

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 963	Press <u>Mis.</u>
61-62	
Dated	6-6-19 1864

Not to be folded or roughly handled

To the President and Members of the Board of Revenue.
Fort St. George.

2333
egw
N/S/09
sixteen

The humble Petition of Sharo Mahomed
Ahik, late Salt Superintendent of
Esakapully Division in the District
of Malabar -

Sheweth,

Being aggrieved by the orders of the sub-
Collector in charge, dated 17th June and 3rd July 1862,
and by dismissing the Petitioner from office, the
Petitioner respectfully appeals to your Honorable
Board on the following grounds -

Before he enters in explaining the Case
to be appealed, the Petitioner thinks it most
necessary to request this Honorable Board, that they
will bear in mind that he served in salt
department for six years with such activity and
ability that he merited the head Collector's
Pers. Allow and Dykes' full approbation
would be seen by the testimonials marked
D, E, F & G - by the former and
the Copy of the extracts of the service list signed
the latter authorities

The Petitioner would further assure this Board
he discharged his duties to the entire satisfaction
of

of the head Collector Mr. Dykes until he leaves the District on the 10th May 1862 without any impeachment whatever, that the Deputy Collector though avowedly prepared himself to annoy the Petitioner during that authority's administration was not succeeded in his view until Mr. Dykes left the District that in 37 days after that gentleman's departure to Europe the Deputy Collector having renewed his view and the head assistant Collector having upheld his reports, the sub Collector in charge never weighing the correctness or otherwise of their reports, dismissed him from service merely on the exaggerated grounds. It remains with the Petitioner therefore to explain the origin of the causes which the said Deputy Collector searched and imputed to your Petitioner in 37 days after the departure of the head Collector Mr. Dykes.

The Petitioner belongs to high and respectable family of the late Daghedar of Wadiagherry and the Collector Mr. Elton was pleased to bestow on him the acting appointment of Salt Superintendant and then confirmed him in the department. The Petitioner performed the duty with credit as stated above.

The

The Petitioner's correct management procured him the rivalship of the salt salt inhabitants but it would be seen by the Collector and his assistants Hookeems. H, I & J that the charges therein falsified had been disproved - a circumstance whereby it is deducible that the Petitioner is or was encumbered with enmity and that the authorities cleared the matter with equity. --- The chief cause which excited the Deputy Collector's increased attempt in annoying the Petitioner from 1860, is that a Goonasta who is a friend to that authority having committed a fraud in selling salt in his divisions, the Petitioner detected it and put him to trial, but the Deputy Collector desired the Petitioner to exonerate the delinquent. The Petitioner not acceding to his request, having counselled the said Goonastah to take his trial before the Magistrate, the Deputy Collector ever since enraged, prepared himself to receive false complaints and false informations from the inhabitants who were already his enemies, and to effect his designs. With respect to the Deputy Collector's engaging in receiving the Petitioner by the means adverted to the Petitioner had now & then, made written reports both to Mr. Collector Dykes and sub Collector Mr. in charge which are now on the records.

Altho

4 Although the several means which the Deputy Collector pointed out to the Collector Mr. Dykes as respects complaints of the inhabitants and of the state and quality of the salt in his division, were orally rejected by that Collector as undeserving of notice, yet your Petitioner would point out only one of them for instance, whereby this Honorable Board will be satisfied that the Deputy Collector is systematically disposed to impeach and injure your Petitioner in any respect whatever, that is, some of the salt Rovers with a view to entangle your Petitioner with fatal end if their acts were detected, had brought a certain quantity of spontaneous salt and clandestinely mixed it with the good article during a day your Petitioner was absent in other part of the Division: your Petitioner on his return discovered the mixture ^{made} a report to the Deputy Collector and forwarded the papers &c. to the sub-Magistrate.

Whereupon the Deputy Collector came and inspected the salt and enquired into who mixed such salt, but no decisive charge was found against him. The Deputy Collector in communication with his enemies (the inhabitants who are the real doers of the act) submitted a letter to the Collector Mr. Dykes that the mixture in question was ^{the}

the conscious act of your Petitioner and that he may be ordered to be dismissed. Mr. Dykes personally visited the salt Division and enquired into the matter and discovered them too that it was impossible to know the real delinquent, but being of opinion that the mixture cannot be easily done without the knowledge of the Peons, Piggustees and Goomaitas & Ackburnaries, dismissed the Peons and suspended the goomaitas &c. for one year, - at the same time the Collector replied to the Deputy Collector that the charge against the Superintendent (Petitioner) is not in the least against him. The same is now on the records of the Collectorate which if called for, will bear testimony for the Petitioner's assertion.

