M.R.O.-14—12,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1196 Press ~~Mis.~~

158-159

Dated 8-7-~~18~~1886

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 8th July 1864.

No. 158. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1864, No. 4,071 :—

Read the following letter from the Collector of Tanjore, dated Point Calimere, 16th June 1864, No. 207.

1. With reference to the Orders of Government of the 4th May last, conveyed in the Board's Proceedings ———, I have now the honor to state that Mr. D'Monte appeared before me at Negapatam on the 2nd instant, and every opportunity was given him of cross-examining the witnesses who had been examined and of adducing further evidence. Many of the witnesses had to come from a distance, and all of them were not present on that day, amongst others the first witness Srinivasa Modelly. Mr. D'Monte, however, at the very outset of the proceedings stated that there were only two witnesses, viz., Samu Pillay and P. Srinivasa Chetty, whom he wished to cross-examine at all, and stated that he had obtained copies of the precis of evidence submitted with my report of the 17th March, and that he did not wish again to have the witnesses examined. I deemed it my duty, however, to have the evidence of all the parties who were present read before Mr. D'Monte, but he presistently refused to put any questions except to the parties above named. Mr. D'Monte then left the office stating that his case had been so long under investigation, that he did not wish the inquiry to be further protracted, and asked a week to perform his written defence. I at once acceded to his request, and Mr. D'Monte's defence reached me on the morning of the 12th, Sunday.

2. I enclose the same as directed, and the further evidence taken by me on the 2nd June; the other evidence both parole and documentary, is already before the Board.

3. I beg also to forward the following remarks on the defence now submitted by Mr. D'Monte.

4. With regard to the Document or Receipt A, Mr. D'Monte now endeavours to make out that it was intended for another, Alagappa Chetty, and he has, with that view, endeavoured to elicit from Samu Pillay, seventh witness (and whom Mr. D'Monte call his agent or cashier), that he (Samu Pillay) had actually agreed to obtain for Mr. D'Monte the amount required by him, Rupees 410, from one Sickle Poorawachary Alagappa Chetty. Now, if this be true, and if there had really been any previous negotiations between Mr. D'Monte and Samu Pillay regarding a loan being obtained from Sickle or Poorawachary Alagappa Chetty, it is but natural to suppose that, when examined by me in February last, as to whether he had any negotiations or dealings with one Alagappa Chetty on behalf of Mr. D'Monte, he (Samu Pillay) would have had no difficulty in at once seeing who the Alagappa Chetty meant was, and it is indeed beyond all reason to believe that Samu Pillay really did not know who the individual referred to was, and therefore denied all knowledge of him. This, in my judgment, shows most clearly that Samu Pillay has been tampered with by Mr. D'Monte, since his return to Negapatam, and that the line of defence now set up is a pure fabrication on the part of Mr. D'Monte. To show this more clearly, I take leave to place, in juxtaposition, a few of the statements given by Samu Pillay in his depositions of the 11th February and 2nd June.

Samu Pillay. 11th February.	*Samu Pillay.* 2nd June.
"I am not Mr. D'Monte's agent." "I am a merchant and deal in soap and sending bullocks to Colombo." Mr. D'Monte never asked me for a loan of Rupees 400 or thereabouts. I do not know Alagappa Chetty.	(In answer to Mr. D'Monte's question, are you my agent or cashier.) I have money dealings with you. In the month of December last, when you (Mr. D'Monte) asked for money, I told you (Mr. D'Monte) to give a chit in the name of Vellapolliam Veerappa Chetty, or Sickle Alagappa Chetty.

Further, and with regard to this document, it will be remembered that, in his first statement, Mr. D'Monte said that the money for which the document was drawn out was to be obtained from Samu Pillay, *the person who was in the habit of lending him money*; and again, in his written statement on the 12th February, he states that the Alagappa Chetty referred to

in the document, and who is there clearly and distinctly described as *resident merchant at Negapatam*, was unknown to him, but was known to his agent Samu Pillay. Now, however, and after the lapse of nearly four months, a new Alagappa Chetty is brought into existence, and the well-known and real Natkotian Chetty, and who does reside at Vellapolliam, a suburb of Negapatam, is stated not to be the right party, but another man of the same name residing at a village some six miles off. I would also observe that both Mr. D'Monte and Samu Pillay are not strangers at Negapatam, and it is simply impossible that either one or the other could have made the mistake of confounding the Vellapolliam Alagappa Chetty with the Sickle or Poorawachary Alagappa Chetty. Further, and in connection with this alleged loan, it is to be borne in mind that Samu Pillay has stated most distinctly, in his deposition of the 11th February that Mr. D'Monte being already in his debt upwards of Rupees 150, he (Samu Pillay) had about fifteen days previously positively declined to lend him any further sums, and had insisted on the payment of what was already owing. Taking all these circumstances into consideration, I conceive that no other conclusion can be come to than that, as originally admitted by him, he (Samu Pillay) had nothing whatever to do with the negotiation of the document A, and that the attempt that has now been made by Mr. D'Monte to show that he had, is utterly false and unfounded.

