M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1775	Press ~~Mis.~~
1-2	
Dated 1 — 8 — 1865.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 1. Read the following letter from G. L. MORRIS, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Point Calimere, 30th June 1865, No. 722:—

SIR,

1. As directed in the Proceedings of Government, Petition Department, dated 15th May 1865, with reference to a Petition* from E. Kondul Row, late Tahsildar of Sheally in this District, dated 19th April 1865, No. 959 of 1865, I have the honor to forward herewith copies of the depositions taken from the witnesses cited by Kondul Row for the purpose of establishing his answer to the principal charge made against him by Mr. Cadell, viz., habitual disregard of the standing rules with respect to the examination of the treasury, and the custody of the treasury keys.

* Herewith returned.

2. The standing rules with respect to the examination of the treasury and the custody of the treasury keys are, that the Tahsildar, if present, is to examine the treasury every month, and to certify that the contents were found correct; and that he is to keep the treasury keys when at the Cusbah.

3. The witnesses examined by me on behalf of Kondul Row, are the Sheally Talook Sheristadar; two Gumashtas, one of whom was Treasury Gumashta of Sheally from July 1862 to January 1864, and the other from February to April 1864; the late Sheally Head Shroff; the present Under Shroff; and a Talook Peon.

4. From the depositions of Kondul Row himself and of these witnesses, it is clearly shewn that the Memorandums of the balance of cash remaining in the Sheally Treasury on the last day of every month (called enclosure A. in No. 1, Appendix D. of the Talook Manual Accounts) from July 1862, when Kondul Row was re-appointed Sheally Tahsildar, to May 1864, when Mr. Cadell reported against him, were regularly forwarded to the Collector's Cutcherry; that Kondul Row's signature is attached to this Memorandum for every month except April, May, July, August, October, and December 1863 and February 1864; that he always examined the treasury when he signed the Memorandum, and that he kept the keys of the treasury when at the Cusbah, except from about the months of January to June, when he used to hand them over to the Sheristadar for ten days in each month, in consequence of large quantities of money coming daily into the Treasury, and the Sheristadar living much nearer to the Talook Cutcherry than he did.

5. In his letter to the Board of Revenue, dated 17th May 1864, No. 162, Mr. Cadell writes as follows:—"From the enclosures relative to the trial of the late "Shroff of the Salt Station at Neidavasal, it will be seen that the Tahsildar Kondul "Row admits that he has habitually left the keys of the Talook Treasury with the "Sheristadar, and that he has only twice examined his treasury between the months "of August 1862 and April 1864. The Sheristadar of the Talook, on the other hand, "states that the treasury has only been examined once."

6. On referring to the enclosures alluded to by Mr. Cadell, viz., the depositions of Kondul Row and the Talook Sheristadar before the Sessions Court at Tranquebar, I find that what Kondul Row says is as follows:—"I have examined the "treasury twice, I think since I was appointed Tahsildar of Sheally in July 1862. "Once when I took charge, and the second time on the 28th December or there-"abouts. The key of the treasury is with the Talook Sheristadar. I entrusted it "to him in order to avoid delay during my absence in villages in the District." The Talook Sheristadar's statement is in the following words:—"The Tahsildar "has not examined the treasury since he took charge, and though the Tahsildar "did not examine the treasury after he took charge, yet it was examined seven or "eight times since his appointment by his order, by me and the Gumashtas."

7. On being questioned by me as to what they meant by the foregoing statements, both the Tahsildar and the Sheristadar assert that they were not refer-

ring to the periodical monthly examinations or general custody of the treasury keys; the Sessions Judge having told them that they were not being questioned about regular monthly examinations.

8. It is of course impossible for me to say positively what the Tahsildar and Sheristadar meant before the Sessions Court at Tranquebar; but I am decidedly of opinion that it is highly improbable that they could have been referring to any periodical examinations; for as shewn before, the monthly Cash Memorandum was regularly sent in every month, and bears the Tahsildar's signature for fourteen out of twenty-one months: so that if they had included these examinations, it would have been, as much as gratuitously acknowledging that the Tahsildar had not only habitually neglected his duty, but had for fourteen months been putting his signature to a falsehood.

9. I think, therefore, that Kondul Row has satisfactorily shewn that he did not disregard the standing rules with respect to the examination of the Sheally Treasury from July 1862 to May 1864, but that his explanation with regard to the custody of the treasury keys is not so satisfactory, for his witnesses allow that he handed them over to the Talook Sheristadar for ten days in every month when the collections were very heavy, even when he was at the Cusbah, in consequence of his house being distant from the Talook Treasury.

10. With regard to Kondul Row's conduct during the whole time of his employment in the public service, I find that he has served the Government for upwards of thirty years, during twenty years of which he was a Tahsildar in this District; that he was on one occasion suspended for six months for misconduct in a Magisterial case, and on another, removed by the Collector, Mr. Forbes, to a lower paid Tahsildarship on charges brought against him by Mr. Cadell; that his services were dispensed with by Mr. Cadell himself on the reduction of Talooks in 1860; and that he then entered the Police at Trichinopoly, and afterwards resigning his post in that Department was re-employed as Tahsildar of Sheally by the express orders of the Board of Revenue.

