

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1672	<u>Press</u> <u>Mis.</u>
183-184	
Dated	12-9-1864.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th September 1864.*

No. 183. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 19th August 1864,
No. 5,342.

Read the following letter from V. H. LEVINGE, Esq., Collector of Madura, dated 10th August
1864, No. 205 :—

1. With reference to the Order of Government, No. 818, dated 3rd June 1864, in the Judicial Department, I have the honor to report that I cannot perceive there was any irregularity in the way of conducting Treasury business in the Trippatore Sub-Magistrate's Cutcherry, as asserted by Mr. Robinson in paragraph 4 of his letter of the 12th March, No. 541, to the Secretary to Government.

2. The cash was kept in a box in the Record-room, it had been so kept for years, the key of the cash chest was kept by the Sub-Magistrate; over the padlock of the box, a bag was passed which was sealed by the Sub-Magistrate with his seal, the box was only opened in the Sub-Magistrate's presence.

3. The Sub-Magistrate kept an account current of his daily receipts and disbursements and examined the whole of his cash on the last day of the month, when sending his account current to the Huzzur on the 15th October. According to the account current there was in the box one full bag of 500 Rupees, and two bags containing Rupees 296-3-9. It is true the Sub-Magistrate did not count the whole of his cash that day, nor did he count it daily; this is charged against him as an irregularity, and as a failure of proof that he had any money in his Treasury on that day; if so, then the work in every Treasury in the country is irregularly conducted, for the cash is not counted daily. I submit such daily counting is neither necessary nor required. On the 15th October, the Sub-Magistrate received money on account of Cattle Pound collections, and opened his box to put it in, and entered the amount in his account current; he also paid 6 Rupees to the Station Head Constable for contingent charges.

4. The Sub-Magistrate entered in his account for that day his receipts and disbursements, and struck his balance which he believed to be Rupees 296-3-9 in the two bags; he saw this remaining money in the two bags though he did not count it, and the bag which he believed to contain the 500 Rupees which he had put into it fifteen days before; the Sub-Magistrate, the Head Gumashta, a Peon, the Masalchee, and the suspected Vencatapathy Iyen, all depose they saw the three bags in the box on the 15th October. I submit there is therefore plenty of evidence that the money was in the box on the 15th, and such being the case, Mr. Robinson has no grounds for saying the robbery may have occurred any day between the 30th September and 15th October. If it did so occur, then the Sub-Magistrate and all these people must be parties to the defalcation and pretended robbery, but the Sub-Magistrate is beyond suspicion, and there is none at present against any of the others, excepting Vencatapathy Iyen, and the only suspicion against

* Vide his deposition, paragraph 14.

him is his reported bad character, and that he was seen hanging about the Cutcherry early on the morning of the 16th, and Hame Singh's accusation.*

5. The Sub-Magistrate is a man of good family and of property. It would not be worth his while to risk his place and a trial for Rupees 796-3-9, which too he would have to share with his underlings, and he would not be the party to bring forward the defalcation. He would, naturally as long as he could, have kept such a deficiency hushed up till he could replace it.

6. To place the fore-mentioned Cattle Pound money in the box, and to make the payment to the Head Constable of 6 Rupees, the Treasure chest was brought out of the Record-room as usual to the place where the Sub-Magistrate sat in the open Cutcherry and in public, the Cattle Pound money was put in the box and the other disbursed, the account was written up, and then the box was replaced in the Record-room. It was when completing this transaction that the witness saw the bags in the box on the 15th October.

7. There is no doubt facility for committing a robbery was given by the practice of keeping the Treasure chest in the Record-room instead of directly under the eye of the Senry, but

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th September 1864.*

that had been the mode of keeping the Treasure before the introduction of the new Police. When the new Police were introduced the then Sub-Magistrate did not place the box under the Sentry, but caused him to take charge of the seal on the Record-room door, according to the old custom, and the Superintendent of Police, who was then present, did not object or ask for a change and to have the Treasure chest under the eye of the Sentry; the present Sub-Magistrate carried on the system he found in practice on his taking charge. I had never visited Trippatore after the introduction of the new Police, and was not aware of how the Treasure was kept, and the Superintendents of Police in their frequent tours to Trippatore never objected to or brought to my knowledge the insecure way in which the Treasure was kept, its being kept in the Record-room and not under the eye of the Sentry.

