M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-9-24.

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

---

## Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

| | |
|---|---|
| G.O. No. 1955 | Press ~~Mis.~~ |
| 88.89 | |
| Dated 4 — 8 — ~~19~~ 1855 | |

***Not to be folded or roughly handled***

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
*4th August* 1866.

No. 88. Read the following Petition from DROMARAZ NARASINGA ROW, late Tahsildar of Amalapurum Talook, in the Godavery District, to His Excellency the Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, dated 14th July 1866:—

MOST HUMBLY SHOWETH,

1. That your Petitioner being employed in high places for fourteen years, of which he had been a Tahsildar for seven years, is now ordered by your Excellency to accept a very inferior place, which proved an insurmountable disgrace to your Petitioner. The Order having been given him on the 10th July 1866, your Petitioner, with great regret for the reverse of fortune, submits three copies of an appeal petition to His Lordship the Secretary of State for India, imagining that His Lordship at least may grant him the boon he is most earnestly requesting. Although your Excellency was persuaded by your Petitioner's ill-luck to pass such an unfavorable order to him, he now earnestly hopes that your Excellency will despatch the enclosures to London, and now obtain for him the favorable permission to fill up his former post.

2. Your Petitioner most humbly craves to know from your Excellency if he has not the privilege of filling up a Tahsildar's place when bestowed upon by any generous gentleman who might be well acquainted with his conduct and abilities, although Mr. Fraser unjustly declared him unfit for it.

3. Your Petitioner ultimately hopes that your Excellency will kindly favor him with an endorsement to this humble petition.

---

No. 89. ORDER THEREON, 4th August 1866, No. 1,955.

Miscellaneous.

Ordered that the Memorial received with the foregoing letter be forwarded to the Home Authorities, and that an intimation of the fact be given to the Memorialist.

(True Extract.)

*Under Secretary to Government.*

Exd. T. Cartledge.

TO

HIS LORDSHIP THE RIGHT HONORABLE
THE SECRETARY OF STATE
*for India.*

*The humble appeal Petition of Dronumraz Narasinga Row late Tahsildar of Amalapurum Taluq in the Godavery District*

My Lord,

1. That your Memorialist aggrieved by the decision of the Madras Government and its authorities respectfully submits his case to your Lordship in Council and begs to state that he served the Government for 14 years in various situations to the entire satisfaction of his immediate superiors by which he obtained promotion to the post of 3rd Class Tahsildar on 200 Rs. per mensem.

2. He held the latter post for 7 years with credit to himself and the entire approbation of the Collector Mr. Arthur Purvis who had been long in the District for nearly 10 years and who had greater amount of experience of the conduct of each servant minutely. The high opinion entertained by the said gentleman as to your Lordshp's Memorialists conduct will be evident from the certificate marked (E) He had also served Mr. T. A. N. Chase for nearly eight years who fully, acquainted with his conduct and qualifications granted him the testimonial marked B. The testimonials marked A. and C. were given him by Mr. Rundall and Sashiah who were no strangers to his up-right conduct for 5 and 14 years respectively. Those certificates which he had obtained from other respectable gentlemen were unfortunately for your Lordship's Memorialist, burnt up with his house in 1862.

3. Notwithstanding which, shortly after the arrival of a new Collector, Mr. James Fraser, your Lordships Memorialist fell in his displeasure, not by any neglect of public duty, but by some cause or other which your Lordships Memorialist is unable to discover, and he with his few months experience of the District and the personal acquintance of your Lordships Memorialist but only once, took advantage of a call from the Board of Revenue for a list of worn out servants " and sent up your Lordship Memorialist's name with it, though he was aged 38 years, with a remark that he is most indifferent.

4. That on a second call from the said Board of Revenue for an explanation of the term used by him, he was obliged to justify his expression and therefore sent a reply marked B behind the back of your Lordship's Memorialist and without giving him any opportunity whatever to explain his conduct. The result of such a proceeding was that the Board of Revenue without asking or hearing your Lordship's Memorialist at all, passed an order that he should be removed from his appointment and desired to retire on gratuity.

5. That your Lordship's Memorialist feeling aggrieved at this arbitrary deprivation of his appointment obtained copies of the foregoing correspondence by which it was evident that no dishonesty or misconduct was imputed to him but that it was alleged that he was considered to be " mentally and physically unfit for duty."

6. That your Lordship's Memorialist then wishing to clear the matter appeared before the medical officer of the District and obtained a certificate of fitness which he (Memorialist) then submitted with his petition to the Board of Revenue for a re-consideration of his case. The said Petition is herewith submitted as it answers all the points reported against him in B.

7. That the Board of Revenue still refused your Lordship's Memorialist that consideration which his case deserved on the ground that they had already passed an order against him and furnished your Lordship's Memorialist with an endorsement.