11. Mr. Cadell, in paragraph 6 of his letter to the Board of Revenue, dated 17th May 1864, No. 162, says that Kondul Row was reduced whilst in the Police for "insolence and insubordination." Such may have been the case, but I think it my duty to add that when I was Acting Collector in 1862, I privately asked the Tanjore Superintendent of Police to find out for me whether Kondul Row had done any thing whilst in the Police at Trichinopoly, which rendered it undesirable that he should be re-employed as a Tahsildar, and was not only informed by the Superintendent that he had done nothing at all, but was also assured in person by Mr. Robinson shortly afterwards, that he was glad to see Kondul Row re-employed as a Tahsildar.

12. I have myself known Kondul Row as a Tahsildar in this District since 1850, and have no hesitation in saying, that though he was not on the whole a very desirable Tahsildar, yet he was much superior to many whom I could name, and who are now in receipt of Government pensions. One of his great faults was, that he never would associate with the natives about him, and another that he would not condescend to enter into the details of his work: he was consequently not only extremely disliked for his exclusiveness, but left many things which he should have done himself in the hands of his subordinates; on the other hand, I always found him very straightforward and truthful, as well as very shrewd; and I am sure that his worst enemies cannot accuse him of having been a bribe-taker, which is not what can be said of many of the Tanjore Tahsildars. As a proof of his rectitude in the matter of bribes, I have only to point to the fact of his being a poor man after twenty years' service as a Tahsildar in Tanjore!

13. Under these circumstances, and considering the facts connected with Kondul Row's removal from office in 1864, I am of opinion that he should be granted the amount of pension to which he would have been entitled if he had then been obliged to retire on account of sickness or any other cause over which he had

no control, viz., a monthly pension of Rupees 63, being a moiety of the average salary drawn by him for the five years previous to 1864.

No. 2. ORDER THEREON, 1st August 1865, No. 1,775.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government are not altogether satisfied with Kondul Row's explanation, but on a review of his case they see reason to think that dismissal without pension is a more severe punishment than the circumstances warrant, and they resolve, therefore, to admit him to a reduced pension of Rupees 40 per mensem, from the date of his removal from office under G. O. dated 1st November 1864.

2. It is observed from the Official List of Revenue Establishment for 1864, that on the above date Kondul Row had served nearly 34 years, and from the Collector's present letter it appears that the moiety of his pay on the average of the five years preceding 1864, would be Rupees 63.

(True Extract.)

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Public Department.
" the Revenue Board.
" the Accountant General
" the Examiner of Claims.
" the Collector of Tanjore.
" Copy of G. O. to Kondul Row, through Petition Department.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.



90

...ngefter
...rnials granted
...tificers.

...nd Ran- served in the
...9 months (in the cint-
...sion) during that
...ligent & faithful
...vant - He speaks
...th English & writes
...nacular with some
...speaks Hindoostan
...mitant - I parted
...ited the Division

...fy that Conduct Rew
...y Trichinopoly Collectr.
...made about a
...ce ever found him
...ful & correct in his
...e / in the B Cavi
collector

...ts that the proceedings
...in without affor-
...nce or explanation
or

Collectors

19 . 3 . 61.

7 April 60

5 [illegible] 959

4-4-[illegible]

[illegible Tamil handwriting]

thereafter

-ionials granted

Superiors.

-ul Row served in the
19 months (in the civil
-sion) during which
-ligent & faithful
-vant - He is pretty
-th English & writes
-versant with Tamil
Speaks Hindoostani
-untant - I parted
~~itted the Division~~
-ber.

[illegible] Ludlow
C. Engineer

-fy that Condul Row
Trichinopoly Collector
-master about a
-e ever found him
-ny & correct in his

[illegible] Blair
Collector

-ts that the proceedings
adopted in dism[illegible] in without affor-
-ding an opportunity of defence or explanation
or

[illegible] only

Collector

2—1—61.

No 95 9865 Surrender

Copies of Testimonials granted to Conduct Peon by his superiors.

No 1 — Conduct Peon served in the capacity of writer for 19 months (in the Civil Engineers department Surveys) during which time I found him a diligent & faithful as well as useful servant — He is pretty well acquainted with English & writes it tolerably. He is conversant with Canarese Telugoo Maratta & speaks Hindoostanee he is also a good accountant — I parted with him when I quitted the Division his pay was 28 Rupees

Signed / H. Goodlad
C. Engineer

Red Hills
7 July 1837.

No 2 I do hereby certify that Conduct Peon served on the ~~Capacity~~ Trichinopoly Collectorate as a Maratta Comadie about a year and half & have ever found him a steady man & always correct in his duty —

Signed / Th. Blair
Collector

Trichinopoly
28 June 1838.

