time after the receipt of the Board's orders, have committed the case. But in spite of these two instances in which his memory had been refreshed, Mr. Jordan does nothing in the case till the close of January 1862.

27. He then contents himself with writing a letter to the Commissioner of Police, and when desired by that officer to send a competent person to prosecute the case, he sends the Javabneiss Kistnasami Iyer, and is satisfied with the Javabneiss returning and stating that he had been examined by the Commissioner of Police. It is extraordinary that Mr. Jordan, when he heard no more of the committal or trial of the case, should not have considered it necessary to make any inquiry regarding it, although he must have been well aware that the Board of Revenue had ordered a report to be made to them on the termination of the trial of these cases before the Magistrates.

28. I have stated above that I do not believe in the excuse of negligence and want of memory advanced by Mr. Jordan. I have therefore endeavoured to ascertain what possible object there could have been, and on whose part, in delaying the committal of the case before the Madras Magistrate. It appears that Agur Chund, the accused in the case of illicit Stamp vending, has subsequently been found to have been concerned in the receiving of counterfeit Stamps, and that he has been committed for trial before the High Court. The forging of Stamps, and the theft of stamp papers, had no doubt been going on for some time prior to the discovery of the illicit sales at Madras and Saint Thomas' Mount. The parties concerned, when discovered in the illicit sale of Stamps, would be very unwilling that the case should pass into the hands of the Madras Police, dreading that incidentally with this case, and in obtaining information thereon, the Commissioner of Police or the Magistracy might, through informers or otherwise, obtain a clue to the more heinous offences of which they had been guilty.

29. These parties were therefore anxious to have the cases disposed of out of Madras. There was no delay in the disposal of the *Mount case*. There was no delay in the elaborate preliminary investigation held by Mr. Jordan in the Madras case. It is only when it is found that the Madras case is beyond Mr. Jordan's jurisdiction, that we find unaccountable delay, and a degree of continued and systematic negligence, which appears inexplicable until the object of such delay is ascertained.

30. It was, as shown above, greatly the interest of Agur Chund, and those concerned in the Stamp forgeries, to endeavour, by every means in their power, to delay the committal of the Madras case, with a hope that it would, in the press of business, be forgotten, as very nearly happened.

One of Agur Chund's witnesses Kalam Soukar, was well known to Mr. Jordan, and this would be the natural channel by which an effort would be made to influence Mr. Jordan. Although my suspicions have been directed to this, the only reason for a corrupt delay in the case under report, I have been unable to obtain any proof of Mr. Jordan having been influenced by Kalam, or of his having received any consideration, pecuniary or other, from Agur Chund or Kalam, to postpone the committal of the case. Notwithstanding this failure to obtain proof, I confess that Mr. Jordan's explanation has not succeeded in removing my suspicions, that some such influence was exercised to delay the prosecution of the case before the Madras Magistracy.

31. Having freely stated my own opinion of this case, I will proceed to lay before the Board Mr. Jordan's defence, or rather his apology, for his conduct throughout the case. Mr. Jordan attributes his neglect entirely to failing memory, and although, as I have stated above, I cannot bring myself to believe that this has been the cause of the delay that has occurred in connection with the case, I must in justice to Mr. Jordan state that, negligence and want of memory, which would be extraordinary in any other Officer, have lately not been unusual with him, and I have reason to think that a reference to Mr. Cunliffe, the late Collector of Madras, would show that his attention has frequently of late been called to Mr. Jordan's extreme negligence in some matters, and to his want of memory in others. These most serious defects have elicited frequent and severe censure from Mr. Cunliffe, and have attracted the notice of Government in connection with Mr. Jordan's conduct as a Magistrate.

32. I may also recall to the Board's recollection that Mr. Jordan has been employed in the public service during twenty-nine years, and that he is in possession of very excellent testimonials from Officers of the Government under whom he has served. Mr. Jordan is in easy circumstances, and he has shown me that he has for many years been in the habit of investing his savings in a perfectly unexceptionable manner, and through respectable Agency. This would contradict the supposition that he had been influenced in his conduct in the matter under report by any pecuniary consideration.

33. Mr. Jordan attributes the failure of his memory and his late negligence in the performance of his duty, to ill-health, which has affected his mental powers; and I believe he is prepared to support this opinion by a medical certificate.