5 - - - - In the proof of the Petitioner's assertion that the Deputy Collector is at variance with him, he would refer this Honorable Board to the accompanying papers K and L which will inspire them that the Petitioner wished to be on leave (without Employ) until Mr. Dykes return to the District owing to the Deputy Collector's wicked Idea, but was unluckily left in the hand of the Deputy Collector to have his wicked design executed towards the Petitioner as at present under appeal.

6 - - - - The Deputy Collector availing the opportunity of the departure of Mr. Dykes on the 10th May made a constant stay at the Petitioner's Division for a month or upwards in search of any false complaints against the Petitioner through the medium of his enemies as also engaged to tutor the people and Peons &c. to bear false testimony against the Petitioner in support of the false accusations in view. In proof of the illegal procedure of the Deputy Collector, the accompanying Mahadarnamah ~~is~~ will show that those who signed it were compelled to give false evidence in certain bribery cases and that they refused and made known the fact to the Collector. By this it is beyond all doubt that the Deputy Collector is determined to annoy the Petitioner at any way whatever.

7 - - - - The Deputy Collector tried the said matters against the Petitioner without allowing him to be present and to cross examine the witnesses. Knowing this the Petitioner addressed an arjee (marked IV) to that authority that the Petitioner might be allowed to be present at the trial as prescribed in Art. 194 of the Penal Code. Without complying with the same requisition, the Deputy Collector ordered

ordered the Petitioner to go to other Cottar Lommalin pente sanda pona the salt into the water. During his absence the Deputy Collector closed the trial and thinking that his direct or single report to the Collector will perhaps become unsuccessful wanted the Assistant Collector's presence at the Division. The Assistant Collector Mr. Wilson is new to the Department and has in consequence concurred in what the Deputy Collector explained to him and so both have submitted reports in one and uniform way as against the Petitioner.

8 - - - - The Sub Collector in charge sent orders to the Petitioner requiring him to afford explanations for all what the Deputy and Assistant Collectors stated against him. To which the Petitioner replied by Arjee on the 16th June 1862 No. 17 affording reasons on every point and requesting that the case may receive reconsideration after allowing the Petitioner to be present at such trial.

9 - - - - The Sub Collector in charge never considering his prayer suspended the Petitioner. (Vide A)

10 - - - - On Petitioner's proceeding to Nagoor, the Sub Collector without entering into any points, but

satu-

11 - - - Satisfying with the reports of the Deputy and Assistant Collectors, dismissed the Petitioner. (vide B.)

11 - - - Having stated the material cause which gave rise to the Petitioner's removal from office, the Petitioner proceeds humbly to show at one sight and place that the Sub Collectors' order B now under appeal is not at all founded upon any proved or like facts except upon imputations or hearsay - impeachments against the Petitioner, viz -

- 1 That he is unwise, drunkard, and a person of sensual appetite and disabled in bodily state.
- 2 That he is as negligent in the cultivation of salt.
- 3 Do - - - in observing the regularity of the accounts.
- 4 That he has stored up bad salt.
- 5 That he was negligent in selling the salt in person.
- 6 That he postponed the salt cultivation whilst the standard quantity is less by 400 Gauris.
- 7 That he did not consciously conform to the orders.
- 8 That he appropriated part of the lamp-oil included in the Circular contingent charges.

For the first point; - The words used are utterly uncorroborated to the state in which the Petitioner is to this moment. Bodily health will by personal examination satisfy the Board that he

6
he is strong enough being 36 years of age. The use of the spirits is under Mahomedan shariah - prohibited. The Petitioner can on his own honor freely deny the imputations. In his shariah, fording on other females except his own legitimate spouse is declared to be highly wrong-doing - such prohibited items of unwise business, the Petitioner has never committed at all.

Had the Petitioner been in slating the said vicious acts, he would have done so at all in former days, and the head Collectors would have paid their attention to them; on the contrary the Testimonials C, D, E, F and G would not have been granted to him; besides this, a letter which the Collector Mr. Dy. has sent to this Honorable Board on the 28th July 62 No. 16 contains commendation as regards the Petitioner. It is likewise corroborated by the Mahajmainahs of the villagers of Esa hapully, Lommalapenta and Gokoolapully dated 18th June which are on the Collector's records which may be called and referred. It is hoped that this Honorable Board will in consideration of the opinions of the full Collectors, set aside the ones now appearing in the orders under appeal.