8. I fail to see any irregularity on the part of the Sub-Magistrate in conducting his Treasury business, and have shown in my previous letter several irregularities which were committed by the Police on the night of the 15th and morning of the 16th, which cannot be refuted.

9. I said before, the Treasure chest was kept in the Record-room. The Sub-Magistrate left the office at 6 p. m. The Gumashas and Masalchee were left behind to put away the records and to prepare the bundle of current records to be taken with the Sub-Magistrate the next morning, who was going circuit; at 7 p. m. the Masalchee was sent off to post letters in the Post Office at the Zemindar's Talook Cutcherry; almost immediately a very heavy fall of rain occurred, and all the Police, including the Inspector and Head Constable who were in the verandah of the Cutcherry, came inside and sat in the Cutcherry in front of the Record-room door.

10. The door could not be sealed till the Masalchee returned; the rain is described by all to have been exceedingly heavy, it prevented any of the officials going away and the Masalchee returning till it cleared up at 9 p. m.

11. The Masalchee then sealed the door and made the seal over to the Inspector and Head Constable who gave it over to the Sentry, Perianen.

12. The practice is that when once the seal is made over to the Sentry the seal cannot be again broken and the door opened by any of the Sub-Magistrate's servants without the permission of the Sentry, which is admitted by the Police. The Head Gumashta Anantaramien kept the key of the Record-room.

13. The strip of cloth was found to be cut and the robbery was discovered when Hame Singh was Sentry. Before me he deposed the Sentry he relieved had run off without making over the strip of cloth and seal to him; that he saw the strip of cloth hanging down at 7 o'clock A. M. of the 16th and told no one, at 8 o'clock 1st class Oomer Sing saw it and told Head Constable.

14. Some days afterwards before Mr. Nelson, the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate, Hame Singh deposed as follows:—

"After Sub-Magistrate left Vencatapathy Iyen came out and asked for a penknife which the writer gave; did not ask about any conversation between Deputy Gumashta and me on the 15th, in the evening. I went on guard at 6 A. M., Vencatapathy Iyen came and spoke to me

* Acknowledged by Govinda.

"at 6½. When I went on guard the door seals

"were right. I relieved Govindu; * it was after

"that Vencatapathy Iyen spoke to me that I

"found the seal-cloth broken. I suspected nothing because the Deputy Gumashta had entered the Cutcherry whilst I was on guard in the verandah. When he spoke to me he was on the threshold; at that time Kasee Ram Singh was coming out of the Cutcherry and also Durg Singh. Vencatapathy Iyen walked up and down the Cutcherry for a few minutes. Kasee Ram Singh and Durg Singh did not stay, but went off. Pichuvien showed me the broken seal; I did not first find it out. Pichuvien has access to the Cutcherry. Pichuvien came after Vencatapathy Iyen left. No one was in the Cutcherry at the same time as the latter. When I saw the seal broken I immediately thought Vencatapathy Iyen had robbed the Treasury, as I knew he had borrowed a knife and scissors on the previous day. As he had not called the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th September 1864.*

"guard to look at the seal as usual, I suspected him. I immediately told the Head Constable, "No. At half past 8, no one was there during the interval. I showed him the seal."

15. Vencatapathy Iyen admitted having come to the Cutcherry, but denied having entered it. Pichuvien denied having been at the Cutcherry at any time on the 16th, and Hame Singh refused to question him.

16. It was Hame Singh's duty to have at once seized Vencatapathy Iyen if what he, Hame Singh, deposed to regarding his cutting the cloth was true; he should have at once made Vencatapathy Iyen prisoner; called the head of the guard and made him over to him, and have at once caused an inquiry to be made. If Vencatapathy Iyen alone committed the robbery, he could only have done it then, the morning of the 16th, and Hame Singh could have seized him with the money on him; his not having seized him and his having remained quiet, shows his complicity in the robbery.

17. If Hame Singh had nothing to do with the robbery, why should he have deposed differently on two occasions. I believe, had he been put on his trial before the Sessions Court as I submit he should have been, on finding himself alone, I believe he would have confessed the truth. I am astonished at Mr. Robinson holding Hame Singh's own admitted dereliction of the most important duties of a Sentry as no crime.