I would however submit that even under this, the most favorable explanation of the circumstances of the case, it can hardly be advantageous to the interests of the public service that Mr. Jordan should retain his present position.

34. It only remains for me to notice the conduct of Kistnasami Iyer, the Javabneiss in Mr. Jordan's Office. From Colonel Wilson's statements both to myself and to my predecessor Mr. Roberts, it is evident that having a full knowledge of the case of illicit stamp vending, which he acquired while taking down the depositions during the preliminary inquiry before Mr. Jordan, he appeared before Colonel Wilson and affected so much ignorance of the case as to prevent Colonel Wilson at once committing the case before the Madras Magistrate; I can come to no other conclusion than that Kistnasami Iyer purposely caused this delay. Further he has been guilty of falsehood in denying that Colonel Wilson desired him to return to his Office when he had made himself acquainted with the circumstances of the case. He further admits that he did not in any way remind his official superior that this case remained undisposed of.

35. Under these circumstances, I propose to reduce Kistnasami Iyer to some lower employment, which will not entail responsible duties.

36. I have to apologize to the Board for the length of this report, but I have considered that it was desirable that, in forming their opinion, the Board should have all the facts of the case before them, and many of these facts have not hitherto been fully stated to the Board.

1. The Acting Collector will be requested to take a written statement from Mr. Jordan, and to forward it to the Board with his own remarks. Mr. Jordan should be particularly required to explain his delay in the original committal of the case on each of the occasions on which, as

shown by Mr. Ellis, his attention must have been recalled to it, and also what ultimately led to its committal.

2. In paragraph 16 of the above letter Mr. Ellis mentions that the Commissioner of Police wrote to Mr. Jordan that the Javabneviss was not sufficiently informed to conduct the prosecution, and that on 7th February 1892, he wrote a *second* time to Mr. Jordan informing him that the Javabneviss had not returned, *which letter* Mr. Jordan states was never received by him. The Board desire to know whether Mr. Jordan admits the receipt of the first letter, and whether the letter has been produced.

3. They also desire to know in what relation Kalaram stands to Augur Chund in general repute, and what is the nature of the connection between Mr. Jordan and Kalaram.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON.

Secretary.

To Honorable R. S. Ellis, c. b., Acting Collector of Madras.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 2,266.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 20th April 1863.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, Madras.
Read the following letter from the Honorable R. S. ELLIS, C. B., Acting Collector of Madras,
to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Home's Gardens,
17th April 1863, No. 120:—
I have the honor to for-

1. In reply to the Board's Proceedings dated the 16th April 1863, I have the honor to forward, in original, the answers made by Mr. Jordan to certain questions I put to him, prior to writing my letter to the Board dated 10th April.

2. These answers contain all the information that can be obtained from Mr. Jordan, and may, in the Board's opinion, render it unnecessary that I should take any further written statement from him.

3. Kalaram is well known to be a friend of Augur Chund's, and they are constantly seen together. The nature of the connection between Kalaram and Mr. Jordan is shown in their replies to questions I have put to them, and which are included in the enclosed papers.

4. I regret to find that I have led the Board into error, by paragraph 16 of my letter, and I beg to enclose a correction thereof which should be substituted for the original paragraph.

5. Colonel Wilson wrote twice to Mr. Jordan. The first letter dated 30th January 1892, which was to inform Mr. Jordan that a competent person should be sent to prosecute the charge on behalf of Government, in the case of illicit sale of Stamps. This letter Mr. Jordan received.

6. On the 10th February 1862, Colonel Wilson again wrote to Mr. Jordan that, as the Javabneiss Kistnasawmy could not afford him sufficient information, he (Colonel Wilson) had requested him to make himself acquainted with the matter; that he the Javabneiss had promised to return the next day, but that Colonel Wilson had not seen him since.

7. This is the letter which Mr. Jordan states was never received by him.

The Board still think it desirable that Mr. Jordan should be called on to furnish, in writing, a full and complete explanation of his part in the matter, which the Acting Collector will forward to the Board with his own remarks.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Secretary.

To Honorable R. S. Ellis, c. B., Acting Collector of Madras.

Exd. J. Wright.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 16th April 1863.

