M.R.O. 14-5,460-22-10-25.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1726 Press Mis.

Dated 12-7- 1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following letters:—

No. 239. From the Officiating Superintendent Revenue Survey, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Chepauk, 23rd November 1865, No. 1,293-55.

1. I have been ordered in G. O. No. 2,843, of the 20th November 1865, to obtain and submit Lieutenant Freeth's explanation of the circumstances under which he failed to comply with the requisition of the Officer Commanding Palamcottah to vacate a house he occupied within the limits of the Cantonment. I have the honor to state, for the information of Government, that as I was present at Palamcottah on a tour of inspection when the order was issued by the Commanding Officer, I am able to supply the information required.

2. The building occupied as a Survey Office (the Arsenal) was in G. O. No. 1,547, of the 6th July 1865, directed to be given up to the Inspector General of Jails, the order was peremptory and admitted of no delay.

3. There was no house disengaged and suited for an office either within or without the Military limits. Lieutenant Freeth, in the most considerate manner, gave up a house he had engaged outside the Military limits, and obtained permission to occupy a house inside the lines.

4. In September 1865 Lieutenant Freeth was ordered by me to prepare to march to Coorg, to take charge of the Coffee Estate Survey. I did not anticipate that he would be absent for more than five months. He requested the permission of the Commanding Officer to retain the house during his absence. Mr. B. W. Puckle, also an Assistant in the Revenue Survey, was at that time sharing the house with him.

5. He received notice to quit on the ground that the house was required for the use of an Officer of the Regiment.

6. At that time there were no less than nine houses, within the Regimental lines, not occupied by Officers of the Regiment.

7. The Officer in whose favor the house was required to be vacated, had already changed his house three times.

8. Major Barber, the Deputy Superintendent, under whose orders Lieutenant Freeth was placed, referred the matter to me.

9. It did not appear to me that the Commanding Officer was, under the circumstances, justified in ejecting Lieutenant Freeth. As requested by Major Barber, I reported the matter to the Adjutant General for submission to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. I did not consider the matter of sufficient importance to be submitted to Government.

10. Had there been any real necessity for the abandonment of the house, I am sure that Major Barber would not for a moment have allowed Lieutenant Freeth or Mr. B. W. Puckle to remain in possession after being required to vacate. I am equally certain that, under any circumstances, he would not have ventured to question the commands of the General Commanding the Division.

11. I am in a position to state that Lieutenant Freeth wrote from Mercara, where he is at present stationed, requesting Major Barber to remove his property.

I am not aware whether the Bungalow is still in the possession of Mr. B. W. Puckle or not.

12. I have, as directed, called on Lieutenant Freeth for his explanation, and will submit it directly it is received.

From the Officiating Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to the Adjutant General of the Army, Fort Saint George, dated Chepauk, 16th November 1865, No. 1,223-268.

1. I have the honor to state that Lieutenant Freeth of the Royal Artillery, Assistant Superintendent of Revenue Survey at Palamcottah, has been called on by the Officer Commanding the station to vacate a house he occupied within the limit of the Cantonment.

2. At the time that Lieutenant Freeth received the order above-mentioned there were nine houses within the limit of the Cantonment vacant, and not a single house beyond those limits available.

3. Lieutenant Freeth engaged the house with the permission of the Commanding Officer.

4. Lieutenant Freeth had made arrangements to occupy a house outside the Cantonment, but gave up his intention, as it was required for the use of the Revenue Survey as an Office, the building formerly in use for that purpose having been by order of Government handed over to the Inspector General of Jails.

Captain Wilson.

5. The Officer in whose favor the house is required to be vacated has changed his house three times already since he has been at Palamcottah.

6. Lieutenant Freeth has been ordered on duty to Coorg, but Mr. B. W. Puckle, an Assistant in the Survey, who shared the house with him, is anxious to be allowed to remain in possession.

Letter from Major Barber, dated 27th Sept. 1865, No. 378-96.
Do. do. 30th September 1865, No. 383-97.
Do. Lieutenant Freeth, 30th September.
Do. Head Quarters, 27th do.
Extract Head Orders by Commanding Officer, dated 14th June 1865.
} Enclosures to No. 350-97.

7. I enclose several letters bearing on the subject. I request that you will have the goodness to submit the case to his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.