5. With regard to the sum for which this document A was drawn out, Mr. D'Monte seems to think it a great point in his favour that the sum total received through Srinivasa Moodelly, as stated in the previous report, *minus* the portions therein noted to have been paid back, falls short of Rupees 410, for which amount the receipt was given to the latter. This is, however, a mistake; the portions referred to Rupees 16, were *not* paid back by Mr. D'Monte, but by his unfortunate tool and dupe Srinivasa Moodelly himself, and who, when it was beginning to be known that inquiry was being made into the malversations stated to prevail in the Salt Department, was pressed on all sides by the parties who through him had given bribes. Again, Mr. D'Monte, in the same paragraph, tries to throw discredit on the statement of first witness, on account of an alleged discrepancy between his statement and that of the fifth (not seventeenth witness as stated by Mr. D'Monte). It will be observed, however, that the difference is only regarding the value of certain rings one party valuing them at Rupees 20, and the other at Rupees 30, and that even the fifth witness does not deny the fact of the *giving* of the rings; it will also be remembered *vide* his deposition given on the 5th February) this witness confessed he had been tampered with by Mr. D'Monte himself, and had, at Mr. D'Monte's suggestions, fabricated a false report: it is, therefore, by no means impossible that the value has been purposely mis-stated.

6. Further, in the case of the thirteenth witness, Mr. D'Monte alleges there is a discrepancy between his statement and that of the first witness, as to the balance for which Ragava Iyengar was to be held responsible, and whether it was Rupees 13 or Rupees 3. With regard to this the thirteenth witness was called on for explanation, when he stated that he was under the impression that he had only to pay Rupees 3 and not 13. It is, however, by no means impossible that he might have misunderstood the exact amount.

7. Again, with regard to the tenth witness, Mr. D'Monte lays stress on the discrepancy between the statement of the first witness who alleges that the amount of the loans given by the tenth witness was Rupees 140, while the latter states it to have been Rupees 250. With regard to the statements of this witness (and who died almost immediately after this examination on his return to his village), I have already drawn the attention of the Board. My firm conviction at the time was, that he purposely and wilfully mis-stated the sums, in order to favour Mr. D'Monte; but it is certainly by no means creditable that he (Mr. D'Monte) should have borrowed so large a sum as Rupees 250 from a person trading in salt, and who, it is a well known fact, was largely indebted to Mr. D'Monte in the matter of salt sales.

8. With reference to the statement contained in paragraph 6, that my Sheristadar suborned Srinivasa Moodelly to give evidence against him, I would only state that the charge is simply as false as it is malicious and malignant, and no one knows this better than Mr. D'Monte himself. If any one suborned Srinivasa Moodelly, or any of the other witnesses, to give evidence against Mr. D'Monte, I was that party, and the Sheristadar merely acted in this, as in all other matters, entirely under my orders. Mr. D'Monte's statement is, I presume, founded on the matter contained in the Petition alluded to by him in the same paragraph, and what does this amount to? It is as follows:—"*The Collector* and his Sheristadar called me on the 16th at Vellu. and said "that to retain my appointment is a difficult matter; you shall have no employment if you fail "to say what you know." If any subornation therefore took place, I am the party responsible for it, and not my Sheristadar, and I trust the Board will acquit him of all complicity in such a charge. As to myself, I leave the matter in the hands of the Board; as they are aware, I have

had a most unpleasant, and can add a most irksome duty to perform. I have, however, endeavoured to discharge that duty to the best of my ability and with an earnest and honest intention to do every justice to the Officer whose delinquencies my duty compelled me to bring to the notice of the Board, as also to the interests of the public service. I will not, however, add more in a matter of a mere personal nature.