For the 2^d and 6th points, — The Standard quantity of salt having been obtained by the 24th May only less by 50 gairs, the cultivation was therefore postponed on that date as the prescribed date for doing so is 30th June, had the 50 gairs were under being grown in the Pans. Hence the Petitioner is not negligent in either of the points. — The Mahazernamah sent to the Hoosoor by the Extraordinary Royals, shows that very near 50 gairs are only deficit.

For 3^d point, — of accounts, — Although the keeping or preparing the accounts is part of the Petitioner's supervision, yet the gomastahs who ~~do~~ prepare them being the own name of the Deputy Collector he may on purpose have delayed their preparation and prepared with obliterations or corrections. There are no other differences but the above. — This point will never be raised as injuring the Petitioner's employ.

For 4th Point — Bad salt, — In July 1269 about 400 gairs of bad salt having been produced they were not mixed with good salt but kept separate. The Petitioner having in his arjee of the 5th May 1860 No. 485 brought the circumstance to the notice of the salt Deputy Collector requesting orders.

orders how to dispose the salt, the same authority came and received the salt on the 26th May and on the 6th June 1860, and gave orders that the same salt be stored up. It was accordingly stored up. The Petitioner has not done so at his own discretion. Besides this, the bad salt which the Petitioner is said in the letter of the Deputy and Assistant collectors to have been stored in this factory, is the one that had been gathered from the Pans during the absence of the Petitioner. The Deputy Collector visited the salt and gave orders that that salt be carried and stored. — The Mahazernamah given by the Royals to the Collector in June 1862 will bear testimony to these proceedings. — For the 5th point, Negligence in selling salt in person. The rules go to authorize the Nazindah to dispose the salt. The Petitioner also sold it many times, but in his absence at any other cottars, the Nazindah sells it. The Petitioner stored up several heaps. Hence he is not guilty if it as would be borne out by the accounts of the storing the salt produced in July 1871.

For the 7th Point — Disobedience to orders. — The Petitioner did never disdain the orders, nor

nor is there any record to show that he did so.

For the 8th Point - Appropriation of Lamp oil -
The Mahager makes this point false, for it
shows that the people are tutored to support
the false accusations.

For the 9th Point - 7 heavier Criminal charges
remitted - The Petitioner would respectfully state
that these charges are the ones which the Deputy
Collector invented against him - To prove that
they are mere inventions, the Putappa people
of Cooropoleem namely Lutchadoo & Benzaro
addressed an Arjee to the Collector in June
last that the Deputy Collector compels them to
give their evidence in support of 40 Rs bribe
which he (the Deputy Collector) is about to cause
to set up such charge to be lodged against the
Petitioner. Besides this, a Peon Mahomed Meerah
also wrote a Petition to the Hoogoor that the Deputy
Collector compelled him to give false evidence
that the Petitioner received bribes from the mer-
chants who come to import salt on Board,
but on his refusing to do so the Deputy Collector
was about to snatch his badge. Notwithstanding
this, the Ryoys of Zoonmalapenta presented a
Mahager to the Collector in June stating that the

the Achthurnariffs and Jommalapenta
Cottar said before the Deputy Collector that that
authority told that they should tell that the
Petitioner received 40 Rs per annum of the last years
salt and that they would pay the same for this
year, and that on their refusing to complain
in such false charge the Deputy Collector has
included their good salt of this year as if bad.
If this Honorable Board would call for the said
Arjees and Mahageramah now on the Collector's
record and refer to them as well as to M it will
convince them that the 7 charges adverted to are
mere inventions set up by the Deputy Collector
and that therefore the sub Collector in charge states
that they were remitted as a grace for the Petitioner
in consideration of the respectability of his family

Therefore your Petitioner would lastly pray
that this Honorable Board will in consideration
of the foregoing reasons be pleased to issue orders
to the Collector of Nellore that he may be reinstated
in his office as his character which was in right
way until the full Collector Mr Dykes leaves
the district, will never be reverse in 30 or 32 days
since his going home - and refund his salary from
the date of his suspension.