No. 240. From the Officiating Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Chepauk, 3rd January 1866, No. 17-2.

1. I have, as directed in G. O. dated 20th November 1865, No. 2,848, the honor to enclose copy of a letter from Lieutenant Freeth, containing an explanation of the circumstances under which he failed to vacate a house he occupied in the Cantonment of Palamcottah, on being called on to do so by the Officer Commanding the station.

2. I have already in my letter of the 23rd November 1865, No. 1,293-55, fully detailed the circumstances of the case.

3. I respectfully submit that no disrespect to the Military authorities was intended by Lieutenant Freeth. In referring the matter he was guided by the opinion of his immediate superior, Major Barber.

4. I trust that the Government will be pleased to consider that Lieutenant-Colonel Dobbie was not justified in calling on Lieutenant Freeth to vacate his house.

5. The house, though within a Military Cantonment, was not absolutely required for a Regimental Officer, there being several other houses disengaged.

From the Assistant Superintendent in charge of Coorg Survey, to the Officiating Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Mercara, 28th November 1865, No. 100-19.

With reference to the explanation called for in Memorandum No. 1,307-87, dated 24th November 1865, I have the honor to bring to your notice the following circumstances.

1. I obtained the permission of the Officer Commanding Palamcottah to occupy the house referred to, with a proviso that should it be required for an Officer o. the Garrison, I should have to vacate it after a month's notice. G. O. G. No. 227 of 6th June 1862, was quoted as the authority for this condition.

2. After I had occupied the house for about a month, I received an order to vacate it at the end of thirty days, but as I considered that, under the circumstances, the Commanding Officer was not justified in ejecting me, as there were a number of other houses available within the Military limits, I wrote and informed him that I had referred the case to superior authorities, through the head of my Department, and requested him to hold his order in abeyance till the matter was settled. I received an answer that the Commanding Officer could not do so.

3. Shortly after this I was ordered to proceed to Coorg. I left all my furniture and effects in the house, being under the impression that I was to return in five or six months; my name was also ordered to be kept on the records of the Survey Party at Palamcottah, and it appeared to me that I should eventually be allowed to retain the house as the G. O. G. above quoted distinctly states that an Officer in Civil employ must vacate a house within a Military Cantonment in favor of a Regimental Officer only when absolutely required, which appears to me not the case when other houses are available.

4. After my arrival in Coorg, I received a letter from Colonel Dobbie, forwarding the decision of the Officer Commanding the Southern Division, viz., that I was to vacate the house. I did not consider any answer to this necessary, but waited for the result of the reference of the case through the heads of my own Department.

5. In the meanwhile, it was settled that my stay in Coorg should not be so temporary as was at first proposed. I immediately wrote to Palamcottah to have my effects taken out of the house. I knew it was about the date on which the month's notice would be up. I was not in possession of the dates, as all the correspondence had been forwarded to Major Barber when I referred the matter.

6. Ignorance of the dates of certain letters, and the delay in hearing the result of the reference made through my own Department, may have caused me to be late in having my effects removed from the house.

7. It will, therefore, be seen that there has been no wilful disrespect to the Military authorities on my part, I therefore respectfully beg to request that the Officer Commanding the Southern Division will withdraw that part of his letter in which my* conduct is styled as contumacious and disrespectful.

* From Officer Commanding Southern Division to the Quarter Master General of the Army, No. 244, dated 2nd November 1865.

8. I should also be obliged, for the information, as to whether the Officer Commanding Palamcottah was justified under the circumstances in ordering me to vacate the house.

9. I would also request that Major Barber may be asked for a corroboration of the facts contained in my letter.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. H. HESSEY, Major,
Officiating Superintendent Revenue Survey.

No. 241.

Miscellaneous.

ORDER THEREON, 12th July 1866, No. 1,726.

1. In the papers connected with this case, it appears that Lieutenant Freeth, an Officer attached to the Revenue Survey Department, obtained in the month of July last, a house within Military Cantonments at Palamcottah, on the usual condition of vacating it, if required, for the Officers of the Garrison.

2. In the month of September Lieutenant Freeth was ordered to march on survey duty to Coorg, but before the receipt of this order he was required by the Cantonment Commanding Officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Dobbie, to vacate the house within thirty days.