9. With reference to the second part of Mr. D'Monte's defence, and in which Mr. D'Monte remarks, that if P. Vencatasa Chetty's books were tampered with to screen him, his name would have been altogether omitted, I would only observe that the fact of part of the book having been destroyed, and in which transactions of an illegal or improper nature may have been entered, does not of necessity invalidate the rest of the books, or that in which ordinary money transactions are entered. P. Vencatasa Chetty, it will be remembered, swears as to the accuracy of the accounts, extract from which has already been forwarded to the Board, and admits that Mr. D'Monte's private account was transferred, by his own order, to the books of the Salt Company, and *without* the consent of his partners. The Board will further observe that these transactions took place at a time when P. Vencatasa Chetty & Co., were fully engaged in the salt trade, and it may not perhaps be out of place to remark that, out of his salary of Rupees 350 per mensem, Mr. D'Monte has throughout been in the habit of remitting to the Bank of Madras Rupees 200 monthly.

N. B.—Document A forwarded with the Board's endorsement of the 31st ultimo, is herewith returned.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Defence of Mr. D'Monte, Deputy Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

ABSTRACT.—Deposition taken from Pallikonda Vencatasa Chetty.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

ABSTRACT.—Deposition taken from Samu Pillay.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

Document A.—Promissory Note.

---

1. Ordered that the above papers be submitted for the consideration of Government, with reference to their Proceedings dated 4th May 1864, No. 777, Revenue Department.

2. In their Proceedings, dated 5th April last, the Board gave it as their opinion that, in fairness to all parties, the charges against the Deputy Collector, Mr. D'Monte, should be formally and thoroughly investigated, and they suggested that a Commission of Inquiry would be the preferable mode of procedure, Mr. Cadell being directed to frame his charges and to prosecute the inquiry into them before such tribunal as the Government might direct. On this the Government resolved to deal with Mr. D'Monte's case under Act VII of 1857, and directed that the Collector should afford Mr. D'Monte full opportunity of cross-examining the witnesses who had already been examined, and of adducing fresh evidence.

Order of Government, dated 4th May 1864, No 777.

3. The Board consider that the manner in which these instructions have been carried out, as reported by the Collector in his letter at the head of these Proceedings, is not satisfactory.

There were several accusations made by the Collector against Mr. D'Monte of gross irregularities and corrupt dealings in the Salt Department over which Mr. D'Monte presided. He was accused of allotting pans at Vadarniem to parties not having a fair claim to them, corrupt motives being implied. He was also accused of systematically allowing excess salt to be stored in heaps, a practice which has been expressly prohibited as affording a wide door for corruption and fraud. Allowing new salt to be sold when old salt was on hand, and favouring certain parties in obtaining this concession, and allowing wholesale purchases to be retailed on the platforms, were other serious imputations made against Mr. D'Monte. The Collector further imputed to Mr. D'Monte the grave offence of trafficing in appointments; and, lastly, accused him of improper pecuniary dealings with a Salt Company.

4. But in the re-examination reported by Mr. Cadell, it is clear that no reference has been made to any but the two last charges, and even as respects these no specific charge has been drawn up against Mr. D'Monte. Mr. D'Monte in his defence says, "*I am led to presume* that "the charges on which I am now called to make my defence are,

"*First.*—That I have received certain sums of money from certain persons through the "medium of Srinivasa Moodelly for rendering them service by re-instating them in their "employments or giving them situations.

"*Secondly.*—That I had money transactions with a Salt Company established at "Negapatam under the designation of Vencatasa Chetty & Co."

5. Correct though the indictments be, it is obviously not regular that the accused should be left to *infer* what the offences are with which he is charged; and, further, the Board do not gather from the Government Order that it was the intention of Government that the formal investigation recommended by the Board should be confined to these two matters out of the many irregularities and corrupt proceedings imputed by the Collector to Mr. D'Monte.

6. In respect, however, of the two charges, to which alone Mr. D'Monte considers himself called on to offer a defence, the Board would make a few remarks.

7. In the first, Mr. D'Monte is charged with receiving sums of money from subordinate servants in the Salt Department for appointments conferred.

8. In this matter one Srinivasa Moodelly is said to have acted as Mr. D'Monte's agent. The money paid by the individuals was paid to him for Mr. D'Monte. But the charge that Mr. D'Monte did demand such bribes, or that they were paid to him, rests (with the exception of two cases) only upon the statement of this Srinivasa alone. In the other two cases, the witnesses say that Mr. D'Monte himself demanded of them the money.

9. In order to test the truth of the statements of these payers of douceurs to obtain appointments, it would have been more satisfactory had inquiry been carefully made into the circumstances under which they lost their appointments and were re-instated; also as to who were removed to make room for them, and what inducements were held out to make them come forward and give evidence against Mr. D'Monte, and to implicate themselves. But nothing of this kind appears to have been attempted, and the credit due to their statements depends mainly on the credit that may be given to that of Srinivasa Moodelly.