With a view to produce before this Honorable Board certain Documents, your Petitioner applied to the sub Collector in charge for copy of them and produced to him worth stamp papers for that purpose. The same authority gave orders for the same Documents and they were copied in the stamps but when signing and delivering them to the Petitioner that authority declined to give them to him - Your Petitioner being loan both the Copies and the value of the stamps, it is requested that he may be paid with Rs 16, the value of the stamps used and which were not given him.

Attested by
11 August 1842 } Shall ever Pray
[Signature]
[Circular Stamp: 11/29, 1842]

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

No 3629 of 1862 From Shali Mahomed
Said Salt Superintendent.

The Board are of opinion that the
Petitioner should not be considered ineligible
for another appointment should the collector
think proper to reemploy him.

By order

[Signed] R. A. Dalryell
Sub Secretary.

Recd B. Office
Govt House.
10th December 1862

[A True Copy]

[Signed] R. A. Dalryell
Sub Secretary.

No 2333 of 1862

From Shali Mahomed
Said Salt Superintendent
to the Collector in Charge
of the Salt Revenue
at the Salt Works
at the Salt Works
at the Salt Works

16th August 1862

16th December 1862

A to N.

Appeals against

the enclosed order of the

Said Collector in Charge

and his officers in the

communication of the

Collector who is in

meant towards him.

Repairs the Salt Works

and repairs him

and pays for order

for repairs of the

to repairs of him

salary from the date

of his disqualification

from office as well as

the value of the claims

papers produced by him

for claims of the

Government of the

to him

Forwarded to the Sub Collector in Charge

of the Salt Revenue for his report. The Collector will

be good enough to forward with his report the

letters from the Assistant and Deputy Collectors

referred to in his order dismissing the Petitioner

together with the Petitioner's defence and any other

important papers bearing on the case. The Board

should accompany any of the papers which

may be in the remembrance. The allegations con-

tained in the Petition should be duly noticed.

By order

Shali

Sub Secretary

Recd B. Office
Govt House
10th December 1862

Revenue Board Office
Government House
10th August 1862

The *baghunnamah* presented by the undersigned villagers
of Iscaully in regard to the conduct of Sha Mohamud
Fahid, Superintendent of Iscaully division under
date the 16th June 1862.

It is 5 years since the arrival of this man to this
division and from that time we have been witnessing
his conduct we have neither heard nor seen
making intoxication. At all time when he comes to
this Kotar every day he generally goes over through
all the platforms and if in salt manufacturing
days he particularly goes over and inspect all the
salt plots and taking care to get thatch of the
roof of salt heaps repaired. He also used to go to the
sea-shore and taking care if there is any drift
wood. He was enquiring the causes of the
decrease in the sales of salt or taking care to avoid
if there are any causes. In the times of salt sales
he also used to correct if there is any irregularity.
Always he was serving the Government very faithfully.

and assiduously, when salt sales were entirely dis-
continued and in order to put off the sale of the
salt which was the only cause for the delay in the
said sales he proceeded to the villages situated in
the western side in January of the year 1862 and
apprehended some earthen salt and sent it
to the higher authorities after this the
traders began to come to the cotars and all
the salt was sold. This superintendent is not a
drunkard and has not at all accustomed to
any of the malpractices in this village. He
was behaving very honestly.

Witnessed by many and signed

12
Kahayamma presided by the undersigned
to the Collector of Bellary dated
16th May 1862.

Not only the Salt Dy Collector
visited & begged over Behavara
Pitcherdy alias Ravanaray, to prefer
a charge of having bribed the Salt Superintendent
of Sakapally Division & visited
Hon & or a shro, Kottamreddy
Kodandaramreddy, Komaloo, Gopambaram
to get some false witnesses in the police
men or Pillapoo persons of Kurru & on
Kurtum said to select some false
witnesses in Luley Caste to give testimony
in the above case - but also the Dy Collector
C. C. Parayannurumy Kodaly is
troubling us to give false evidence that
the Superintendent has received bribe
& Behavara Pitcherdy, Kurtum said
likewise entreating us to give evidence
to the same effect. Consequently, should
we give false evidence as the Dy Collector

instructed us? or tell what is true
 & what we know? If we say what
 is true we are sure the Dy. Collector
 will trouble us very much & what should
 we do to this? We beg your honour
 to favour us an Endorsement in the
 manner in which you & honour think
 proper. (Tolutha) saying this the said
 Melchior & Hurstun said told us
 that in case of our not giving evidence
 as foreward, the former that he will get
 the name of our men & give evidence
 the latter that he will get all the Subby
 men under him & do so. We heard
 he told us our present & we heard
 telling this. We have not seen any man
 giving bribe to the superintendent, nor
 we heard that any one bribed him. This we
 have submitted for your honour's information.

