M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1760 Press ~~Mis.~~

358.359

Dated 26 — 9 — 1864.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 26th September 1864.

No. 358. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th September 1864, No. 5,832.

Read the following letter from S. R. LOCKE, Esq., Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, to E. G. R. FANE, Esq., Collector of Madras, dated Sydapet, 19th August 1864, No. 399 :—

1. In paragraph 2 of their Proceedings, dated the 21st June 1864, No. 3,799, the Board remark that certain Petitions against one Paupanah, a Kurnum of Pakala village in the Chendraghiri Talook of North Arcot, were forwarded to the Collector of that District on the 19th December 1861, and that they were handed over to me, then a Deputy Collector in the same District, for inquiry. In paragraph 3 of the same Proceedings, they remark that I apparently took no steps in the matter, and in paragraph 8 they animadvert upon my dilatory proceedings in the case, which enabled a corrupt official to escape punishment.

2. From my successor Soobroyaloo Naidoo's letter to Mr. Fraser, the late Acting Collector of North Arcot, dated the 23rd October 1863, No. 66, I learn that the case was only referred to me on the 11th August 1862, having been previous to that date under the investigation of the Inám Deputy Collector, T. Mutusawmy Iyer, and that it was not therefore transferred to me by the Collector immediately it was received by him, as paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings would imply it had been.

3. I assumed charge of the Zemindary tracts from my predecessor, M. Nursimha Puntulu, on the 1st July 1862, and was fully occupied for several days in clearing his Magisterial file which contained not a few and very intricate cases. As soon, however, as I was at leisure after receipt of the Collector's letter, I find that I did not omit to take the usual initiatory proceedings, by issuing Processes for the appearance of the parties concerned ; and I also find from the original records received on my application from my late office at Naggery that I am able to account satisfactorily and step by step, for my apparent neglect of the case.

4. Thus I find (1) that summonses were issued on the 19th September 1862 ; (2) that the accused appearing on the 25th idem, asked for an adjournment on business grounds, supported by an application from the Tahsildar to the same effect ; (3) that an adjournment *sine die* was granted by an order to the Tahsildar, dated the 30th September ; (4) that a second order, dated 11th October was issued, appointing the 20th of that month for the hearing ; (5) that the parties, excepting three absentees, appeared on the 26th of that month ; (6) that the Tahsildar was written to on the following day (27th) to procure the attendance of the absentees without delay ; (7) that the absentees not appearing and having other heavy work on hand, the case was again adjourned *sine die* ; (8) that in the early part of this month I had received an English report from the Tahsildar informing me of extensive frauds perpetrated by the Kurnum Paupanah in Fuslies 1269-70 and 1271, which also induced me to send him back for inquiry ; (9) that during November, exact dates unknown, a charge of concealment of cultivation against the same individual was investigated by the Tahsildar, and eventually on his report and perusal of the records of the case, thrown out by myself ; and (10) that the inquiry in connection with the grave charges referred to under Clause 8, was commenced with on the 20th December 1862, and did not terminate before the 27th February 1863, when the Kurnum was convicted and fined in a sum of 1,500 Rupees, and dismissed from his post besides.

5. From the foregoing abstract of the records I have received, I trust I have satisfactorily shown that neither neglect nor dilatoriness is traceable to me, and that no weakness or indecision was exhibited by me when I found a clear proof against the man. He has been heavily fined and dismissed from his post under my conviction, and more could not have been done to him, even if I had the opportunity of going through the original charge against him. I am only sorry that I did not, when reporting this conviction, advise the withdrawal of the original charge, an omission owing entirely to forgetfulness, and not arising from any desire on my part to screen the offender.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
26th September 1864.

No. 380.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue, with reference to their Proceedings, dated the 21st June 1864, No. 3,799.

SYDAPET,
20th August 1864.

(Signed) E. G. R. FANE, *Collector.*

Submitted to Government with reference to their Order, dated 6th July 1864, No. 1,176. The Board acquit Mr. Locke of having been dilatory in his proceedings, but he must be aware that to adjourn *sine die* a case involving a serious criminal charge, is any thing but a proper course of procedure. As no mention was made by Soobroyaloo Naidoo of any proceedings in the case during Mr. Locke's tenure of office, the Board naturally concluded that none had been taken by him, between August 1862 and the date on which he left the District, but the Board did not consider him to blame for the delay in the disposal of the Petition which had taken place previously, for, as noticed by Mr. Locke, Soobroyaloo's letter showing that the case had been referred to his predecessor in August 1862, was before the Board.

No. 359. ORDER THEREON, 26th September 1864, No. 1,760.

Miscellaneous.

The Government will take the foregoing Proceedings into consideration when they have before them the explanation of Moottoosawmi Iyer.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

No. 5,832.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 7th September 1864.

