

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 502

Press
Mis.

113 114

Dated

8 - 3 - 18 65.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
8th March 1865.*

No. 113. Read the following Petition from C. KAMARAUZE, late Curnum of the village of Mamidada, in the Talook of Ramachendrapooram, in Godavery District, now at Madras, to His Excellency the Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 11th February 1865:—

My LORD,

Being dissatisfied with the decision passed by the Government, under date 18th July last, on his Petition No. 1,698 of 1864, your Petitioner begs to submit herewith (in triplicate) an appeal Memorial against the same to the address of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, and humbly prays that it may be forwarded to that noble authority.

Shall ever pray.

No. 114. ORDER THEREON, 8th March 1865, No. 502.

Miscellaneous.

From the Collector's endorsement submitted by the Memorialist, it appears that he was dismissed on account of general inability and carelessness in the discharge of his duties as Curnum, under Section VI of Regulation VI of 1831. Appeal against this Order was made in the first instance to the Board, whose decision, final and conclusive under the enactment quoted, was confirmed by Government in the endorsement, dated 22nd June 1864, passed on his Petition No. 1,698 of 1864. Under these circumstances the Government decline to forward his Memorial to the Secretary of State for India.

(True Extract.)

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

To C. Kamarauze.

Exd. S. T. Angustin.

To

The Right Honorable Sir Charles Wood, Bart. K. C. B.
Secretary of State for India in Council.

The humble Memorial of Hama-
rauz, late Karam of the Village
of Mamidada in the Talug of
Ramachendrapooram, Godavery
District

Madras.

Most Respectfully sheweth

That having failed to obtain justice
at the hands of the Board of Revenue or of the Govt.
of Madras against the Proceedings of the Acting Collector,
removing the Memorialist from the office of Karam
on the charge of incompetency and carelessness- asserted
to the prejudice of the Petitioner, for the first time
after he had served the State faithfully for the last
35 years- Your Excellency's humble & aggrieved
Memorialist has dared to lay his grievances before
your Lordship in Council as his last resource for
redress.

2 That the circumstances connected with the
Petitioner's case are as follows:— Through
the

the connivance of the Sahasildar some of the Ryots of Mamidada made a verbal complaint to that Officer against the Petitioner to the effect, that the Petitioner levied a greater amount of water-tax on the complainants for F 1272 than paid by them for F 1271, on their fields. This charge added to others of the Sahasildar's own coining were reported to the collector but that gentleman unwilling to give credit to the bare assertions of the Sahasildar, desired the latter to institute a regular enquiry into the conduct of the Petitioner. On this the Sahasildar took some written depositions simply from the complainants & the Petitioner, & not from any witnesses in the case, & having waited till the departure of Mr. Morris, reported the affair to the Pleurpoor just after the arrival of Mr. Morris as Acting Collector of the District, who being misled by his office Subordinates - the friends & supporters of the Sahasildar - issued an order dismissing the Petitioner.

3 That against this order the Petitioner appealed successively to the Board of Revenue & to the Local Government, but to his great mortification those Authorities did not make any enquiry into the circumstances connected with the Petitioner's dismissal and simply stated that they were unable to interfere with the decision of the Acting Collector.

4 That with a view to a clear understanding of the case by your Lordship in Council, your humble memorialist has taken the liberty to enter here under an English translation of

3
the Acting Collector's order on one side, with the explanation of the Petitioner on the other to the various points brought against the Petitioner

Collector's Taked

Dwarapwodi Venkatachellum and others cultivating Ryots of the Village preferred complaints against the Petitioner; that is, that he committed irregularities when furnishing the data for the levy of water-tax for F 1272, by making greatly incorrect entries in respect of the measurements taken of the lands cultivated by means of the Annicut waters, so that, the *teerua* might appear large in the case of some of the Village Ryots whom he disliked and small in respect of others from whom he had received benefit; by entering the lands that used the waters as not having been so irrigated & the *Vice Versa*; & by entering in the accounts lands belonging to one party in the name of another - that besides he entered the figures in the Patta

Explanation of the Petitioner

There was no written complaint of this kind made by the complainants, much less was it presented to the collector, as the words of the order would imply - A mere verbal charge was preferred before the Talug Authorities by the Ryots named, & that was simply to the effect that the Petitioner assessed them with a greater amount of water-tax for F 1272 than for F 1271; the other

charges were of the Sahasildar's own coining - It is to be observed that this part of the Acting Collector's Taked is taken almost verbatim from the report of the Sahasildar

Patta for last year, making them at variance with the Moolcheliha - & that having committed some irregularities in realizing the collections for A 1271, he made the Account Book No. 11 & the Patta relating to that Fusli unintelligible, in view to the non-discovery of such irregularity -

Upon this, in pursuance of the Tahasildar's order, one Balantaras Joghah, on behalf of the complainants, measured the fields cultivated and submitted some accounts; & in view to ascertain the truth of these measurements,

the Goomastah attached to the cattle-pound, examined some portions of fields under the orders of the very Tahasildar, & forwarded the accounts