Wid. Gunda Parayasa
 Wid. Gunda Subbick
 Wid. Subba Venkataramu
 & Wid. Rajesetty Sarma
 Wid. Gonnattoor ya Rambram
 Wid. Perreth Hossein

To the Collector
 Since a period of six months we have taken
 much trouble and have manufactured up to this
 time 1600 gasses of salt out of the 1666 gasses of salt
 sanctioned to be manufactured in Iskapilly Coto
 fusle 1271 and the salt of the first scrapings was
 stored up and the salt of 2nd scrapings amounting
 to 900 gasses was taken to the salt ridges on the 17
 on the 19 and 20 of this month the Deputy Collector
 in charge of salt department came and inspected the
 salt of Iskapilly Coto and said that the salt is of
 good sort and ordered to carry the salt to the eastern
 side to be taken to the platforms. on our declining
 to carry the salt to the eastern side which is quite
 contrary to the law he ordered and proclaimed
 by heating town that almost all the salt should
 be carried to the platforms before tomorrow evening
 and in failing to do so the salt will be thrown away
 in the water we have afraid and carried all the salt
 to the platforms. We do not know the cause the said
 Deputy Collector showing and telling to the Collector
 that the salt is bad. This salt is of superior quality
 than that which was during the time of manufacture
 of fusle 1269 reported by the superintendent having
 been of good kind and which the Deputy Collector
 came and saw and told that it is of good sort and to be
 stored up but not other wise. There having been
 Pn

N^o 2282 f 1863.

Petitioner. —
should address the Board
of Revenue to whom
the petition alluded
to has been forwarded
with the decision of
Government. —

For A. St. C. 25th Sept. 1863

By Order

eghant

Dr. Lecy to Govt.

(Faint handwritten notes in Devanagari script)

prays for a favorable
order restoring to his
office or conferring
on him a similar
one.

No. 2282 of 1863.

From Shah Mahomed
Sahib late Salt Supe-
rintendent of Esakapally
Division in Nellore
District - Nellore -

Dated 29th Aug^r 1863
Recd 2 Sept^r

States that no reply
has as yet been sent to
him to his former
Petition of 11th June last,
requesting that he may
be ordered to be restored
to his Post.

Representing his
difficult circumstances

27

16

The Honourable the Secretary
of the State of India,
V^m V^m V^m

The humble memorial of Lhas
Mahomed Saib, late Salt
Sup^r of Esakapally Division
Nellore District

Most respectfully sheweth.

That your Memorialist
begs most respectfully to state that
Mr. B. D. Smith, the officiating Collector of
Nellore District without any enquiry
whatsoever unjustly placed his confidence
on the false statements contained in the letter
of the Dy. Collector (believed him & the
Memorialist, there exists a great enmity
as is shown in the 3^d Para. of this Memorial)
dismissed your Memorialist, whereupon
your Memorialist presented a petition
to the Board of Revenue & is now by
Documentary

4th August
1863

(1) & cumulative & oral evidence that the grounds on which your memorialist was dismissed were all false & useless, yet not obtaining a favourable order, he was obliged to appeal to Govt. & did so on the 11th July 1863, where even having failed to get justice done to him, your memorialist he goes to enclose the endorsements of the Board & Govt. & lay his grievances before you in hopes of getting favourable orders.

2. Your Memorialist belongs to high & respectable family of the late Jagherdar of Oodagahery. Mr. Elton the then Collector of Nellore in consideration of the Memorialist's mobility & honesty favoured him with the ~~of~~ Appointment of Salt Supp. & then confirmed him in the appointment.

Mr. Elton in the Conduct Register remarked that he is well pleased with your Memorialist's Character & Conduct in the discharge of his duties. Further 4 European ship Commanders under whom your petitioners had served, bear a satisfactory

testimony

testimony of your relations some of which testimonials were confirmed & concurred with by the Collector.

The present Collector Mr. Byrnes has also reported of the good conduct of the Memorialist in his letter to the Board of Revenue & dated at Sec. Margia. The above testimonials marked B. D. & H. & I.