Read the following letter from S. R. LOCKE, Esq., Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, to E. G. R. FANE, Esq., Collector of Madras, dated Sydapet, 19th August 1864, No. 399 :—

1. In paragraph 2 of their Proceedings, dated the 21st June 1864, No. 3,799, the Board remark that certain Petitions against one Paupanah, a Kurnum of Pakala village in the Chendraghiri Taluk of North Arcot, were forwarded to the Collector of that District on the 19th December 1861, and that they were handed over to me, then a Deputy Collector in the same District, for inquiry. In paragraph 3 of the same Proceedings, they remark that I apparently took no steps in the matter, and in paragraph 8 they animadvert upon my dilatory proceedings in the case, which enabled a corrupt official to escape punishment.

2. From my successor Soobroyaloo Naidoo's letter to Mr. Fraser, the late Acting Collector of North Arcot, dated the 23rd October 1863, No. 66, I learn that the case was only referred to me on the 11th August 1862, having been previous to that date under the investigation of the Inam Deputy Collector, T. Mutusawmy Iyer, and that it was not therefore transferred to me by the Collector immediately it was received by him, as paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings would imply it had been.

3. I assumed charge of the Zemindary tracts from my predecessor, M. Nursimha Puntulu, on the 1st July 1862, and was fully occupied for several days in clearing his Magisterial file which contained not a few and very intricate cases. As soon, however, as I was at leisure after receipt of the Collector's letter, I find that I did not omit to take the usual initiatory proceedings, by issuing Processes for the appearance of the parties concerned; and I also find from the original records received on my application from my late office at Naggery that I am able to account satisfactorily and step by step, for my apparent neglect of the case.

4. Thus I find (1) that summonses were issued on the 19th September 1862; (2) that the accused appearing on the 25th idem, asked for an adjournment on business grounds, supported by an application from the Tahsildar to the same effect; (3) that an adjournment *sine die* was granted by an order to the Tahsildar, dated the 30th September; (4) that a second order, dated 11th October was issued, appointing the 20th of that month for the hearing; (5) that the parties excepting three absentees, appeared on the 26th of that month; (6) that the Tahsildar was written to on the following day (27th) to procure the attendance of the absentees without delay; (7) that the absentees not appearing and having other heavy work on hand, the case was again adjourned *sine die*; (8) that in the early part of this month I had received an English report from the Tahsildar informing me of extensive frauds perpetrated by the Kurnum Paupanah in Faslis 1269-70 and 1271, which also induced me to send him back for inquiry; (9) that during November, exact dates unknown, a charge of concealment of cultivation against the same individual was investigated by the Tahsildar, and eventually on his report and perusal of the records of the case, thrown out by myself; and (10) that the inquiry in connection with the grave charges referred to under Clause 8, was commenced with on the 20th December 1862, and did not terminate before the 27th February 1863, when the Kurnum was convicted and fined in a sum of 1,500 Rupees, and dismissed from his post besides.

5. From the foregoing abstract of the records I have received, I trust I have satisfactorily shown that neither neglect nor dilatoriness is traceable to me, and that no weakness or indecision was exhibited by me when I found a clear proof against the man. He has been heavily fined and dismissed from his post under my conviction, and more could not have been done to him, even if I had the opportunity of going through the original charge against him. I am only sorry that I did not, when reporting this conviction, advise the withdrawal of the original charge, an omission owing entirely to forgetfulness, and not arising from any desire on my part to screen the offender.

No. 380.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue with reference to their Proceedings, dated the 21st June 1864, No. 3,799.

SYDAPET,
20th August 1864.

(Signed) E. G. R. FANE,
Collector.

Submitted to Government with reference to their Order, dated 5th July 1864, No. 1,186. The Board acquit Mr. Locke of having been dilatory in his proceedings, but he must be aware that to adjourn *sine die* a case involving a serious criminal charge, is any thing but a proper course of procedure. As no mention was made by Soobroyaloo Naidoo of any proceedings in the case during Mr Locke's tenure of office, the Board naturally concluded that none had been taken by him, between August 1862 and the date on which he left the District, but the Board did not consider him to blame for the delay in the disposal of the Petition which had taken place previously, for, as noticed by Mr. Locke, Soobroyaloo's letter showing that the case had been referred to his predecessor in August 1862, was before the Board.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Sub-Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.

Copy to E. G. R. Fane, Esq., Collector of Madras.
„ to G. Banbury, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 1700.

The Government will take the foregoing Proceedings into Consideration when they have before them the explanation of Moottoo Swami Iyer.

Fort St. George
26th. Septr. 1864

14 Copies to the Board of Revenue

Dated 7th July 1864. No. 1,186.

Despatch from Govt. to Board of Revenue.

Received 9th July 1864.

Despatch from Board of Revenue.

Dated 7th September 1864.
No. 5,832.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

No. 2446.

Department

Received 12th September 1864.

Submitting with remarks letter, of Mr. Locke Deputy Collector of Madras accounting for the apparent neglect and dilatoriness remarked on by the Board in his conduct of the case of Paupannah,