Despatched

Received

No. 2, 1966.

零

1865.

Department:

Calling for a written statement from Mr. Jordan in connection with the charges preferred against him, and requesting certain other information on the subject.

Enclosure of 73 in the Proceedings of the Board of Pensions to the Secretary to Government P. P.
dated 23rd May 1863. 49.

1745 permi sein 1745

13*

Copy

My dear Sir

I have your care fully
 going to all these papers -

I do not think that there
 are grounds for imputing cor-
 rupt motives - I don't see what
 such motives could have been -

But the whole proceeding
 shows an amount of "puzzle-
 headedness" and total ab-
 sence of business-like habits
 which quite disqualify Mr.
 J. for his present over and
 responsible post.
 On the back of this is the

Enclosure 1st, in the Proceeding
 of the Board of Revenue to the
 Secretary to Government of P. D.
 dated 25. May 1863 etc -

1863.

Department

Revenue 1208/12

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 20th April 1863.

Despatched

Received

22584

No. 2,266.

Considering it desirable that Mr. Jordan
 should be called on to furnish, in writing, a full
 and complete explanation of his part in the mat-
 ter regarding the unlicensed sale of Stamps.

in different opinion entertained of him as a public servant by Council - and his conduct in the breach of contract cases - He ought to have been transferred to some other District for these last - as I proposed in my mem: on them. But other Councils prevailed.

The question is what to do with him now.

He cannot continue Depy Comm of Madras.

Nor would it be for the good of the public service to depute him to some lower appt. in another Dist.

14
He should positively leave the public service forthwith - To grant him a years leave is out of the question - If he can produce medical testimony of physical unfitness for further duty, I should not object to his going on $\frac{1}{3}^d$ pension -

Otherwise he must go un-
-reservedly and without pension:
for stay in govt employ which he cannot.

It is to be regretted that he should thus be turned adrift without pension - But here contra it is to be considered that he has for some years

been drawing high pay for office for which he was quite unfit - Secondly, that he had no family & no private means

I have gone carefully through all the papers and am not disposed to attribute corrupt motives to Mr Jordan. - he has however shown due carelessness in the performance of the important duties entrusted to him that his continuance in the service of the Govt is impossible. There is a recommendation statement from the Collector that he propose to reduce his remuneration to some lower employment which will not exact responsible duties. I believe this man to have been actuated by corrupt motives and to have told sundry falsehoods brought to the completely discredited. -

If there are any grounds upon which Mr Jordan can claim a pension I should not object to grant one but certainly not his full pension of his length of service.

W

(+ necessary by the Hon. Secy. Oct. 1)

In this letter the 14th of Oct. report on the conduct of Mr Jordan, Deputy Comm. & Magistrate of Madras, in connection with a case in which certain parties were charged with illicitly selling stamps.

On the 5 Oct 61. the Magistrate at the Muzh sent Mr Jordan some stamp papers which the parties were accused of illegally selling.

Mr Jordan Com. - Pleated an elaborate enquiry into the matter and reported to the Com. on the 23rd Oct. id. recommending that the 14th permission to per-

Leaves the parties -
/one at the Marsh &
the other before a Master
Magistrate according to the
jurisdiction within which
the offences were committed
should be attained.

This permission was
granted on the 28 Oct:
and the Marsh case
sent up on the 29th
and settled on the 4th
Nov. The other case ought
now to have been com-
mitted for trial.

On the 11th Nov:
Mr Jordan recalled
the Stamps of which he
has been sent by the 18th to
the Sub. for examina-
tion /- in order to use
them in the trial -

The Stamps were
returned on the 13th
and were taken pos-
session of by Mr Jordan.

in whose desk after 15
unavailing search
every where else they
were found in 1863 -
The letter which
accompanied them
was not placed on
record.

On the 9 Dec: 1867
Mr Reade enquired
about the case from
Mr Jordan and un-
derstood Mr Jordan
to say that the Ma-
draz case was being
investigated by the
Master Magistrate.
Mr Jordan says Mr
Reade misunder-
stood him - but there
is no doubt that Mr
Reade enquired
about the case - & thus
of course brought it
to Mr Jordan's re-
collection.