& I would appear to have been placed with your Memorialist's petition to the Board of Revenue herewith submitted.

3. Your Memorialist's correct discharge of the duties entrusted to him procured the enmity of some ryots who preferred complaints against him to the higher authorities which were all pronounced in their Fardas to be false ones, which Fardas H. P. J. would appear to have been on a reference to the ^{2nd} part of the Board's petition, subsequently in the

16th March 1860 it was brought to petitioners notice that Holacooloon Kasavia a Somanata in Somanapenta & doing duty in Fata of Bovaladina sold 40 Meraals of salt & appropriated

for his owner, the value thereof,
whereupon he required the charge was
proved against the said groomasters
whom he committed to the joint Magistrate
where the accused was sentenced to
imprisonment, but when the case was
being enquired by petitioners the Dy. Collector
in charge of the Salt Department, informed
him that the groomaster in question is his
friend that petitioners may not deal
with him strictly. But as your Memorialist
set aside the requests of the Dy. Collector,
it created enmity between him & your
Memorialist. Your Memorialist has
also reported to the Collector about
this affecting vide para 3 of the
accompanying Petition to the Board
of Revenue.

4 After the departure of Mr. Dy. R. as
the Dy. Collector having compelled
certain inhabitants to bring charge against
the Memorialist & induced certain persons
to bear witnesses to those charges. Your
Memorialist brought the same to the
Sub Collector's notice who was in charge,
& desired him to enquire himself the

2 16
charges, but this Sub Collector in charge
having failed to do so, the charges were
enquired into by the Dy. Collector himself
in the absence of the petitioners & in
contravention to section 194 of the Indian
Penal Code previous to the enquiry of the
about charges your petitioners requested
the Dy. Collector to proceed with the
trial in his presence but the Dy. Collector
thinking that your petitioners was allowed
to remain present during the enquiry the
witnesses will not prove the charge
as he expects since they will be cross
examined by the petitioners ordered the
petitioners to go to Narmalapatla & pour
the bitter salt into the water. This is what
during the course of the Petitioners that
the charges were tried & records were
framed as was hoped by the petitioners
enemy the Dy. Collector. Certain individuals
who were induced to depose falsely against
the petitioners gave the names of the
Collector, mentioning therein that the
Dy. Collector had induced them to depose.

of a cask which Mahagunnams are now
in the possession of the Collector's Office. The
petitioner has also filed one of such
Mahagunnams in Board of Revenue.

5. Further the Dy. Collector thinking that
the officiating collector who is well aware
of the enmity between the petitioner & the
Dy. Collector would place no confidence
on his statement has applied for the
assistance of the Assistant Collector.

The Dy. Collector during the absence of
the petitioner prior to the arrival of
the Assistant Collector caused the
bad salt to be produced in the pans of the salt
to the extent & prevented the sea boat men
whom your petitioners prevailed upon to take the
salt in consequence of the refusal of the sea
boat men to do so on the plea that there was
no water in the canal. Your petitioners
immediately after the arrival of the Assistant
Collector, the Dy. Collector informed
him that restored the bad salt in
question, & it was through his negligence

that board do not concern the salt
which the Assistant Collector is having
made returns against the petitioner &
the inhabitant of Santapally having
through Mahagunnams informed the
Collector that it was the Dy. Collector
who ordered them to stop the bad salt the
Collector required of your petitioners a
reply to the report of the Assistant & Dy. Collector
which he furnished & requested him to try
again the case in his presence but no enquiry
was conducted in the manner solicited
had no consideration was paid to the
original Mahagunnams. He was first
suspended & then discharged.

6. The petitioner stated the material cause which
led to the petitioner's removal from office
being that he proceeded humbly to show at
his sight & place that the Dy. Collector's order
how under Appeal is not all founded
upon any proved or like facts, except
upon imaginary or hearsay impeachments
against the petitioner & viz.

1. That he is unwise, drunkard, and

a person of sensual appetite & disabled
in body & state.

2nd That he is negligent in the cultivation
of salt.

3rd That he is negligent in observing
the regularity of the accounts.

4th That he has stored up the bad
salt.

5th That he was negligent in selling
the salt in person.

6th That he postponed the salt cultivation
while the standard quantity is less
by 400 Guans.