18. If the Police are innocent and the robbery did not occur that night and with their connivance, their conduct is most strange. The Head Constable lay down at the Record-room door at 9 p. m., intending to sleep there till morning, the Singh party of Constables got him away by getting up a false cry of burglary in the Town, and kept him trotting about on the same plea more than half the night. Many of the Police are unable to account for themselves during the night, and contradict each other as to their whereabouts.

19. The midnight Sentry's lamp went out in a most unaccountable way that night, and he left his post to go to the Zemindar's Cutcherry to get it re-lit; he must have been absent quite time enough to admit of a robbery being effected. The relief of Sentries by their own admissions showed a disregard of discipline and of all rules, and the last Sentry admits he let the fastening over which he was guard be cut, suspected a robbery had taken place, took no notice of it, and allowed the thief to walk off.

20. In the face of the above, Mr. Robinson asks Government to believe there can be no suspicion of crime or complicity on the part of the Police, and that the theft of the money occurred through the Sub-Magistrate's irregular way of conducting his Treasury duties, the irregularity being that he did not count his cash daily.

Ordered to be submitted for the consideration of Government, with reference to Government Order, dated 21st June 1864, No. 1,070, Revenue Department.

No. 184. ORDER THEREON, 12th September 1864, No. 1,672.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Board will inform Mr. Levinge, with reference to the remarks made by him in paragraph 3 of his letter submitted with their Proceedings above recorded, that though the money in the Treasuries should not be counted daily, ~~but~~ this precaution should be taken occasionally and not on fixed days. It should however be always counted when the Account Current is sent to the Huzur and the fact notified in the account.

2. The same course should be adopted generally, if this be not the case already.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

to the Board of Revenue.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 19th August 1864.

Read the following letter from V. H. LEVINGE, Esq., Collector of Madura, dated 10th August 1864, No. 205:—

1. With reference to the Order of Government No. 818, dated 3rd June 1864, in the Judicial Department, I have the honor to report that I cannot perceive there was any irregularity in the way of conducting Treasury business in the Trippatore Sub-Magistrate's Cutcherry, as asserted by Mr. Robinson in paragraph 4 of his letter of the 12th March, No. 541, to the Secretary to Government.

2. The cash was kept in a box in the Record room, it had been so kept for years, the key of the cash chest was kept by the Sub-Magistrate; over the padlock of the box, a bag was passed which was sealed by the Sub-Magistrate with his seal, the box was only opened in the Sub-Magistrate's presence.

3. The Sub-Magistrate kept an account current of his daily receipts and disbursements and examined the whole of his cash on the last day of the month, when sending his account current to the Huzzar on the 15th October. According to the account current there was in the box one full bag of 500 Rupees, and two bags containing Rupees 296-3-9. It is true the Sub-Magistrate did not count the whole of his cash that day, nor did he count it daily; this is charged against him as an irregularity, and as a failure of proof that he had any money in his Treasury on that day; if so, then the work in every Treasury in the country is irregularly conducted, for the cash is not counted daily.† I submit such daily counting is neither necessary nor required. On the 15th October, the Sub-Magistrate received money on account of Cattle Pound collections, and opened his box to put it in, and entered the amount in his account current; he also paid 6 Rupees to the Station Head Constable for contingent charges.

4. The Sub-Magistrate entered in his account for that day his receipts and disbursements, and struck his balance which he believed to be Rupees 296-3-9 in the two bags; he saw this remaining money in the two bags though he did not count it, and the bag which he believed to contain the 500 Rupees which he had put into it fifteen days before; the Sub-Magistrate, the Head Gumastah, a Peon, the Masalchee, and the suspected Vencatapathy Iyen, all depose they saw the three bags in the box on the 15th October. I submit there is therefore plenty of evidence that the money was in the box on the 15th, and such being the case, Mr. Robinson has no grounds for saying the robbery may have occurred any day between the 30th September and 15th October. If it did so occur, then the Sub-Magistrate and all these people must be parties to the defalcation and pretended robbery, but the Sub-Magistrate is beyond suspicion, and there is none at present against any of the others, excepting Vencatapathy Iyen, and the only suspicion against him is his

reported bad character, and that he was seen hanging about the Cutcherry early on the morning of the 16th, and Hame Singh's accusation.*

* Vide his deposition, paragraph 14.

5. The Sub-Magistrate is a man of good family and of property. It would not be worth his while to risk his place and a trial for Rupees 796-3-9, which too he would have to share with his underlings, and he would not be the party to bring forward the defalcation. He would, naturally as long as he could, have kept such a deficiency hushed up till he could replace it.

