

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1077	Press Mis.
Dated	7-5-	1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1866.*

No. 115. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 25th April 1866, No. 2,901 :—

Read again letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 19th January 1866, No. 10, recorded in Board's Proceedings, 13th March 1866, No. 1,734.

Read also the following letter from the same Officer, dated 28th March 1866, No. 89.

In reply to Proceedings of Board, dated 13th March 1866, No. 1,734, I beg to inform them that Soloor Soobaya would have been long ago employed had his reputation been good. I took considerable trouble to ascertain from those under whom he had served, their opinions regarding him, but the opinions expressed, though not recorded officially, were adverse to him. Several native officials of position and standing, and unconnected with the Revenue Department, as well as my late Deputy Collector, Iyaloo Naidoo, spoke to me about Soloor Soobaya.

* As Vakil in the Civil and Session Court of Coimbatore, six years.
As head Gumashtha in do. Acting District Moonsiff of Colligal and Tahsildar of Errode, five years and ten months.

In consideration of their representations, and having regard to his past period* of service, I finally gave him his present appointment.

1. Ordered that the foregoing letters be submitted to Government, with the Board's recommendation that Soloor Soobaya be exempted from passing the Special Test Examination, consequent on his re-appointment to the service as Talook Sheristadar of Colligal. Soloor Soobaya had been Tahsildar of Errode for nearly three years, when that Talook was abolished on the re-arrangement of the District, and his case resembles that of Karunagara Menon, Tahsildar of Kotiyom in Malabar, who, in concurrence with the Board's views, was exempted by Government from passing the Special Test on his re-appointment even to the higher grade of Tahsildar. Karunagara Menon's case was considered by Government in their Proceedings of the 9th September 1864, No. 1,645. Soloor Soobaya has passed the District Moonsiff's test according to the old standard, and if Government think fit, he may be required to pass the Modified Test for Talook Sheristadar and Sub-Magistrate within a year.

2. Soobaya lost his appointment of Tahsildar of Errode in October 1860, and continued out of employment until November 1865, when he was nominated by Mr. Grant to the post of Sheristadar of Colligal which he now holds. It does not appear that for any specific misconduct he was so long left out of employment. All that the Board learn from the Collector's second letter, is that his former superiors had expressed unfavorable opinions of him to Mr. Grant. But as Mr. Grant has after all given him employment, having been induced to do so by the favorable testimony of many natives of standing both in the service and out of it, and as it is presumed that Mr. Grant has nothing to urge of his own knowledge against Soobaya, the Board do not see any bar to Soobaya's re-employment in the service.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1866.

No. 116.

ORDER THEREON, 7th May 1866, No. 1,077.

Miscellaneous.

1. Soloor Soobaya may be re-employed as Tulook Sheristadar, without passing; but he cannot be promoted to a Tahsildary without passing the Special Test.

2. The Government observe that he was promoted in 1858 to be a Tahsildar, from the post of a Court Gamashda on 21 Rupees per mensem, without so far as appears a day's revenue experience. Such a proceeding was highly improper.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Accountant General.

Ed. S. T. Augustin.

88.1077
Soloor Soobaya may be re-employed as Tulook Sheristadar, without passing. But he cannot be promoted to a Tahsildary without passing the Special Test.

The fact is that he was promoted in 1858 to be a Tahsildar from the post of a Court Gamashda on 21 Rupees per mensem without a day's revenue experience. Such a proceeding was highly improper.

all the same to the Board of Revenue
J. D. Sim, 7th May 1866.