3. Lieutenant Freeth deeming himself hardly treated in being required to relinquish his lodging, made an appeal against the order referred to through Major Barber, his superior Officer in the Survey Department, by whom that appeal was to be transmitted to Major Hessey, and through him to the Adjutant General for the orders of the Commander-in-Chief.

4. Pending the decision of higher authority, Lieutenant Freeth did not make any preparation for vacating the house, but left it in charge of Mr. B. W. Packle of the Survey Department, who had been living with him, without, as far as appears, any authority to remove his furniture at the expiration of the period indicated in the order of Lieutenant-Colonel Dobbie.

5. After his arrival in Coorg, Lieutenant Freeth received a letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Dobbie, under date October 7th, acquainting him that the order requiring his house for an Officer of the Regiment had been confirmed by the General Commanding the Southern Division; but to this letter Lieutenant Freeth returned no reply, indeed he has stated in his letter of November 28th "that he did not consider any answer to it necessary;" nor did he give any orders to vacate his house, so that Lieutenant-Colonel Dobbie found himself, at the date when the house ought to have been vacated, in the necessity of soliciting the orders of the Major General Commanding the Division, by whom the circumstances were brought to the notice of the Commander-in-Chief.

6. The Governor in Council is of opinion that Lieutenant Freeth erred in leaving Palamcottah without taking measures for the evacuation of the house, and that he was guilty of grave disrespect to Lieutenant-Colonel Dobbie in not replying to the letter of that Officer, conveying to him the decision of the Major-General Commanding the Southern Division. His Excellency cannot see any justification for the reasons in the explanations alleged by Lieutenant Freeth and by Major Barber that there were other houses vacated in the Cantonment, that the Officer for whom the house was wanted had shifted his lodgings three times, and that no house outside of the Cantonment was to be had. These circumstances, if exact, might have been considered by the Commander-in-Chief on the representation of Major Hessey, but they afforded no justification for a disobedience of orders binding on every Civilian, and doubly binding on a Military Officer selected by the favor of Government and the permission of the Commander-in-Chief for civil duty.

7. The Commander-in-Chief has stated that, in his opinion, the error of which Lieutenant Freeth has been culpable, can only be sufficiently marked by removal from the Government appointment which he holds.

8. Before passing a final resolution on the subject, the Governor in Council desires that the whole correspondence connected with the case should be laid before the Commander-in-Chief. If His Excellency should discover in the circumstances alleged by Lieutenant Freeth, in his youth, or in the absence of any judicious advice on the part of Major Barber and Major Hessey, which these Officers might well have offered to their subordinate, some ground for mitigating his severe opinion respecting Lieutenant Freeth, the Government will then mark their condemnation of Lieutenant Freeth's conduct by conveying to him a strong expression of censure; but if His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief should, on re-consideration of the case, still deem it desirable, for the vindication of Military authority, that Lieutenant Freeth should be removed from his Civil office, the Government will act in conformity with the opinion of His Excellency.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Military Department,
,, the Officiating Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

From the papers con-
-nected with this case,
it appears that Lieut
Keeth originally occu-
-pied a house outside
the Cantonment limits,
the Survey office being
then located in the
Arsenal - The latter
building was however
transferred to the Pub.
Dept. and there being
no other suitable build-
-ings available, within or
beyond Military
limits, Lt. Keeth
fixed upon his house
for the Survey office
and obtained another
within Military limit
on the usual condition
of vacating it, if
required for Govt.
the Secy. of the Interior.
Lt Keeth left

Palamocotta for
Mercara in Lehb
Coast, on the 17th Inst
Mr. B. W. Rackle
of the Survey Dept,
who shaved the Route
with him as ast.

Shortly before his
departure, Lt Heath
had requested by the
Com[mandi]ng Officer, Col
Dobbie, to vaccinate
the troops on the in
30 days.

There were, it ap-
pears, at that time,
three other unoccu-
pied houses in the
Cantonment, and
the officer, on the
account Lt Heath
had requested to vacate
his house, in each

according to a Patent
on the part of Lt Heath
and Major Barker
a number unoccupied

and it is reported
that [illegible] the cantonments
there was not a single
house available.

place previously
change of his resi-
dence three times.