6. To place the fore-mentioned Cattle Pound money in the box, and to make the payment to the Head Constable of 6 Rupees, the treasure chest was brought out of the Record room as usual to the place where the Sub-Magistrate sat in the open Cutcherry and in public, the Cattle Pound money was put in the box and the other disbursed, the account was written up, and then the box was re-placed in the Record room. It was when completing this transaction that the witness saw the bags in the box on the 15th October.

+ It should not be counted daily, but occasionally and not on fixed days. It is? however I think always counted when the account current is sent to the Huzzar and the fact notified in the account current J.R.

7. There is no doubt facility for committing a robbery was given by the practice of keeping the treasure chest in the Record room instead of directly under the eye of the sentry, but that had been the mode of keeping the treasure before the introduction of the new Police. When the new Police were introduced the then Sub-Magistrate did not place the box under the Sentry, but caused him to take charge of the seal on the Record room door, according to the old custom, and the Superintendent of Police, who was then present, did not object or ask for a change and to have the treasure chest under the eye of the Sentry; the present Sub-Magistrate carried on the system he found in practice on his taking charge. I had never visited Trippatore after the introduction of the new Police, and was not aware of how the treasure was kept and the Superintendents of Police in their frequent tours to Trippatore never objected to or brought to my knowledge the insecure way in which the treasure was kept, its being kept in the Record room and not under the eye of the Sentry.

8. I fail to see any irregularity on the part of the Sub-Magistrate in conducting his treasury business, and have shown in my previous letter several irregularities which were committed by the Police on the night of the 15th and morning of the 16th, which cannot be refuted.

9. I said before, the treasure chest was kept in the Record room. The Sub-Magistrate left the office at 6 P. M. The Gumastahs and Masalchee were left behind to put away the records and to prepare the bundle of current records to be taken with the Sub-Magistrate the next morning, who was going circuit; at 7 P. M. the Masalchee was sent off to post letters in the Post Office at the Zemindar's Taluk Cutcherry; almost immediately a very heavy fall of rain occurred, and all the Police, including the Inspector and Head Constable who were in the verandah of the Cutcherry, came inside and sat in the Cutcherry in front of the Record room door.

10. The door could not be sealed till the Masalchee returned; the rain is described by all to have been exceedingly heavy, it prevented any of the officials going away and the Masalchee returning till it cleared up at 9 P. M.

11. The Masalchee then sealed the door and made the seal over to the Inspector and Head Constable who gave it over to the Sentry, Perianen.

12. The practice is that when once the seal is made over to the Sentry the seal cannot be again broken and the door opened by any of the Sub-Magistrate's servants without the permission of the Sentry, which is admitted by the Police. The Head Gumastah Anantaramien kept the key of the Record room.

13. The strip of cloth was found to be cut and the robbery was discovered when Hame Singh was Sentry. Before me he deposed the Sentry he relieved had run off without making over the strip of cloth and seal to him; that he saw the strip of cloth hanging down at 7 o'clock A. M. of the 16th and told no one, at 8 o'clock 1st class Oomer Sing saw it and told Head Constable.

14. Some days afterwards before Mr. Nelson, the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate, Hame Singh deposed as follows:—

"After Sub-Magistrate left Vencatapathy Iyen came out and asked for a penknife which the writer gave; did not ask about any conversation between Deputy Gumastah and me on the 15th, in the evening. I went on guard at 6 A. M., Vencatapathy Iyen came and spoke to me

* Acknowledged by Govindu.

"at 6½. When I went on guard the door seals were right. I relieved Govindu; it was after that Vencatapathy Iyen spoke to me that I found the seal-cloth broken. I suspected nothing because the Deputy Gumastah had entered the Cutcherry whilst I was on guard in the verandah. When he spoke to me he was on the threshold; at that time Kasee Ram Singh was coming out of the Cutcherry and also Durg Singh. Vencatapathy Iyen walked up and down the Cutcherry for a few minutes. Kasee Ram Singh and Durg Sing did not stay, but went off. Pichuvien showed me the broken seal; I did not first find it out. Pichuvien has access to the Cutcherry. Pichuvien came after Vencatapathy Iyen left. No one was in the Cutcherry at

"the same time as the latter. When I saw the seal broken I immediately thought Vencatapathy Iyen had robbed the treasury, as I knew he had borrowed a knife and scissors on the previous day. As he had not called the guard to look at the seal as usual, I suspected him. I immediately told the Head Constable, No. At half-past 8, no one was there during the interval I showed him the seal."