8. On presenting to the Government the appeal petition marked (J.) against the manifest injustice done to him in the Revenue Board, and as regards his restoration to his former post, the former without even attempting to elicit the truth of the Collector's statement, either by giving your Lordship's Memorialist an opportunity to explain himself or by properly demanding true explanation of the Collector as to the pointe of the appeal petition, and without giving due consideration to the nature of the grounds employed in favor of his dismissal, asked the Collector if your Lordship's Memorialist had ever been fined, and if he (the Collector) had any objection to confer upon him a place inferior to a Tahsildar's, having resolved, it would appear, not to see him in possession of his former post. The Collector who had in a previous occasion recommended your Lordship's Memorialist to the Board of Revenue for a lower grade Tahsildar's place, finding the government inclined to disfavor him, now answered them saying that he was fit for a place inferior to a Taluq Sheristadar's.

9. It can be easily guessed that the Collector who was prevailed upon, by the evil machinations of your Lordship's Memorialist's adversaries in his office, to do him every kind of ill office and reduce him to the brink of ruin would when consulted in the same matter do nothing more than justify his deed, however unjust it might be.

10. " The appeal petition of your Lordship's Memorialist intimated that the order they might pass thereon without having recourse to a satisfactory investigation of his case will prove a greater disgrace to him than that of the Board of Reuenue. It also stated, that the Government would be pleased to take defence from your Lordship's Memorialist before they give him a final decision, to peruse the testimonials of his ability and good conduct favored him by many a generous gentleman whom he had the fortune to serve respectively, and to consider how he conducted his public business in the copacity of a Tahsildar. He did not fail to observe in the same petition the facts, that because he sweated blood and water in the discharge of public functions he is now obliged to boast of a spotless public career of fourteen years ; that if the Government should ponder upon these points, they would justly declare him eligible for the place which he is now prohibited from filling : and that if on the other hand he, like the newly entertained servants, is still held, the object of their suspicion in spite of his unquestionably faithful services, they may try him in any other district by nominating him the Acting Tahsildar there of. He concludes the petition saying that should the Government decide his case taking for their guide the unfounded statement of the Collector they would be doing such an injustice as will be watched by nothing on the face of the earth. This petition was presented to the Government on the 7th June who, promising to declare themselves in favor of justice, ultimately, and according to the statement of the Collector endorsed it saying that your Lordship's Memorialist should take up a place inferior to a Taluq Sheirstador's which is a Goomastah worth 20 Rs. although he held the high place of Tahsildar worth 200 Rs. per month not with standing his faithful services strongly merited speedy promotion (vide K.)

11. In the reply of the Collector to the Government, the former far from being able to refute the points of the Petition marked(H) and declare them untrue, excused himself saying that your Lordships Memorialist had on some occasions been fined, and that complaints had been preferred by the taluq people against his holding office at home and thus making himself invisible by his subjects.

12. Your Lordships Memorialist thinks that none of the Tahsildars of the District has ever escaped the penalty of fine. Eeven those that enjoyed the confidence and good will of Mr. Fraser have been the more frequently fined. Those trifling charges for which your Lordships Memorialist was fined should properly be imputed to the Taluq sheirstadors, who being purposely appointed to close the accounts delayed to do it in time.

13. The Amalapurm Taluq unlike the other Taluqs contains no building spaicous enough to hold the office of a Tahsildar. There is, however, a small station house in it which had been formerly made use of by the Sayer Darogas. It is now of very little utility in as much as it affords sheeter only to the Records and cash chest, and provides a seat for a single shroff. It is therefore no wonder that Tahsildars were wont to hold their office at their homes.



When in the late arrangement two or three Taluqs were amalgamated into one, the records having been proportionately multiplied and occupied every creek and corner of the Station house that your Lordships Memorialist was obliged to hire a house and adjacent to his, for the holding of the office. The fact of his paying rent out of his pocket and assembling his officers at home for the discharge of public duties had been many a time reported to the Collector both orally and in writing who merely tantaliged your Lordshsp's Memorialist with the promise of a new building. He begs to submit that he had recourse to this measure in the absence of any other building and not without the knowledge and consent of the Collector.

14. When in the commencement of 1864, Mr. Morris (the acting Collector) arrived at this Taluq of Amalapurem for Jamabundy, your Lordship's Memorialist did not fail to apprize him of the inconvenience cosed by the want of a Cutcherry building and of the loss of his money paid as rent. The Collector seeing in person that not an inch of floor in that station house is left unoccupied by the Records, ordered him to hire a house in the vicinity of the stationhouse whose rent he promised to pay contingent henceforth. Your Lordships Memoralist accordingly bespoke a house for rent and therein held his office.