Considering
that the circum-
stances he had a
chance to obtain
house, Lt Heath had
the Major before
the Major Barker his im-
mediate superior who
referred it to
the Major Storey, the
Head of the Dept by
whom it was sub-
mitted to H.E. the
Commander

Lt Heath had
meanwhile proceeded
to Coorg, and await-
ing the result of the
reference made by
his Departmental
superiors, did not

fine upon the house
until the following
Wednesday - the notice
expired on the 22d
Inst.

The question is upon
the motion that Mr
Rice the right to have
given upon the house,
shall be postponed to-day,
for the purpose of awaiting
the result of his ap-
peal - It was on the
condition that he
obtained postponement
of the hearing, and he
had, under any cir-
cumstances bound
to obey the orders of
the Military authori-
ties, in a matter
which, if Mr Rice's
case was known, per-

his petition - It was
quite open to him to
appeal against the
decision - but before leaving Pa-
liament he ought
to have left instruc-
tions for the removal
of his property by
the day on which
the notice expired,
if his brother's order not
first intervened to be
reversed or rescinded
by higher authority.
For this disobedience
of orders, Major Barter
~~and Col Hartley~~
must also be held
in some degree re-
sponsible, as he ought,
in Mr Rice's absence
to have caused the house

to be rendered one day. the ~~order~~ [also when he made the reference] ~~Lord~~ & have written to L^d Rec^k marked the absolute necessity of his ~~[illegible]~~ ~~non-compliance~~ obeying the order, if not immediately set aside.

The French detrimental Colonel Decker has been sent with L^d Rec^k the very Letters written by him to which he has been privy and warning him against any respect to such encroachment.

The French feels confident that no

written to Lord Rec^k towards the Military and Writers now present by L^d Rec^k - and looking at the circumstances of the case - as well as L^d Rec^k's ~~[illegible]~~ qualifications for the service in which he is employed & his Lordship conducts in the business, H.E. considers that the continuance of such a character upon him ~~[illegible]~~ Constitutes defence & crime & form is Lordship for his benefit.

J. D.

The predicament in which Lieut. Keeth-
is placed, is not the first that has arisen
from the unconcerted power given to a Regt.
Commanding Officer to eject accomplices of known
in place, designated military Custom accords
but which in reality, are years upon Civil
Usage. Relinquishes Rank on an one of
there. - he has only been Lieut Colonel
of a Regiment of H. M. British Forces, enrolled
Contract by own authority in respect of
ejectment. So that extraordinary that
a Lieutenant, many years that Colonel's
Junior should have had an overbearing
opinion of a Senior Officers power in
such a matter?
Assuming however, Lieut. Keeth's error and
admitting he should at once have yielded
to Colonel Dobbin's requisition, I cannot help
feeling that the assertion of the officer
superior, Major Barker & Major Hope,
to assist on their subordinate & Redress
to Colonel Dobbin call, was a more serious
error than that which the Subordinate
has himself committed.
Forest, Prior Remedy of the Inter of the
Military Department should have pointed
to the unfortunate results of matters Lieut.
Keeth-med Col: Dobbin's requirement?
Lieutenant of Cavalry, they each of their
respect for a Superior to keep an attention
Contract the reference & by the delay consi-
quent-Prevent, they their Junior from the
the proposed Superintendency of Prince

cannot avoid saying that the gravamen of the
charge was a want of courage to meet the
enemy, when actually (what I cannot have been
sure of) in the sight of the 2nd Regt
which it was witnessed by the Lieutenant
Lieutenant.

I would observe further, that His Excy the
Commander in Chief's communication to Lt Col Dalton
by Lt Maitland, was written when His Excy
had had no opportunity of hearing or
perusing any of the explanations of this
matter which have been submitted to the
Court, since His Excy's view of the
Facts proceeding was intimated to the
Court. That view rests on the letter of
General Armstrong. Copy No 5. Ord^n; and
General Armstrong's letter, again, rests on
the Report of Colonel Dobbie, the officer
appointed by the Commander of the
Forces, which either Major Baker or
Maj^r Hepburn was, I am prepared.