On the 29 Jan^y
1862 Mr. Jordan
sent the Case to
the Com^r of Pleas
instead of the Ma-
jistrate - In the
interval between
the 29th Oct & 29 Jan^y
nothing was done to
the Case by Mr. Jo-
-dan - in fact there
was nothing to do
by and sending the
Case up - which
could have been
as easily done on the
first as on the last
mentioned date.

Mr. Jordan pleads
press of business
& forgetfulness.

The first plea is
untenable for the
Case had in fact
been settled - all

16
but a letter of a
few lines to Mr. Wil-
son on the 23 Oct - the
second plea is upset
by the fact that in
the interval the Case
must have been brought
to his mind on the
two occasions above men-
-tioned.

The reason why
the Case was sent up
on the 29th Jan^y - is
also apparent - On
the previous day the
Supt of Champs wrote
to the Com^r enquiring
what had been done -
the Com^r was an in-
-competent and the letter
must have gone to Mr.
Jordan in the usual
course & been opened
by him - but it is
not entered on the
record & the original is

not for the coming -
It is to be remarked
however that Mr. Jor-
dan himself al-
ludes to this letter
in his defence - which
he would not have done
had he wilfully sup-
pressed it.

The case was
sent up afterwards
in a very unbusi-
ness-like way & to
the wrong officer. The
court did not ac-
company the letter
nor was the least al-
lusion made to the
stamps which were
actually in Mr. Jordan's
possession.

Col. Wilson on the
30th wrote to Mr. Jordan
to send a competent
person to prosecute &

Mr. Jordan accordingly
sent his clerk, Rich-
ardson Lyer - This
person however appeared
^{ignorant} or affected ignorance
of particulars and
was told by Col. Wilson
to make himself
better acquainted
with the case & re-
turn on the following
days - He however
never returned and
on the 10 Feb Col.
Wilson wrote to Mr.
Jordan telling him
this.

Mr. Jordan de-
clares he never re-
ceived this letter
and it is not on
record in the Court
Office - He says also
that the Clerk led
him to believe that
Col. Wilson was pro-
ceeding with the case
in the usual way.

This the matter
remained in abeyance
until the beginning of
this year when the
party concerned in
the case had charged
with forgery.

There can be
no doubt that in
the preliminary part
of this case ~~Mr. Jordan~~
for which he was
more particularly
responsible, Mr. Jordan
is very seriously &
Kane - and even
after the commitment
of the case, he, on
the most favorable
views of his proceedings,
evinced a most
extraordinary degree
of apathy - being
once enquiring what
had become of an
enquiry in which

he had taken so im-
portant a part -

Of course the easiest
way of showing all dif-
ficulties is to suppose
that there was corruption
among our personal know-
ledge of Mr. Jordan
would not lead me
to this inference - He
was an Assistant
in the Rev. Bd. for
some years - and was
a very willing, hard-
working and trustworthy
servant - but very
thick-headed - if it
was possible to make
a blunder, he was
sure to make it - &
his stupidity in ma-
king it was only
equalled by his indi-
crous surprise when
the mistake was ex-
plained - He had quite

a mania for collecting
papers in his room
and fancying he
was doing the whole
work of the office - When
a paper could not
be found elsewhere -
search was made in
his room - His assurance
on his part that he
had never seen it has
never accepted - he
has made to open
his desk & drawers &
very often the missing
paper was there found -
But his character for
integrity and honesty
of purpose was admitted
by all. In the N. Circars
during the many trials
for malversation which
then occurred, his pro-
pety was often tested &
J. H. Mr. Elliot & Mr.
J. H. Hume assured
me that he had stored

the test - Mr. Elliot also
states that Mr. Jordan
has shown him that
"he has for many
years been in the habit
of investing his savings
in a perfectly un-
exceptionable manner
and through respectable
agency -" From my
knowledge of Mr. Jordan
and in the absence
of any thing like
evidence I should
throw out the sup-
position of corruption
and in such a
case as this a man
may surely claim
that previous charac-
ter should be taken
into consideration.

But it is clearly
out of the question to
keep Mr. Jordan in
his present appoint-
ment - Especially
as in the Dept. he

his plate shown him
self inefficient.

He is anxious
to get a year's sick
leave and retire at
the end of it. He would
then have served 30 years
and could claim a
pension of $\frac{1}{2}$ pay = 250
rupees. If compelled
to retire now he would
only get $\frac{1}{3}$ = 167 Rs.