I most respectfully submits that the proceedings adopted in dismissing him without affording an opportunity of defence or explanation

or

No 3. This is to certify that Lieut Rose served in the Irishmoyly Collectorate in the situations noted in the margin for 8 years & that I have every reason to be pleased with his attention to business. his intelligence & integrity - he left this dist to obtain abetter situation in Tipperary

Irishmoyly
15th July 1845

Signed / W. Sinclair
Collector

Gonaster
Sawyer
Temperly
Boyne Coo
-master
Limestone
Newcastle
-Lyons
Londonderry
Glen -
Tandragee

No 4. Lieut Rose

I have much pleasure in forwarding to you herewith a certificate from Sir Thomas Redmond this day - I was happy to see to small a balance in your demand collection for the last July.

18 July 1845. Signed / J. Patten
Collector

No 5 Lieut Rose came to this district from Irishmoyly to better his fortune at my invitation. It was some years I assistant of battalion, and gave every satisfaction, he is much missed to Skelly a very troublesome & unpleasant & difficult Duty to manage, & seems to have done his duty equally well & satisfactorily here. He is a very intelligent-liberal minded person far beyond the generality of his class in education and manners, and deserves every encouragement from those under whom he serves, & hope he will soon obtain some appointment of advanced pay. I would add of important too, did I not think that his present Duty required a more than ordinarily active man to manage it properly -

Signed / Patten
Collector

Skelly
7 February
1848
1848 -

No 6. With reference to the accompanying application made by Lieut Rose I have pleasure in stating that I consider him a man of talent and experience, and of such active

to

& most respectfully submits that the proceedings adopted in dismissing him without affording an opportunity of defence or explanation

or

to

bodily habits, that he is in my opinion
fit for a responsible appointment
in the Professional Police. The high posts
he has held in this Est.t also make
me consider that he is deserving
of one of the higher grades of Inspec-
torships, and I shall accordingly
be glad to hear that he has obtained
such.

Signed/ G. Lee Morris
Collector
Pondt Cuddalore
23d June 1860

No 7. This is to certify that Cond.r Ren-
-last his appointment of Tassildar
of Paralem in consequence of the
Taluk where he was employed being
abolished, and not thro' any mis-
-conduct or misbehavior on his
part.

Signed/ G. Lee Morris
Collector
Vepauveram
22d Aug.t
1860

No 959 of 65

I have known Cond.r Ren well last
2 years both personally & officially. I believe
him to be one of the few Tassildars who cannot
take bribes, and except in cases where some
personal feelings and Peyne is involved to
be thoroughly trust worthy. In point of abi-
-lities too, I have found him as far as Can
Judge well qualified for his work, both
Magisterial & revenue & quite above the ave-
-rage run of Tassildars.

Tanjore 22d July 1860. /signed/ W. H. Weir
Special asst
Tanjore Dist.

Extract from the Dist Police order by
Captain A. B. Marsack Supt.t of Police
Trichinopoly Dist dated 4th June 1861.

4th class inspector Cond.r Ren
having delivered over charge of the range
to 6th class inspector Ramanuja Naidoo,
is delivered from further duty & allowed
to resign the service at his own request-

A. B. Marsack Captain
Supt.t of Police

& most respectfully submits that the proceedings
adopted in dismissing him without affor-
-ding an opportunity of defence or explanation

or

Orln

957 of 1865
22 Aug.
5 Encl.

To

The Right Honorable Sir. H. Drummond Wood Bt
Governor in Council
Fort Saint George

The Humble Petition of
C. Conaul Row late Tassildar
of Shealy in Tanjore Dist.

Respectfully Sheweth.

1st That your Petitioner was dismissed by an order of Government passed in November 1864 on the representation of Mr. Cadell late Collector of Tanjore

2d That previous to his dismissal your petitioner was neither called upon for an explanation by Mr. Cadell nor by Government.

3d That your Petitioner is a Public Servant of about 30 years standing who has held the office of Tassildar for 20 years & most respectfully submits that the proceedings adopted in dismissing him without affording an opportunity of defence or explanation

or

or man without previously apprising him of the charges on which that extreme measure had been resolved on is unusual and affords but scant encouragement to any man who can do better to devote his life to the service of Her Majesty in subordinate employment in India, leaving out of consideration the strong inducement to make "Day while the Sun shines" which uncertainty of office will most assuredly call into existance.

4. After dismissal your Petitioner was on his application to the Chief Secretary to Government favored by Mr Cadell on the 11 January [illegible] with a memorandum of the charges which had been resolved on and which he presumes constitute the charges preferred against him.

5 Had your Petitioner been favored previous to his dismissal with these charges he humbly thinks that the explanation he is about to offer might have induced your Excellency in Council not to have taken an extreme view of his conduct and even if in any respect he were considered blameworthy to have adopted some other mode of punishment than that of entailing upon him ruin for life.