7 That he did not conscientiously confirmed
the orders.

8 That he appropriated part of the
lamp oil & candles in the Vicar's
Contingent charges.

To the first point. The words used are
utterly uncorroborated, to the state in which
the petitioner is to this moment. No self
health will by personal examination satisfy
that the petitioner is strong enough
being 36 years of age. The use of the spirit is
in order the Mahomedan shara prohibited.

The petitioner can on his own honour
freely deny the imputations. In his shara
for doing another females except his own
wife.

Legitimate case is declared, to be highly
serving doing, such prohibited claims of
unwarranted claims on the petition & has never
been admitted, as it is.

It is the petition. When in listing
the words used, he would have
been so at all times. The words used
(Collector would have paid them
attention to them. But the contrary the
determination of the Board will not have
been granted to him. However a letter which
the Collector & the Board sent to this
Honorable Board on the 28th January 1816
(contains commendation as regards the
petitioner. It is likewise corroborated
by the Mahajumans of the village of
Kapaally, & Damma la, & the village of
Kaled 16th Jan which are on the Collector's
books which may be called & referred
it is hoped that your Honour in consideration
of the shens of the full Collector will
set aside the one now appearing in the
case under appeal).

Now the second & third points, the
standard quantity of salt having been

the Cultivation was therefore postponed
in that date as the prescribed date for
it being so is the 30th June. But the 50 gams
were under being grown so the point. Hence
the petitioners is not negligent in either
of the points. The Mahajannams sent
to the Nazoor by the Suba Pallygouds
shows that very near 50 gams are only
defect.

For the 3^d point of account. Although
the keeping & preparing the account is
part of the Petitioner's superintendence, yet the
Gomastah who does prepare them being the
own man of the Dy Collector he may
on purpose have delayed their preparations
& prepared with obliations & over-
There are no other differences but the above.
This point will never be so much as
injuring the petitioners employ.

For the 4th point, bad salt. In February
1769 about 400 gams of bad salt having
been produced, they were not mixed
with good salt but kept separate.
The petitioner having in his charge
of the 5th May 1860 (to 1885) brought the
Circumstances to the notice of the Dy
Collector requesting orders

to be disposed of the salt, the same
authorities were visited, the salt was
sold in May 1860 on the 5th June 1860 & was
that the same salt be stored up. It was
sufficiently standard in the collection
have not done so at his own discretion.
There is a letter the Dy Collector wrote to
the Collector in the letter of the Dy
Collector. The Collector to have been
in there & finally in the one that has been
attached from the point during this absence
the petitioner. The Dy Collector visited
the salt & gave orders that that salt
be carried & stored. The Mahajannams
sent by the Dy Collector to the Collector in June 1860
will bear testimony to the proceedings.
For the 5th point, negligence in selling
salt in 1860. The rules go to authority
then to order to dispose the salt. The
Collector sold it many times
and in the absence of any other Police
the Collector sold it. The petitioner
stored up several heaps. Hence he is
not guilty if it would be borne
in the account of the storing the salt
in 1860 as in July 1871
For the 7th point, disobedience

The Petitioners did not go down
the river nor is there any record
to show that he did so.

For the 8th point of Apprehension
of a conspiracy. The Mahajans
make it this point - false for it shows
that the people are lulled to support
the false accusations.

For the 9th point of (Gravest Criminal)
Charges committed. The Petitioners
would respectfully state that those
charges are the ones which the
Collector is initiated against him
& prove that there are mere inventions
the Duttas people of Kotahpore
namely Lachari & Bungara addressed
in order to the Collector in June last
that the Sp. Collector compels them
to give their evidence in support of 40 Rupees
bribe which the Sp. Collector ^{he} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~is~~
do cause to set up such charges to be
brought against the Petitioners. Besides
there is a person named Moirak also
wrote a petition to the Hazoor that the
Sp. Collector compelled him to give
false evidence that the Petitioners

are corrupt, but from the mere
word is impossible to be on Board, but
the only remedy to do is the Sp. Collector
must be able to settle his charge.

For the 10th point the Report of Doomalaput
presented to the Mahajans to the Collector
in June stating that the Sp. Collector is
Doomalaput Doomalaput Hot and cold
for the Sp. Collector that that
authorities told that they should tell
that the Petitioners received 40 Rupees
for 5 years of last year each and that
they would pay the same for this year
and that without refusing to comply in
such false charge the Sp. Collector has made
their good faith of this year as if had.