I assume then, that in the Ord^r to act
on a suspicion of this the Commander in Chief was
the same punishment & train of proceedings
towards a Subaltern officer in Civil Employ,
though the Person that that suspicion was
offered when only the prosecutor's case
was heard & the accused had not been
offered an opportunity of making a defence
were totally at variance with the
whole system of Communication prevailing

between His Excellency & the subordinate
Military Branch. It would seem
to contravene the ordinary rules of
penitentiary jurisprudence: and if in Public
Prosecutions, if there the Chief had before
him the Papers were circulated, that
he would form the opinion he was en-
titled to take, that Major Baker
first, and then Major Hepburn are the
persons really blamable for allowing
their Police officer to come into collision
with the Military Commandant of
Palamcottah.

I feel doubtful in another respect: that
a Court martial sitting in Fort St George
for the trial of military Persons or Di-
rection, & finding them guilty, have recom-
mended a more severe punishment
than a reprimand? The measure of
Punishment to which the Court is disposed,
would be degradation & much severer
Corp. Many other respectable Persons,
Officers of the Staff Corps, but not
in your Corps will be probably
there for the Court. Can such Persons
then, or can
the Papers be submitted to the Adjutant
of Department Portion, without
which, I much doubt whether Colonel
Dobbie would ever have sentenced
to Pay or Rank Suitable & for in the
Line.

I would add to the Conclusion

Saturday. July 7. 66.

My dear Lord Napier -

So many unwelcome
packets came before me yesterday,
that I was unable to thank your
Lordship for the note in re the
Doctor & Keith case, kindly written
& sent late on Thursday evening.
I feel most fully with the decision
& the high military discipline and
Subordination which your Lordship has
so well enforced. But I somehow
feel doubtful whether Lieut. Keith
intended to be defiant. What could
he fancy he? The fact of his having
made a reference to superiors au-
thority, and the further fact that
that reference was accepted & acted
on by those to whom it had been addressed
by Lieut. Keith, may have caused

I have no acquaintance whatever with
Lieut. Keith or any one who may be hap-
pened to be [illegible] since
I have never seen Lieut. Keith -

5 Feb 66

Ld N

I feel most strongly the importance of the
case pressed by Major Barker and Rogers
Report. They ask that I have impressed on the
young man the duty of instantly obeying in the
most respectful manner the orders of the
Commanding Officer even while making an appeal
to the Court in Chief. Major Gen. Quarter Master
Gen. but I cannot shall exonerate Lieut. Keith.
He appears to have contemplated the retention of
his lodging against the orders of Lt Col. Dothie and
Genl. Anthony even while absent at Koorgaum he
did address another respectful reply to a
communication addressed to him by Lt Col Dothie
by order of the Genl Commanding the Division. Such
indeed was altogether contemptuous and indeed
disrespectful conduct. The first duty
of a young soldier is to obey the law and his
superior officer. He does not cease to be a soldier
in becoming a surveyor. The authority to eject
civilians from houses in cantonments is an undeniable
and necessary power. How can be expect civilians
to obey if officers themselves refuse. I cannot
countenance any tendency on the part of officers to neglect
a civil duty to assert military authority. Their
affections and their duty might both be put to a severe
strain did they have to do so. I observe in military
matters to use the best counter the Commander

the few days delay in receiving the 30 dollars the Police for me. I intended.

The defence however, of your Lordships opinion, I have incited the Deputy Governor & Colonel Lodge with a request that I may be passed on to the Secretary in Chief for Colony and despatch of your Lordship does not allow me to do it.

I might not disclose part the contract or modified somewhat, until hearing the Post position connected to the Patent address of this Bay the Chief Justice & Crew. I believe I shall receive answer by next Packet.

and are mere clamp as friendship by Sudney to Rio Janeiro what he buy coal away to his advice from the Governor Bank, but as opportunity of Sunday.