Conscious.

Conscious that in the desire to check misconduct among subordinate public servants your Excellency in Council can have no wish wantonly to work injustice or to effect injury either to feeling reputation or the rights acquired by length of service, your Petitioner entreats permission to submit for consideration a brief statement in reply to the grounds of dismissal furnished to him by Mr Cadell.

1st charge

"Habitual disregard of Standing rules relating to the Treasury, viz not keeping the Keys thereof in his own custody and in altogether neglecting to examine the cash periodically as required."

Your Petitioner was in the habit of [illegible] periodically, & beyond a simple assertion he is not aware that any Evidence has been adduced or taken by the Collector to show he neglected this duty.

The Talug Sheristadar was permitted to examine the treasury only when your Petitioner's time was otherwise fully occupied in other public business, or when he was absent in out Villages, on which occasions the

only the Keys were entrusted to him.

This method of discharging this duty is unavoidable from necessity & is followed by all other Tassildars, & every Tassildar in the Dist. was liable to the same charge & is liable to dismissal on the same ground.

1. Charge Con.

2d Charge.

" Direct and persistent disobedience of the collectors order calling upon him to remove his residence to the Cusba station of his Talug notwithstanding that one months time was given him for so doing and urging false & frivolous reasons that he could not find accommodation therein.

Mr. Cadell in charge of 2d Circuit Bill directed your Petitioner to remove his residence to the Cusba Sheally within 48 hours & afterwards within one Month. Your Petitioner replied that it was impossible to comply with the order in consequence of there being no vacant houses in Sheally, & that the order could not be complied with unless he built a house for himself.

He

2d Charge continued

He resides 3440 Yards from the Talug Cutcherry measuring by one road, or 1440 Yards measuring by another, & was only distant 1336 Yards from the extremity of the village of Sheally. The superintendance of the Police having been taken away from Tassildars. Your Petitioner submits that these distances from the Cutcherry are by no means sufficiently great to justify either dismissal or the interference of the collector with the locality of his residence. If your Petitioner were present at his Cutcherry at office hours & were accessible at all hours within convenient distance your Petitioner conceives that the distance he resided from the Cutcherry was not sufficiently great to render him

him amenable to censure. Compare the distance of residences at Madras & other large towns from public offices and will Excellency decide that your

2d Charge con^d ——— Petitioner resided too far away?

Your Petitioner's predecessor resided at Velm-thedesa moodrum, this successor the present appe-ciating Tassildar resides at Tripady, respectively distant one mile from the Cutchery. No fault was found with them for so doing. When the Honorable Mr. Phillips at present a member of your Excellency's Council was Collector of Tanjore he sent your Petitioner an order dated 13th January, 1858. observing that it was immaterial whether your Petitioner lived at the Cusba station or not provided he took measures for the Police

Bun-

Bundobust. Your Petitioner

2d Charge con^d ——— submits that it must be the more immaterial now in as so much as Tassildars are relieved of Police superintendence, and that the view taken of the matter by the Honorable Mr. Phillips. was at a time when Tassildars had that duty displayed that proper repugnance to interfere with the private convenience comfort, & taste of a public servant which ought to Charac-terize an official superior

Whether your Petitioner has subjected himself to dismissal for not removing into Shedly at a time when he could not procure a house at least a house suitable for the residence of the Chief native official of the Taluk to reside in he submits to the decision of your Excellency-

This

3d Charge

3d Charge

"General inefficiency insolent and insubordinate conduct & untrustworthiness, as testifyed by his suspension for 6 Months from the duties of Tassildar in 1857."

This charge so indefinite, that your Petitioner feels unable to meet it in detail & as he is not informed in what instances he has displayed general inefficiency, insolence insubordination & untrustworthiness, he is utterly unable to offer an explanation.

It is true, your Petitioner was suspended for 6 Months in 1857. under the following circumstances. Having committed certain persons, the Sub Judge of Kumbaconum fined them. On appeal the Session Judge reversed the Sub judge's sentence & conceiving that Your Petitioner had erred in committing the case recommended his punishment to the Magte, who suspended him for 6 Months.

If

3d Charge Con?

If your Petitioner erred in committing & deserved & deserved punishment, what did the Subordinate Judge deserve who sentenced? in him the error was an error of judgement. in your Petitioner the error was a crime. If your Excellency will punish with dismissal every Subordinate Servant covenanted or uncovenanted who improperly commits or sentences a party Your Excellency will scarcely have an individual on the civil list in the course of a few years. Setting this aside, Say your Petitioner erred, Say he deserved punishment. Say a distinction might be drawn between the inefficient Tassildar & the efficient Sub judge. Your Excellency will remember that Your Petitioner has been once punished for that offence if he committed any. & he submits

to

to your Excellency to state whether it is just that he should be punished a second time for the same offence.

3d Charge Contd.

4th Charge

"For oppression & abuse of Authority his subsequent reduction to the lowest grade of Constableship in 1858."