15. Had the station house presented a spacious and convenient place when Mr. Morris visited it he could have been impelled by no necessity to issue orders for hiring a place at the expense of the Gevernment. Your Lordship may well conceive how those things that had passed long ago are now brought to mind to form some plausible charges againts your Lordships Memorialist,

16. Your Lordsihips Memorialist would admit his subjects into his presence from 7 in the morning till 10 in the night. How is Mr. Fraser then justified in saying that he was invisible by his snbjects.

17. If according to the statement of the Collector he had had any comylaints against your Lordships Memorialist he would dobtless have brought him to trial forthwith and punished him. It can frankly and justly be said that the people suffered much from the Collector for the following reasons rather than from your Lordiships Memorialist who never let slip any opportunity of doing them justice and who was therefore confident that none would have said any thing against him. Besides, the people of the Taluq presented Mahazarnamahs to the Board of Revenue and Government concerning your Lordship's Memorialist whom Now Mr. Fraser nevertheless intends to ruin by imputing to him false charges.

18. When Mr. Fraser came to this Taluq for Jamabundy your Lordsihp's Memorialist repaired to the precincts of his Taluq to welcome him, as usual. His arrival thither being made known to the Collector, he ordered his peons to tell your Lordship's Memorialist to post at his tent a dozen of strong palanquin bearers and two peons who were well acquainted with the places frequented by storks &c. This is what the Collector had with the Tahsildar of a Taluq yielding a revenue of lacs of Rupees nearly, on the occasion of Jamaubundy.

19. He divided all the cases committed by the Taluq Magistrates between the Principal Sudder Ameen and the H. Assistant Collector. If any cases were committed during the a adjournment of the Court he would refer them to the Dy. Collector Kauthumbary Jagunnatha Row for enquiry rather than do it for himself.

20. Mr. Fraser further laid down that no petitions either of Revenue or Magisterial business will be received and taken notice of unless they are presented only in person by the parties themselves on a certain day of the week. Some of the people whose interests would be much affected by undertaking a costly journey to the head quarters of the Collector, would give up all hopes of suing for redress. And the others who could not help appearing before him are detained arriving in time or not there either for nor being able to see the Collector on the day fined and conse quently suffer much damage from their hopes not being realized.*

21. Your Lordship's Memorialist was never in the habit of giving people any cause of annoyance by receiving brives from them and thus ingratiating himself into the good graces of the Hoozoor officers. This is known not only to all the people around but also to many Eng-

lish gentlmen.* These facts and the fact of the Civil Judge having once referred to the High Court have been published in the District Gazette. If he is permitted to speak more on the subject a large volume will not suffice to convey all that can be said against him. Fearing that the prolixity of the petition might exhaust your Lordship's patience your Lordship's Memorialist drops it for the present.

22. Those that enjoy the good will of the Hoozoor officer have the fortune to pass for innocent and honest people notwithstanding they are guilty of serious acts. But if any one has the misfortune to incur their displeasure even though he be an honest and faithful servant he is found guilty of some trivial act, which is truly trifling with others, and subsequently deprived of his means of subsistence. Such a kind of injustice is far from deserving the protection of the British Government.

23. It is highly ungenerous on the part of the Revenue Board and the Government and contrary to the British policy that far from giving due consideration to the testimonials given by the most respectable predecessor of Mr. Fraser and in spite of many instances of your Lordship's Memorialists zeal and integrity they credited and acted according to the words of a single individual (Mr. Fraser) whose ears are possessed by his officers and whose qualifications are by no means favorable from the facts stated above.

24. Your Lordship's Memorialist believes that your Lordship will be convinced of the truth of his statement and that the progress and prosperity of the kingdom owe chiefly to the impartial distribution of justice which characterizes the British Govornment at home though not in the far off dominions.

25. That your Lordship's Memorialist now ventures as the only means of getting final redress in the face of the open unjustice done to him after a long service extending to 14 years in the Madras Government to submit this Memorial to your Lordship in Council in the [illegible] hope that he will receive that justice which he failed to obtain here.

26. That your Lordship's Memorialist submits with profound respect that it is to be remembered that his present arbitrary dismissal is based on the alleged mental and physical unfitness, though the contrary was previously certified by the former Collector of long experience and others in strong terms and also by the medical officer of the District; and that your Memorialist served in the same post and in the same District for 7 years without any complaint whatsoever.

27. That in conclusion your Lordship's Memorialist craves leave to submit that without the interference of your Lordship in Council in these matters though very trifling before your Lordship, the Native servants have no hope of any reward for labor and honesty in the hands of the local Government and its officials and that the enclosures speaking for themselves how hardly your Memorialist has been dealt with, after a long and honest career, your Lordship's humble Memorialist refrains from making any further attempt to take your Lordship's time and reposes his entire confidence on your Lordship's justice.