10. This Srinivasa Moodelly holds a subordinate situation in the Salt Department, and according to his own showing, was the tool of Mr. D'Monte. He avers that he received the several sums of money, amounting to about 400 or more, paid by nine subordinates for their appointments, and that through him were the negotiations made. But at length he betrayed his master, and there is much to throw discredit on his testimony. On the 5th February, this man appeared before the Collector and produced a document, which was a Promissory Note in favour of one Natkotian Alagappa Chetty for Rupees 410, written and signed by Mr. D'Monte, and bearing date Vellum, 25th January 1864. This note, he said, was given to him by Mr. D'Monte on the day on which it bears date (*i. e.*, 25th January) for the re-payment of sums which had been originally received by him on behalf of Mr. D'Monte, but which the givers now insisted on having re-paid. At this time it must be remembered that the Collector was making vigorous inquiries into abuses said to be prevalent in the Salt Department.

11. The document in question (referred to as document A, in the Collector's proceedings

See enclosure in Mr. D'Monte's letter, dated 16th March 1864

is acknowledged by Mr. D'Monte as having been drawn by him, but he distinctly denies that it was given by him to Srinivasa Moodelly at all either for the purpose stated, or for any other purpose. He avers that it was drawn by him with a view to obtain, through one Samu Pillay, a loan from a Sowkar to enable him to remit some money to his family at Calcutta; that, on the 26th January, he entrusted it to Mooniandi, a Masalchy of his Office, to take to Negapatam; that, not hearing of its arrival, he telegraphed, and finding it had miscarried, and that the bearer was missing, he, on 29th January, reported the circumstances to the Police at Tanjore, and went himself to Negapatam, on the 30th, to make inquiries about it; that late on 1st February, after his return to Tanjore, Mooniandi's father came and told him that his son was ill, and possessed by a devil, when he (Mr. D'Monte) told the father about the note entrusted to his son; that the father said he would make inquiry, and that, on 3rd February, he came and said his son was dead, and that he had inquired for the papers, but the females of the house in which his son had lodged said some of the salt servants had been there during the man's illness, and that the letter may have been given to one of them. One of these salt servants he ascertained to be this Srinivasa Moodelly, and Mr. D'Monte subsequently, on 6th February, ascertained that the document A had been taken to the Collector on the 5th, after a consultation between the Sheristadar, Srinivasa Moodelly, and Shediendra Pillay on the night of the 4th February. Now in the Collector's investigation no endeavour whatever has apparently been made to ascertain the truth of this part of Mr. D'Monte's statement regarding the document in question. It was not produced before the Collector until the 5th February, though dated 25th January. Mr. D'Monte's statement was clearly one which (true or false in itself) it was easy to corroborate to a great extent by inquiring for the telegraph message, and by reference to the Police, but no evidence has been taken on this point at all. Srinivasa Moodelly's story has been accepted as true by the Collector. But why Srinivasa Moodelly should have retained the document so long, or why he should have betrayed his master, and (if his story is true) by giving up the note lost his own money, which, he says, he had paid away to those claiming re-payment, is not explained. And there is further matter in the record, as stated by himself, which unexplained throws very great doubt on the truthfulness of this man's account of how he became possessed of the document, independent of the contradictory statements of other witnesses.