This Joghah is a private Goomastah of the Tahasildar & is no public servant. The irregularity of the Tahasildar & the ill-will borne by him against the Petitioner are clearly seen from the fact of his employing, an Agent ready to serve his ends, for examining the proceedings of the Petitioner. And the Acting Collector's tacit allowance of such conduct on the part of the Tahasildar, cannot, the memorialist trusts, but strike your Lordship as very strange. This is again the Goomastah attached to the cattle-pound, who could not properly be deputed to examine the accounts of the Petitioner - The proper person

From this clear proof exists as to the Petitioner having concealed some of the tilled lands, as to his having entered as cultivated fractional parts of fields, left waste,

to inspect the fields & ascertain their state was, next to the Tahasildar, the Revenue Inspector, a person specially appointed to such work, but the Tahasildar passed over that official as the latter happened to attest to the truth of the Petitioner's statements. The Petitioner here begs to add that the examination of the Pound Goomastah itself extended to but few fields, as admitted by the Acting Collector, & his accounts cannot therefore furnish any proper data as to the incorrectness or otherwise of the Petitioner's statements.

This statement is incorrect as there are no accounts or other public evidence in support of the same - Moreover had there been found to exist any excess in the cultivation the tax due upon the same would have been realized from the Ryots; but the absence of such levy must remove even any moral ground of presumption as to the guilt of the Petitioner.

As to his having entered in the accounts the measurements in respect of full & detailed numbers of fields, at variance with the area fixed at the time of the survey - The Petitioner confessed himself that he so fell into error owing to the Demarcation numbers not having been understood & other causes -

Moreover with reference to the alteration of the Figures in the Patta for last year the Petitioner said that it was made by his fellow Harnam & the latter imputed it to the Petitioner; & so they threw the blame on each other.

The Petitioner had to enter the items from dictation, the numbers being read out to him from the Taluk records by one of the Tahasildar's goormastars, at the busy time of the collector's yearly Settlement of the District; & besides the Petitioner was not permitted to compare his copy with the original - This circumstance accounts for the discrepancy noticed by the Acting Collector.

At the desire of the Village Moonsiff the Petitioner allowed his fellow Harnam to take a copy of the Patta for F 1272. The Petitioner therefore strongly suspects his fellow Harnam who owes a grudge to him, of having tampered with the items in the Patta. Moreover the fact of the Petitioner's fellow Harnam having omitted to point out the alterations when he received the Patta from the Petitioner's hands, goes beyond a doubt to establish the innocence of the Petitioner - Besides of what

On a consideration of all the above facts it appears that these errors have arisen from incompetency & carelessness, and that the Petitioner has not sufficient ability for the discharge of the duties connected with the office of Harnam; tho' sufficient proof is wanting to shew that he committed himself from any intentional malice - Therefore the Petitioner has been discharged from his post from the 1st instant and order to that effect issued to the Tahasildar. So this fact is made known by this.

(Signed) Morris
Collector.

what avail could the alterations be to the Petitioner in as much as copies of the several items in the same were long ago furnished to the Ryots concerned, that they may know the actual amount payable by them to Govt., & any subsequent alterations could easily be detected by a comparison with those copies.

It is seen from the Acting Collector's own admission that no serious guilt attaches to the Petitioner; & it must therefore be evident to your Lordship, that the heavy punishment of dismissal is quite undeserved by the Petitioner a faithful servant of 35 years standing -

butchery of the Acting collector
of Godavery -

Dated Secanada 31st October 63

5 That in conclusion the Petitioner humbly
begs that, under the explanation submitted by him
to the various charges brought against him by the
Acting collector & looking to the circumstance
that no actual guilt has been brought home
to the Petitioner, your Lordship in Council
will be pleased to order his restoration to his
post.

That for this act of justice the Petitioner
shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Madras
11th February
1865

Revenue Department
No. 502. 6
Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 8th ~~February~~ ^{March} 1865.

Read the following
Petition from C. Kammurige, late
Kammur of the Village of
Kannidada in the Taluk of
Rannachendrapooram, in the
Godavery District, now at Madras.

Being dissatisfied with
the order of Govt passed on his
petition of 16th 98 of 1864 - Encloses
herein a Memorial to the address
of the Secretary of State for India
and prays that it may be for-
warded for his consideration.

Here enter 11th Feb^y 1865.

From the Collector's
endorsement submitted by
the Memorialist, it appears
that he was dismissed on
account of general inability
and carelessness in the dis-
charge of his duties as
Kammur, under Section
VI (VII) of Reg: VI of 1831 -
Appeal against this order
was made in the first
instance

instance to the Board
whose decision, final
and conclusive under
the enactment quoted,
was confirmed by Govt^y
in the endorsement dated
22^d June 1864 passed
on his petition No. 1698
of 1864. Under these
circumstances the Govt^y
decline to forward his
Memorial to the Secretary
of State for India. -

JH

To Lp. Kammaraing D. des 10 March

Revenue 1565 with
a receipt for what

15302

P
27 of the March 1565
28 of the March 1565

1565 1565 1565

Declaring to transmit
to the Court the account
from the March 1565
to the March 1565