Mr. Cadell in 1853. (not 1855) recommended Your Petitioner's dismissal to Mr Collector Forbes who declined to accede to his recommendation. Is Mr Cadell to be allowed in 1864. to renew a charge thrown out by his superior 11 years before? Your Petitioner being unwilling to continue under Mr. Cadell voluntarily applied for & obtained a lower grade. This application was a matter of prudence, is it now to be brought up in judgment against him? Say your Petitioner was punished which your Petitioner solemnly declares was not the case, is he to be punished a second time.

Owing to the caprice of some collectors Tasildars

4th Charge Contd. ..... were very frequently punished in former times & if your Excellency were to call for a list of the dismissal, re-employment, removal, degradation, & promotion of various Tasildars under various collectors scarcely a man would be found worthy to retain his office if his conduct were tested by the punishment inflicted upon him previous to the order of the Board of revenue taking these offences under their own immediate protection.

5th Charge

"His reduction to the lower grade of Inspectorship of Police in 1861. & his ultimate resignation of Police appointment."

Your Petitioner was reduced to a lower grade Inspectorship because he had overstayed thro' unavoidable circumstances, the leave granted to him to perform a marriage which

which he could not complete within the time he imagined the ceremony would occupy, he resigned, because the duties of Inspector were uncongenial to the habits of your Petitioner.

5th Charge Con?

6th Charge

"Also utter & entire ignorance of the criminal codes, & hence consequent unfitness for the office of Sub Magte as repeatedly brought by the officers of the Magistracy & Police under whome he has served."

Your Petitioner has been nearly 30 years in the service he was promoted step by step from office to office in the Magisterial depart. He was 20 years a Tassildar, he holds testimonials expressive of approbation from officers, under whom he served, & if he were utterly & entirely ignorant of his duty, & the rules laid down for his guidance, your Petitioner submits that it is a singular fact that his ignorance should have remained undiscovered for so long a period. On the one hand your Excellency has the indefinite assertion of Mr Cadell. On the other your Petitioner's length of service, gradual promotion & testimonials, & your Petitioner left to your Excellency to determine whether Mr Cadell's bare assertion is sufficient to over turn the testimony of the number of other officers under whom your Petitioner has served.

6th charge con?

——— Your Petitioner has briefly answered the charges & is conscious of no other fault than the misfortune of having been placed under Mr Cadell a second time. In 1853 that gentleman unsuccessfully recommended his dismissal to Mr Forbes: In 1860 on new arrangement he removed your Petitioner to a Taluq which was about to be abolished and

12

and the proceeding consequently threw your Petitioner out of employ. In 1862. when Mr. Morris. the present then acting collector was pleased to appoint your Petitioner to Shealy Talug.

In 1864 Mr Cadell recommended your Petitioner's dismissal to the Board of revenue, & your Petitioner is informed that the Board declined to sanction the recommendation. Persisting he carried his complaint to Government, & in 1864 succeeded in effecting the intention he had formed 11 years before. Such being the state of the case. Your Petitioner leaves it to your Excellency to decide whether the charges read in connection with his explanation are really sufficient to justify the dismissal of any man much less a public officer of about 30 years standing; whether in fact there are really any charges which seriously deserve notice; or whether in fact there is any fresh charge brought against him of so serious a nature as to justify dismissal without enquiry or without any consideration for your Petitioner's long & faithful service.

With confidence your Petitioner lays his case before your Excellency, & entreats that he may be either restored to office or be allowed the pension to which his length of service entitles him.

For which act of benevolence your Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray-

Madras
April 1865

I Cordial Row
late Tassildar of Shealy

enclosure

in the Middle of July 1862, and held it
up to the 10th November 1864. During
that time, except when I was absent
from Scilly or engaged in important
Criminal business, I examined the
Treasury on the last day of every Month,
and having put my Signature to in

Enclosure

as will be seen from his annexed answers to them; and that Mr. Cadell had been trying from 11 years to get him dismissed. Prays that he may be either restored to office or allowed to receive the pension to which he is entitled on the score of his long service.

Rev. 1786/65

Rev.

No. 959 of 1865.

From E. Condul Row, late Tahsildar of Sheally in Tanjore District. Now at Madras.

Rec'd 19th April 1865.

With 5 enclosures.

Enclosing copies of testimonials given him by a number of officers whom he has served. States that on the bare representation of Mr. Cadell, the late Collector of Tanjore, he was dismissed by a Govt. order of November last, without having been allowed an opportunity of defence or explanation, either by Mr. Cadell or Govt. & worse than that, without having been previously made known of the charges on which he was dismissed; that he has served Govt. for the long period of 30 years; that the charges brought against him are unfounded.

The deposition of E. Kondal Row, late Tahsildar of Sheally Taluk Tanjore District.