12. He stated before the Collector, on the 5th February, that this note A was given to him by Mr. D'Monte, but only on condition that he deposed in his (Mr. D'Monte's) favour respecting a complaint brought against him by one Ramalinga Teven, to which he agreed; and on his writing the required deposition the Note A was given to him. The deposition and the note are both dated the 25th January, and so far bear out Srinivasa Moodelly's story. The hour at which this transaction is stated by Srinivasa Moodelly to have taken place at Mr. D'Monte's quarters, was 3½ *o'clock* P. M. Therefore the deposition must have been written at that time. But, in reading the contents of the deposition, it is evident that it could not have been given till a much later hour, for it relates occurrences that took place that day after 4 o'clock before the Collector. It states that the Collector sent for him to Vellum on 16th January, and asked him about pans given to Ramalingum; that, on 21st, Ramalingum came and was privately examined by the Collector. That on *25th*, at 4 P. M., Ramalingum's deposition was taken by the Collector, and in it he stated that he (Srinivasa Moodelly) had taken a private message from the Deputy Collector to the Peshkar. That he (Srinivasa) was then sent for by the Collector and Ramalingum's statement was read in his presence, and he was again threatened with loss of employment and bid not to be afraid, and asked to depose to what Ramalingum had said. That he replied that Ramalingum's statement was not true, for he (Srinivasa) had received no instructions from the Deputy Collector. That he then signed the paper after a few more words. This deposition concludes with asking the interference of Mr. D'Monte. It is dated Vellum, 25th January 1864. As Ramalingum was questioned at 4 o'clock, and as Srinivasa Moodelly was sent for after that and questioned, it would probably be 5 to 6 o'clock before he left the Collector; yet, in his deposition of 5th February before the Collector, he says that it was 3½ o'clock when Mr. D'Monte promised to give the note A on condition of his giving this deposition which contains an account of facts which at that time had not taken place! And so the evidence of Chellumbara Pillay conflicts with the above statement, and the evidence of each of these three witnesses, respecting the document A, is at variance the one with the other, and cannot, in its present state, be accepted as sufficient to confute Mr. D'Monte's account of the transaction about the document A, unsatisfactory as that account in the present stage of the proceedings is.

Note—In this man's deposition, dated 5th February before the Collector, as translated, the 26th is the date given, but it is clearly a clerical error.

13. Were the object, therefore, to investigate Mr. D'Monte's conduct with respect to this one charge, viz., the receiving of bribes, the Board would consider it necessary that the case should be remanded for further and more regular and full inquiry, and especially that Srinivasa

Moodelly, who was not present for cross-examination by Mr. D'Monte, should undergo a strict cross-examination. It is much to be regretted that the Collector did not insist on postponing the last inquiry until Srinivasa Moodelly was present, in order to cross-examine him before Mr. D'Monte. The omission to do so has given Mr. D'Monte the opportunity, which he has availed himself of, to remark "that Srinivasa Moodelly failed to appear for his cross-examination by me." But it was equally Mr. D'Monte's business to insist in having this man produced before him.

14. Such an accusation as this of receiving bribes for giving situations against a Deputy Collector, is one that, if taken up at all, should be thoroughly sifted. The Collector is under the impression that this trafficing in appointments has been carried on to a great extent, but he has only been able to adduce nine cases, and these more or less dependant on the testimony of one man, and he the man who arranged the bargains and received the money, and whose testimony is open to grave objections.

15. In respect to the second charge of having money transactions with a Salt Firm, it appears that Mr. D'Monte employed one Vencatasa, a member of this Firm, as his banker before the Firm was constituted as a Salt Company, and he gives a plausible reason for so doing. His continuing to employ him as such was very improper; but there is nothing in the evidence produced by the Collector to convict Mr. D'Monte of dishonest dealings with this Firm. The fact of his having any dealings at all was brought to Mr. Cadell's notice in a somewhat objectionable manner by a partner in the Firm. Mr. Cadell believes that the transactions of Mr. D'Monte with this Company have been much larger than the extract from the Account book shows, and the fact that several pages have been cut out, may give ground for this suspicion; but it would have been more satisfactory had some evidence been taken to ascertain why these leaves of the Account book had been torn out, and whether Mr. D'Monte had not transactions with his banker subsequent to May 7th, 1863; for, it is to be noticed, that the extract of the account shows transactions for only about two months, viz., from 3rd March 1863 to 12th May 1863, though Mr. D'Monte admits he had money dealings from the year 1860 with Vencatasa Chetty, and it might seem reasonable to suppose that they continued on after May 1863, as the account shows a balance against Mr. D'Monte. During this period of two months a sum of Rupees 2,445-10-6 was paid to Mr. D'Monte, and he is credited with Rupees 1,500, leaving a balance against Mr. D'Monte of Rupees 945-10-6 on 12th May 1863. Whether this balance has been paid or not, does not appear from the record. It may be observed that the sum at debit may be the amount alluded to by the partner Srinivasa Pillay as part of the sum in dispute which prevented an adjustment of the accounts. But the Board cannot but agree with Mr. Cadell that under these circumstances, and in the position in which Mr. D'Monte stood, these pecuniary transactions with the head of this Firm were highly objectionable and reprehensible.

16. The investigation and the charges against Mr. D'Monte being so incomplete, the Board do not feel themselves in a position to submit any definite opinion in respect to Mr. D'Monte's conduct. Their 3rd Member, Mr. Clarke, is now at Tanjore, and will, no doubt, be making full inquiries into the working of the Salt Department, and the Board would suggest that he be directed to investigate the specific charges which the Collector should frame against Mr. D'Monte, and report his opinion on such, and generally on the state of Mr. D'Monte's management of the Salt Department during the time he had been in charge of it.