There is a rule however
forbidding promotion
servants being kept on
merely on a trial for
a higher rate of pay.
Sir and I do not
think the Government has
a right to do what
has occurred. I
expect such a favor
even if it were not
forbidden.

I am not quite
sure that he can
get a medical
certificate of in-
capacity - and if

he cannot, there may
be some difficulty
in getting him his
pension - as it or-
dinarily requires 35
years service. A dis-
-pense with the Cer-
-tificate.

Of course, if the
Govt. consider that
corruption is at the
bottom of his Resi-
-gnation, there is an
end of the matter.
He can either be
dismissed on the
enquiry already made
or tried formally
by a Comⁿ.

J.D.S.

21
My dear Sir

I have gone carefully
through all the papers.

I do not think that there are
grounds for imputing corrupt
motives - I don't see what such
motives could have been -

But the whole proceeding shows
an amount of progluttedness,
and total absence of business like
tactics which quite disqualify me I
for his present overness and espousal.
With respect -

To

the best of this is the indifferent
opinion entertained of him. As
a public servant by Campbell -
and his conduct in the matter
of contract cases - He ought to
have been transferred to some
other District for some time - as I
proposed in my Memo. on this -
but other considerations prevailed -

The question is what to do with
him now -

He cannot continue Dep^y Col^l
of Madras.

He would do for the public
service to be kept here for some

time app^l. in another Dist.

He must positively leave the
public service forthwith - To
grant him a year leave is out
of the question - If he can per-
form medical &c. in any
of physical sciences for some
time duty I would not object
to his going on $\frac{1}{3}$ rd pension -

Otherwise he must go
unremunerated and without pen-
sion; for staying for employ-
ment he cannot.

It is to be regretted that he
and others have been advised

without previous - but for certain
it is to be considered - first that he
has for some years been doing
high pay for an officer for which
he was quite unfit - secondly
that he has no family, and has
private means -

I have not written this on
your memo because I thought
that you would see in the
papers to read for my infor-
-mation and not that I should
give my opinion first - But
I have no objection to your sending
this to the Governor with the papers
if you wish it. Very truly
27 May J. G. R.

W. 923. R. 3
Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 28th May 1863 -
Read the following Memo
of the Board of Revenue
(Here enter 23rd May 1863.)

The first have care-
fully considered
the R. S. report and
its accompanying
on the Jordan can-
duct in the
trial of Agur Chund
for selling stamps
without a license -

2. The first see no
ground for imputing
corrupt or improper
motives to Mr Jordan
and his character
for integrity and
honesty of purpose
during his long service
of 29 years precludes
such a supposition -
3. But his proceeding
throughout even at such
a total absence of
business-like habits
and such unac-

- Come to the careless-
ness and ~~careless~~
neglect of duty
that his longer con-
tinuance in the
public service is
worse out of the
question - On a re-
cent occasion the
Jt. Administrator
saw him on the mar-
ch in which he
dealt with certain
cases of breaches
of contract - and
the Col. stated that
"negligence & want
of memory, which he
is extraordinary
in any other officer,
have lately not
been unusual with
him" - Much as
the Jt. report it, in

the case of so old a
person, & these oc-
currences, desiring
an officer, they have
no resource but
to direct his im-
mediate retirement.
At his age and
with his failing
memory, transfer
to another District
or to a less onerous
situation would be
useless -

4 The Jt. will
be prepared to
consider Mr Jordan's
claim to a pension
on his submitting
the prescribed Me-
dical Certificate.
The Jawstevens,
his trustworthy
should certainly be

he is misled.
He has evidently
been "putty up"
falsehood and
he "bears a very
bad character."

L.D.

14 Re 18th

14 Copies To the Post Office
with 7 Enclosures. (Capt. & Clerk)

Not Copy Dist. 28

3 Copies To the Civil Paymaster
Capt. & Clerk.

Let to the

Revenue 1863. Sept¹⁰
No. of Govt for May

No 923.

No. of the Madras Govt.
of 28. May 1863.

Mr Gordon Treasury
Deputy Collector in the
Madras District, ordered to
be relieved from the public
service.

No 336 & 337.