15. Vencatapathy Iyen admitted having come to the Cutcherry, but denied having entered it. Pichuvien denied having been at the Cutcherry at any time on the 16th, and Hame Singh refused to question him.

16. It was Hame Singh's duty to have at once seized Vencatapathy Iyen if what he, Hame Singh, deposed to regarding his cutting the cloth was true; he should have at once made Vencatapathy Iyen prisoner; called the head of the guard and made him over to him, and have at once caused an inquiry to be made. If Vencatapathy Iyen alone committed the robbery, he could only have done it then, the morning of the 16th, and Hame Singh could have seized him with the money on him; his not having seized him and his having remained quiet, shows his complicity in the robbery.

17. If Hame Singh had nothing to do with the robbery, why should he have deposed differently on two occasions. I believe, had he been put on his trial before the Sessions Court, as I submit he should have been, on finding himself alone, I believe he would have confessed the truth. I am astonished at Mr. Robinson holding Hame Singh's own admitted dereliction of the most important duties of a Sentry as no crime.

18. If the Police are innocent and the robbery did not occur that night and with their connivance, their conduct is most strange. The Head Constable lay down at the Record room door at 9 P. M., intending to sleep there till morning, the Singh party of Constables got him away by getting up a false cry of burglary in the Town, and kept him trotting about on the same plea more than half the night. Many of the Police are unable to account for themselves during the night, and contradict each other as to their whereabouts.

19. The midnight Sentry's lamp went out in a most unaccountable way that night, and he left his post to go to the Zemindar's Cutcherry to get it re-lit; he must have been absent quite time enough to admit of a robbery being effected. The relief of Sentries by their own admissions showed a disregard of discipline and of all rules, and the last Sentry admits he let the fastening over which he was guard be cut, suspected a robbery had taken place, took no notice of it, and allowed the thief to walk off.

20. In the face of the above, Mr. Robinson asks Government to believe there can be no suspicion of crime or complicity on the part of the Police, and that the theft of the money occurred through the Sub-Magistrate's irregular way of conducting his treasury duties, the irregularity being that he did not count his cash daily.

Ordered to be submitted for the consideration of Government with reference to Government Order dated 21st June 1864, No. 1,070, Revenue Department.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.
Copy to V. H. Levinge, Esq., Collector of Madura.

Exd. J. Wright.

Revenue Department
No. 1672.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 12th September 1864

Read the following
Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue.

Submitting for consideration
letter from Col^l of Madura
reporting that there was no irre-
gularity in the way of conduct-
ing Treasury business in the
Trippatore Sub-Magistrate's
Cutcherry as reported by
Mr. Robinson.

(Here enter 19th Aug^r 1864
No. 5342)

The Board will
inform Mr. Levinge, with
reference to the remarks made
by him in para 3 of his
letter submitted with their
Proceedings above recorded, that
though
the money in the Treasuries
should not be counted daily

Read

Rev 3 June / 64. 805
3.6.64-39
Rev 21 June / 64. 12.274-50

Rev.
1864. Department
of Government

No. 2286.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 19th August 1864.

Aug 22 1864
Rev 22 1864

No. 6342

22 Aug 1864. 12.274-50

Secy. to Govt. No. 1736

5th. 1864

Submitting for consideration letter from Col-
lector of Madura reporting that there was no
irregularity in the way of conducting Treasury
business in the Trippatore Sub Magistrate's
Cutcherry as asserted by Mr Robinson.

RECORDED.

21.8.1864

2.10.1863.

~~the~~ ^{this} precaution should be taken
but occasionally and not
on fixed days. It should
however be always counted
when the Account current
is sent to the Huzur and
the fact notified in the account.

The same course
should be adopted gen-
erally if this be not
the case already.

To
14 The Board of Revs. Sept. 13 1841

517
3

Revenue 1861 Sept 20.
No: of Boston Sept 20

No: 1672.

No: of the Atlantic Coast
Sept 12 Sept 17/64

Informing the Colls
of the nation with reference
to his explanation; report:
ing the manner in
which the Tribunal
Treasury work is conducted
that money should be
counted occasionally
and not on fixed days.

No 1834 184.