No. 159. ORDER THEREON, 8th July 1864, No. 1,196.

Miscellaneous.

1. Agreeably to the recommendation of the Board of Revenue, the Government resolve to request Mr. T. Clarke, who is now at Tanjore, to investigate the specific charges which the Collector may prefer against Mr. D'Monte, and report his opinion on them and on Mr. D'Monte's management of the Salt Department through the collective Board.

2. The Government intended by their Order dated 4th May 1864, No. 777, that the various charges against Mr. D'Monte should be formally made known to him; that the evidence should be read over to him in the presence of those who gave it; that the witnesses should be brought forward for his cross examination, and that the documents should be produced for his inspection. They request Mr. Clarke to follow this course, and to make the investigation as complete as possible.

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

transactions with his banker subsequent to May 7th, 1863; for, it is to be noticed, that the extract of the account shows transactions for only about two months, viz., from 3rd March 1863 to 12th May 1863, though Mr. D'Monte admits he had money dealings from the year 1860 with Vencatasa Chetty, and it might seem reasonable to suppose that they continued on after May 1863, as the account shows a balance against Mr. D'Monte. During this period of two months a sum of Rupees 2,445-10-6 was paid to D'Monte, and he is credited with Rupees 1,500, leaving a balance against Mr. D'Monte of Rupees 945-10-6 on 12th May 1863. Whether this balance has been paid or not, does not appear from the record. It may be observed that the sum at debit may be the amount alluded to by the partner Srinivasa Pillay as part of the sum in dispute which prevented an adjustment of the accounts. But the Board cannot but agree with Mr. Cadell that under these circumstances, and in the position in which Mr. D'Monte stood, these pecuniary transactions with the head of this Firm were highly objectionable and reprehensible.

16. The investigation and the charges against Mr. D'Monte being so incomplete, the Board do not feel themselves in a position to submit any definite opinion in respect to Mr. D'Monte's conduct. Their 3rd Member, Mr. Clarke, is now at Tanjore, and will, no doubt, be making full inquiries into the working of the Salt Department, and the Board would suggest that he be directed to investigate the specific charges which the Collector should frame against Mr. D'Monte, and report his opinion on such, and generally on the state of Mr. D'Monte's management of the Salt Department during the time he had been in charge of it.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D., with four enclosures.

Copy to W. M. Cadell, Esq., Collector of Tanjore.

Exd. J. Wright.

Rev. 1864. Department.

Proc.s of Gov.t for July

No. 1738.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

Dated 2nd *July* 1864.

Despatched 2nd —

Received 2d —

To the Secretary to Government

S. O. No 1196- 8 July

No. 4,071.

Submitting report from the Collector of Tanjore on the inquiry held by him into the charges against his Salt Deputy, Mr. D'Monte, which, in the Board's opinion, is incomplete; and suggesting that their 3rd Member, now at Tanjore, be directed to investigate the specific charges which the Collector should frame against Mr. D'Monte.

For Orders.

The intention of Govt was, as the 1st state - that the various charges against Mr D'Monte should be formally read down to him - that the evidence should be read over to him in the presence of those who gave it - the witnesses brought forward for his cross examination - the documents submitted for his inspection & all matters of the kind as pass between the Court & the accused, which was only under Act VII of 57 as it is, I think, unnecessarily

charges collected the Collr
may prefer against
the Revenue and perform
such Services as shall
occur in the Management of the
said Department
through the Collection
thereof.

2 The Fees established
by these orders of 4th
May 1804 & 1st 1777 shall
be received & the Revenue
so produced shall
be accounted for by the
Receivers General of the
Customs to the Board
& by them carried to
the Credit of the
Consolidated Fund
of Great Britain

16 Copies to the Bp Revd
1 — do. Jr. & Caribbee, with a copy of Order 1st May 1804 & 1st Decr 1777
No 1 & 71 and power and Instructions as per Minute of this date

orded to England
6th Oct. 1865 No 63. Mis.

Colonies & Sea Depts.
Pro: of Govt for Duty

No 1196.

Pro: of the Madras Govt
Dy. 8th July 1864.

Pro. of the Board of
Revenue 16 December 64
No 3199.

Ordering Mr. T. Carter
to investigate into the
Charges against Mr.
J. Prendergast Collr. of
Tanjore.

No 1584 of 59.