Question — The Government having in their Proceedings dated 15th May 1865, directed me to give you an opportunity of Establishing your Answer to the charge brought against you by the late Collector of this District, viz. "Habitual disregard of the Standing rules with respect to the Custody of the Treasury keys and examination of the Treasury":

Will you state how you can disprove that charge. ?

Answer — I took charge of the Sheally Taluk in the Middle of July 1862, and held it up to the 10th November 1864. During that time, except when I was absent from Sheally or engaged in important Criminal business, I examined the Treasury on the last day of every Month, and having put my Signature to

Enclosure

Enclosure **A** in No 1 Appendix **D** of the Taluk Manual Accounts, forwarded the same to the Treasury Deputy Collector. I now produce certified copies of Enclosure **A** for the twenty one Months from July 1862 when I took charge, to May 1864, in which Mr Cadell reported against me, and from these you will observe that I examined the Treasury every Month except April, May, July, August, October, and December 1863, and February 1864. In these Months I was, as I have stated before, either absent or engaged in other important business. On the occasions when I examined the Treasury, the Nagudi Gumastah and the Shroff were present. The Nagudi Gumastah generally signed Enclosure **A**, and the Sheristadar always did so, as well as myself, but the Sheristadar was not present when I examined the Treasury. Besides these periodical examinations, I examined the

Treasury twice I think, once in December 1863, and the other time when I took charge, but I cannot recollect positively. With regard to the Custody of the keys, I beg to state that they were always in my Custody, except when I had to leave Shrally, when I delivered them over to the Taluk Sheristadar. As a general rule the Treasury keys were every day when I went to Cutcherry taken together with my Dafters to the Taluk Treasury along with me by one of my Peons, and delivered to the Shroff; who in the evening returned them to me in a Small bag when Cutcherry was over, and they were taken back again to my house in the same way as they had been brought in the morning. Now & then when Money arrived in large quantities the Shroff used at first to come for the keys in the Morning and in order to avoid this, I used to hand them over to the Sheristadar on the previous

evening

evening and he gave them to the Shroff.
I wish the following persons to be exa-
mined as to the truth of the facts
I have stated above. Viz. Subbara-
saya late Magudy Gumastah of
Shrally, Ragunada Rau the presnt
Magudy Gumastah of Shrally, Ambala-
vana Chetty the presnt Shroff of Shrally,
Saminada Chetty late Head Shroff of
Shrally, Iron Pattukotta Ramasami,
and Ram Rau the Shristadar of
Shrally.-

Question — In your deposition given on oath before the Sessions Court of Tranquebar in April 1864, in Case No. 9. you state as follows;

(Deposition of Kondal Rau)

"I have examined the Treasury
"twice I think since I was appointed
"Tahsildar of Shrally in July 1862.
"once when I took charge, and the
"second time on the 28th December
or

"or thereabouts. The Key of the Treasury
"was with the Taluk Shristadar. I entrus-
"-ted it to him in order to avoid delay during
"my absence in Villages in the District.
What did you mean when you said this,
and how do you reconcile it with your
deposition as now recorded by Mr E

Answer — The Sessions Judge asked me, when I had examined the Treasury. I answered him that I had made the regular periodical Examination at the end of each Month according to the Manuel. The Judge said that he did not refer to the periodical Examination, but wanted to know how many times I had examined the Treasury. I said twice, meaning of course twice besides the periodical Examinations. Respecting the keys of the Treasury, I meant that I left them with the Shris-tadar when I was absent from Shrally and when much money arrived daily, and not that I always left them with him.

Signed/ C. Condal Rau
late Tahsildar

Taken before me this the 20th day of June 1865.

Signed/ G. Lee: Morris
Coll.r & Magistte

(True Copy)
G Lee Morris
Coll.r & Magistte

Subba Narasaiya, son of Venkata Narasaiya, a Revenue Inspector in Chamarajnagar Taluq, aged 44, having taken the usual affirmation deposes as follows:-

From July 1862 to January 1864 I was Nagadi Gumasta in the Taluq of Shiddi. Kondal Rao was then Tahsildar. I have now looked at the Enclosure A accounts produced before the Collector, as having been sent to the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury on the last day of each month; they are quite correct, such of these accounts as bear Kondal Raos signature, shew that he Examined the Treasury in those months. I was present on all the occasions which bear my signature, and saw him Examine the Treasury on every such occasion, & his signature is attached as well as mine. He never signed these accounts unless he actually Examined the Treasury himself. If his signature is not attached to these accounts, it was because he was absent from Shiddi

and

Pro: 178/65.