But I mere Thank the Secretary for your Lordships kind consideration not have to increase the trouble this matter must have caused already. I passed on and stand, the draft note be drawn in the Portuguese and officially signed. I remain

My Lord's Most

R D Lodge

Discharge of the
Under Sheriff

Capias order
Sovereign

Queens Bench
Trinity 1865
Record the following Writs from the
Office of the Queens Remembrancer
Queens Bench 23rd November 1865 No 1247
Queens Bench 3rd January 1866 No 17

For the Reasons Contained
in the Case, of Affidavits
filed Certificate Exhibit &c &c
Rule absolute to be Discharged
Accordingly, without Costs
Per Curiam
Rule Discharged
Queens Bench Trinity 1865
Record the following Writs from the
Office of the Queens Remembrancer
Queens Bench 23rd November 1865 No 1247
Queens Bench 3rd January 1866 No 17

For the Reasons Contained
in the Case, of Affidavits
filed Certificate Exhibit &c &c
Rule absolute to be Discharged
Accordingly, without Costs
Per Curiam
Rule Discharged

To the Adjutant General for the
Orders of the Commander in Chief.

Reading the decision of Lieut
Lieut Freeth directed that
any preparation for vacating the
house, but left in charge of
by B. M. Packe of the Survey
Department, entered, so far as
appears, any authority to remain
in occupation of the expiration
of the period indicated in the
order of Lt Colonel Dobbie.

After his arrival at Corfu
Lieut Freeth received a letter from
Lt Colonel Dobbie under date 28th
requesting him to the Orders
respecting his leave for an Officer
of the Regiment had been confirmed
by the General Commanding the
Ionian Division: but of the letter
Freeth returned no reply, decided he has
stated in his letter of November
28th "that he did not consider any
Answer to if necessary" nor did
he give any orders to vacate
his house to Lt Colonel
Dobbie found himself on the
Receipt of Orders for the Orders

Note Date
when the house ought to
have been vacated

of the Major General Commanding
the Division the circumstances
together with the Copies of the
Correspondence
The Governor in Council is
of opinion that Lieut Freeth was
in Error if he remained after
receiving Intimation from the Executive
of the House, that the house
Quarters of Field Officer Com-
Colonel Dobbie as Representing
the Letter of that Officer com-
ferred to him the Decision upon
the Major General Commanding
the Ionian Division.
Gentlemen Council does not see any just
Objection for the Conduct on the
Occasion alleged by Lieut
Freeth And by Major Gordon
that there were other houses vacant
at the Government that this Officer
for whom the House was intended
did not refuse the Lodging offered
them, And that the Commanding
Officer Commanding cannot be held
Responsible for Orders which
might have been issued by
the Commander in Chief
Corfu
Representation of Council

Deputy, but they afforded no
justification for a considerable
Number tending on every
Civilian and doubly tending
on a Military Officer selected
by the favor of Government for
Civil duty.

The Commander in Chief has
stated that in his opinion the
error of which Lt Freeth has
been culpable, can only be
sufficiently marked by removal
from the Government appointment
which he holds. The Governor
in Council cannot but feel that the
sentence thus recommended is above
par, but with a keen to the official
superior of His Excellency Govern in
a Matter which nearly concerns the
Vindication of Military Authority
the Governor is constrained to accede to
the views of the Commander in Chief
Lieutenant Freeth will therefore be
removed from his employment in the
Revenue Survey Department and his
services will be placed at the
disposal of the Commander in Chief
The Governor in Council regrets
that Captain Barker did not deem

from 6

Before passing a resolution
on the subject the Go-
vernor in Council
desires that the
whole correspondence
connected with the
case should be submitted
to the Judgement of
the Commander in Chief.
If His Excellency should
this course
circumstance alleged
by Lt Freeth, in his
favour, it is the absence
of any evidence other
than the oath of Frazer
corroborated by Lieut and Brigade

such Plea Officers
might not have
offered a Plea
sufficient ground for mitigation
his severe sentence on
the Government Servant
and then mark the
condemnation of Lt
Freeth conduct by
censure, but if His
Excellency the Commander in Chief
should, on reconsideration
of the case, still deem
it necessary to mark
disapprobation of Freeth's
conduct that a
censure should be passed
by the Government
it will be necessary
that it should be
conformable with the
sentence of His Excellency

case with the
view to the expediency of
recommending Officers
to the discretion of
the Commander in Chief

Received 1866 Aug 8
by Governor Seely

No 1926.

Proof the Madras
Government
of 13th July 1866.

Pro. of Govt Pub. Dept. of
27 July 1866 No 2290

Pro. No 3685 of 2. 11. 65

Correspondence on Lieut
Heath's disrespectful &
improper Conduct towards Public
Authorities. Turbunal of
the Commissioner of Police
to Govt.