Now the charges inserted to are mere
inventions set up by the Sp. Collector
and that therefore the Sub Collector
in charge states that they were permitted
as a grant for the Petitioners in
consideration of the respectability of
the family. Upon a petition furnished stamp
papers and affidavits for the attested
copies of the charges &c but in consequence
of there is not being supplied, he was obliged

Your petitioners whom the Board have
 held to be quite-innocent,--of the charge--
 submit that your honour will be pleased
 to restore him to his appointment, & order
 the disbursement of the arrears of his salary
 from the date of his suspension to the date of

[illegible]

Received of
 J. W. W. Co.
 \$100.00
 30th April 1860

24

This is a Memorial from Shah
Bahadur Sahib Late Salt Superintendant
of Ichapalli in the Helore
District, addressed to the Secre-
tary of State praying for restora-
tion to his post.

The history of the case is con-
tained in Board's Pro: of November/62
Petitioner was dismissed under a
decision of the Sub Collector, which was
approved by the Collector and con-
firmed on appeal by the Board of
Revenue. He did not however im-
mediately come up to Govt until
having further petitioned the Bd,
he obtained from them an order
in which they expressed their
opinion that he should not be con-
sidered ineligible for another ap-
pointment should the Collector think
proper to reemploy him. He then ad-
dressed Govt forwarding the Collec-
tor's order dismissing him and the
Board's endorsement. Cash refer-
red to, but carefully avoiding all
reference to the fact that his
dismissal had been confirm-
ed by the Board. However
the truth was known to Govt
before they passed their order
of the 15th July 1863. On Feb. 15/64
a direct reply was made in this
order to the prayer of the Petitioner
viz - for restoration to his post -
but it was pointed out to the Board
that the sanction of Govt was re-

11/10/64

175

cessary before Petitioner could be
reemployed and the endorse-
ment which they had given in
favor of Petitioner was returned
to them in view to their making
a formal recommendation in
his behalf if they saw fit.

Upon this the Board replied
communicating strongly upon the
duplicity of which they consider-
ed Petitioner had been guilty in
concealing the actual facts of
the case, and stating their opin-
ion that his conduct had depriv-
ed him of any title to favorable
consideration.

The Govt thought it doubt-
ful whether the Petitioner really
did intend any duplicity, but at
the same time they authorized the
Board to inform the Petitioner
that under the circumstances
they (the Govt) were unable to in-
terfere in his behalf.

I think it the present memorial has been pre-
pared after the method aimed
to in the written report by the Board. Memo-
rial in on "rials" again & make it appear
despatch. That the Board on perusing the
Subcollector's dismissal order
held him to be quite innocent and
authorized the collector to reemploy
him. I request orders whether
the memorial, or be returned
State how to the writer for amendment or
whether it should be despatched
at once to the Secretary of State.

x Bd. Pro: d
29 July 1863
No. 4736

22 August 63

C. 22 May 1863

1235/4
23

all the same as before
H. C. and by the right of the Govt. in Council
and in order to advise the Govt. of the result of the
and the result of the Govt. of the result of the
the humble petition of the Petitioner
and the result of the Govt. of the result of the
and the result of the Govt. of the result of the

Most respectfully submitted
That your Petitioner agreed with
order of the Sub collector in charge of the said District
unjustly depriving him from the appointment
to the Board of Revenue when

that they do not consider your Petitioner
for reemployment. Should the collector think prop-
to reemploy him. Whereupon your Petitioner
waited upon the collector not being favored with
any appointment presented an appeal to the
Govt. soliciting to order the collector to bestow
immediately upon the Petitioner his former appoint-
ment by an endorsement directed the
Petitioner to the Board stating that their
orders have been communicated to them;
accordingly your Petitioner applied to the Board

same with all its
enclosures to the said
authority.

Copy via letter to Com^r
7-7 June N^o 1 of 1864 Sep 2nd

N^o 61 & 62.

20 May 1864 Rec^d RC/June
R³

Rec^d 1864-10/11
~~Pro^{of} of Govt for June~~
From N^o 13/14.

Shamabamed
Saib, late Salt Super
intendent of Yesso ca
-pulley in the C. street
of Sellore.

Dated 30 April 1864.

Re-date 2nd May 1864.

With three enclosures

21963-8 Luno

With an order
Forwarding a Memorial
in triplicate addressed
to the Right Honorable
the Secretary of State
for India touching his
dismissal from his
office pray for the
transmission of the