1865

Deputy

Assistant

from

The Collector

Chamrajnagar

&c &c

The Secretary

to Government

Bangalore

Herewith I have the

honor to forward

to you

Copy of

Deposition of

S. Narasaiya Pro:

Dated 1st June 65

and could not Examine the Treasury.
The Salary Sarishtadar did not
Examine the Treasury when Kondiah
Rao did so, but he signed the account
on these occasions also, because it
is usual for him to do so with re-
gard to all accounts sent to the
Kutcheri. I do not recollect whether
Kondiah Rao ever Examined the
Treasury on any other occasions
than the periodical ones.-

/Signed/ Soobbanarasyen
Inspector

Read over to the witness in the Tamil
language which he understands and was
acknowledged by him to be correct.-

20th June 1865

/Signed/ G. Lee: Morris
Collector & Magistrate

(True Copy)

G Lee Morris
Collector and Magistrate

Rev-1786/65
1865 Department

In a letter
From the Collector
of Jaffna
To
The Secretary to
Government

Dated 30th June 1865
Rec'd

No 722

Copy of Deposition
of the 1st Witness

P.S. 25 Aug 65
No 1822

Treasury when the Exhibition was absent.-

/Signed/ Ranganada Row
Jaguir Quinastah

Read over to the witness in the Tamil language which he understands and was acknowledged by him to be correct.

20th June 1865

/Signed/ G. Lee: Morris
Collector & Magistrate

(True Copy)

G Lee Morris
Collector & Magistrate

Rec'd 17th/65
1865 Explanation
from a letter
From the Collector
of Jaffna
To the Secretary
to Government
dated 20th June 1865
Received 3rd July
Copy of Exhibition
of the 2d Witness
Dy 1865

3d Witness

23

Ambalavanar Chetti, son of Arunachalam Chetti, Shroff in Chavagacherry aged 60 years, having taken the usual affirmation deposes as follows:-

I was Shroff of Chavagacherry during all the time that Kondal Row was Exhibitor of Chavagacherry from July 1862 to April 1864. During this time the Exhibitor used as a general rule to keep the Keys of the Treasury with him, to take them home to his house with his Daftar after Kutcherimaster over, and to hand them over to the Shroff again when he came to the Kutcherri. When however a great deal of Money was coming into the Kutcherri, the Exhibitor used sometimes to order the Keys to be handed over to the Sarishtadar for the night after the shopping was over, and go home without them: and the same was done. This did not however take place very often but only now and then.-

/Signed/ Ambalavanar Chetti

Read over to the witness in the Tamil language which he understands and was acknowledged by him to be correct.

20th June 1865

/Signed/ G. Lee: Morris
Coll.r & Magistrate

(True Copy)

G Lee Morris
Collector & Magistrate

4th Witness

Saminada Chetty, Son of Ambalavana-Chetty, formerly Head Shroff of Shrally Taluk, aged 42 years, having taken the usual affirmation deposes as follows.—

I was Head Shroff of Shrally Taluk during all the time that Vondal Rau was Tahsildar of that Taluk from July 1862 to February 1864, when I was removed by order of the late Collector— As a general rule the keys of the Treasury were with the Tahsildar— he used to bring them with him when he came to Cutcherry, and hand them over to me, and I used to return them to him in the evening when he left Cutcherry. When money used to come in large quantities, the Tahsildar used to go home without the keys and I used on these occasions to hand them over to the Shristadar by his order, who kept them for the night, and gave them back again to me the next morning— This used to take place for some 10 or 15 days in each month when

Rec. 17/6/65.
1865 Explanation
In a letter
From
The Collr
of Tanjore
To
The Secretary
to Government

Dated 30th June 1865
Received 3 July

No. 922

Copy of Explanation
of the 3rd Witness

Sub Collr's Office
Kumbakonam
15/6/65

when the Collections were heavy from February to June.—

In your examination before the Sessions Court of Tranquebar in April 1864, you state as follows.— Question

"The Sheristadar keeps the keys of the Treasury as the Tahsildar lives at a distance, but the Tahsildar ought to do so." What do you mean by this.?

I was not speaking generally when I stated the above before the Sessions Court but merely what was the practice when there was a large quantity of money coming into the Treasury which was the fact when the money was stolen about which I was then being examined by the Court.—

/Signed/ Saminada Chetti

Read over to the witness in the Tamil language which he understands and was acknowledged by him to be correct.

20th June 1865 /Signed/ G. Lee Morris
Coll: & Magistrate

(True copy)

G. Lee Morris
Collector & Magistrate

Collector Magistrate

Rev. 1780/86
1865 Explanation
Or a letter
From
The Collector
of Tanjore
To the Secretary
to Government
Dated 30th June 1865
Received
No. 922
Copy of Deposition
of the 4th Witness

5th Witness

Ramasami, son of Govindappa Naik, a Poor in the Shiali Taluq, aged 31 years, having taken the usual affirmation, deposes as follows:-

I was a Poor in the Shiali Taluq from July 1862 to April 1864, whilst Kondal Rão was Tahsildar of that Taluq. I know that I used often to take the Treasury Keys along with the Tahsildars Dubash and boy to his house from the Kutcherri and from his house to the Kutcherri. I know also that when the Tahsildar was in Shiali the Keys used, when a large Quantity of money was coming into the Treasury, to be sometimes for some days along with the Sarishtadar, in order that the Treasury might be opened in the early morning. I cannot however speak with any certainty on the subject.-

/signed/ Ramasami

Read over to the witness in the Tamil language which he understands and was acknowledged by him to be correct

5th June 1865

/signed/ G. Lee: Morris
Coll.r & Magistte

(True copy)

G Lee Morris
Collector & Magistte

The deposition of Ram Rao, son of Baba Rao, aged 51 years, Talug Sarishtedar of Shiali, having taken the usual affirmation deposes as follows:-

I am at present Sarishtedar of the Talug of Shiali. I held that appointment from July 1862 to April 1864 when Kandal Rao was Sahsildar of that Talug. I have looked at the Enclosure A in No 1 Appendix D of the Talug Imamal accounts for Shiali from July 1862 to April 1864: in some of the months account the Sahsildar's signature is attached, & in some it is not. he Examined the Treasury in those months in which his signature is entered, and did not do so where it is omitted. I Examined the Treasury when the Sahsildar did not, but simply signed the accounts when the Sahsildar Examined.

Question In your deposition before the Sessions Court of Tranquebar you have stated that, the Sahsildar has not Examined the Treasury since

Rev: 1786/65
1865 Department

In a letter

From The Collector of Customs

To The Secretary to Government

Date 30th } June 1865
Recd }

No 722.

Copy of Despatch
of the 6th Instant -

P 1st July 1865

No 1802

him a day. not only did I exa-
=mine the chest once more
but I did it two extra times.
I cannot understand to how
the jailer could have told him
that the quantum had in effe-
=ct to the regular monthly
Examination. when in point
of fact this was the first of the
whole chapter and all that the
Govt. did was to ascertain
under the circumstances and
looking to the fact that Dr Bronx
was a certain extent called
upon to vindicate himself for
having recommended the man
for the appointment which he
took I am not disposed to
alter the opinion which I pro-
=nounced when the case was originally
brought before me. I ought
I would be for modify the
punishment I gave in that sen-
=tence as to say that time might
Perhaps might be given to the

man in consideration of his
length of service.

WD

30

31

In God's pres: 15 May last; we held that the charges against Conduct Rows made by the late Capt: of Layne, Mr Cadell had rendered himself liable to a principal one, - whether he had habitually disregarded his standing duty & respect to the authority of the Treasury here as Examinants of the Treasury. Whether, the present Conduct Rows, deserves, & allows Conduct Rows an opportunity to explain & defend - We have done so & now report the result:-

Mr Morris is not of opinion that Mr Cadell's charge is established. He deems both, on a consideration of the papers now submitted, to be fully justified in coming to that conclusion which I do not conceive to be justified in fact, the examinants appear to have had no fair ground & was ill timed, & unless Mr Morris has correctly misapprehended the circumstances, which Conduct Rows' proceedings, & the report of Mr Sague with Mr M — in Pleasure, are not such as showed malicious against the claimants established & done 30 years & more. & upon which the Treasury has since proceeded & now be taken for granted, & stopped now be taken for granted, & stopped

4 July 65.

Mr

case Ry. Ch

Exam: I think

that dismissal

& Court function

is a severe

severe punishment

than the circum: cs

being a moiety of the average salary
drawn by him for the 5 years previous
to 1864.—

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant.

G. Dee Morris
Collector

Fro 1st November 64 A9-11

Rev.

1865 Department

No. 1786.

From

The Collector

of Tanjore

To The Actg Secretary

to Government

Fort Saint George

Madras

Dated 30th June 1865

Received 3 July

Enclosures 8.

No 722

Dt 8 Oct 1775 - 10 Augt

Forwards herewith

copies of depositions

taken from Condal Rau

and the witnesses cited

by him.

No 1

4 July 65 R4

2

No. 1775. 1st Augt 1865.

Sent the following letter

from the Collr of Tanjore

dd 30 June 1865.

The Govt are not

altogether satisfied

with the Conduct

& proceedings of

the Court of Adawlut

on a previous occa-

sion when they

were of opinion

that dismissal

with Costs

is a very

severe punishment

when the circumstances

Warrant &c. and stay
proceedings for to
admit him to
extend pursuit of
Lt. 40. per annum
from the date of his
present from Office
under G.O. of 24th Nov/64.

It is observed from
the official List of Lieuts.
Establt for 1864. that
on the above date under
four Lieuts nearly
34 years - and from
the Colonial Secretary's letter
it appears that the
Services of Lieuts
average 5 years
preceding 1864. Vide Lt. Off.

28. Jan 65

5 2 Lieuts [illegible] Sept 2 Augt
14 6 2 [illegible]
1 [illegible]
&c. [illegible]

45
7

[illegible] with one Petition Vide Enclosures

Revenue 1865 Department
Proceedings for August

No 1775

Proceedings of the Madras Govt
Dated 1st August 1865

Sanctioning a Reduced
Pension of Rupees
10 per Mensem to
Koiadul Rama late
Tahsildar of Shealy

No 142