Your Memorialist as in duty bound,
shall ever pray.

14*th July* 1866.

No. I. ENCLOSURES TO THE PETITION.

Translation of a Teloogoo order issued by James, Fraser Esquire, Collector of the Godavery District to Dronumrazoo Narasinga Row, Tahsildar of the Amalapurum Talook dated Coconada 13th November 1865.

The Board of Revenue have in their Proceedings of the 20th Ultimo, directed that you are to be recommended for a gratuity, and removed from your present appointment on four main grounds namely:—

1st. That you are utterly destitute of the qualification, requisite to fill the post of a Tahsildar

2nd. That you have been negligent in examining and reporting upon the state of cultivation in certain villages under your charge, as well as in disposing of petty disputes, between parties, and in replying to certain references made to you.

3rd. That you are utterly disqualified to discharge your Magisterial duties, as you are not sufficiently acquainted with the Penal Code &c.

4th. That you are incapacitated by your extreme ill-health, from discharging your responsible duties, as the head of a Taluq, and from actively employing your subordinate officials.

2. You are therefore hereby imformed that you have been removed from your Tahsilship, from this date, and that you are to deliver over charge of your office and of your general Treasury to Azzarapu Ramannah the Tahsildar of Rajamundry Taluk, who is temporarily to succeed to your appointment, and to obtain receipt from that officer. Further, it being necessary to recommend you for gratuity, in accordance with the orders of the Board, you are required to furnish a list shewing your service.

13-11-65.

(Signed) J. FRASER,
*Collector.*

No. II. ENCLOSURE A.

RAZOLE,
*24th November* 1865.

TO
D NARSINGA ROW,

Sir,

I have received your letter of yesterday's date I am very sorry that this trouble has come upon you; I know that Mr. Purvis, had a high opinion of you, and sent you on that account, to the notoriously troublesome Taluk of Amalapoor. During the five years you have been there, I have always heard you spoken of, with respect, by the ryots and others for your probity

I hope you may be able to obtain another appointment soon.

I am, your's faithfully,

(Signed) J. W. RUNDALL,
*Executive Engineer, Godavery*

---

No. III. ENCLOSURE B.

I have known Dronumraz Narasinga Row, for several years. Lately he was Tahsildar of Amalapoor in the Godavery District, and unfortunately fell sick. My opinion of him was that he was honest and hardworking.

MUSULIPATAM.
*6th December* 1865.

(Signed) T. CHASE,
*Acting Collector*

---

No. IV. ENCLOSURE C.

I have known Dronumraz Narasinga Row, from the commencement of his career, in the late Masulipatam District as a Sherashta Goomashta, and Moonshee attached to the Head Assistant Collector. He distinguished himself, by his superior intelligence, and probity, and this led to his promotion to his present post, at the recommendation of Mr, T. A. N. Chase. I believe he fully maintains the high character he previously earned, and during the settlement of the Inams of the Chintallapoondi Taluk, he was of the greatest assistance to me, and I take this opportunity of recording it with much pleasure. I fully trust his future in public life, may be as good as the past, and hope to hear of his early promotion, of which I believe he is fully deserving.

(Signed) A. SESHIAH,

ELLORE,
*8th April* 1860.
*Deputy Collector attached to the Inam Commission.*

---

*Remark.*—D Narasinga Row to whose Character, I bore the above testimony, having lost the original when his house was burnt down at Amalapoor, and sent me for renewal a copy, which happened to be preserved from destruction, I have much pleasure in stating that the above was the testimonial I had given him.

(Signed) A SESHIA,

COIMBATOOR,
11th *August* 1863.
*Special Assistant to the Inam Commission.*



No. V ENCLOSURE D.

This is to Certify that I have examined Dronumraz Narasinga Row, late Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate of Amalapoor Taluk, and I consider him to be at present in good health and fit for the public service.

(Signed) THOMAS CROUDACE.

RAJAHMUNDRY,
*4th December* 1865.
*Civil Surgeon.*

---

No VI. ENCLOSURE E.

NAME, DRONUMRAUZ NARASINGA ROW, AGE WHEN FIRST ENTERTAINED 23 YEARS.

| Establishment. | Date. | Appointment. | Salary. | | Period of Service in each appointment. | | | Remarks regarding punishments, service, and formal, reprimands, and all special commendations or marks of approbations. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Rs. | A. | Ys. | Ms. | Ds. | 6 |
| Late Masulipatan District Collector's Office | 14th May 1852 ... | Sherista Madatgar ... | 14 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 21 | |
| Do. Head Assistant Collector's Office. | 5th October 1854. | Revenue Moonshee ... | 17 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 15 | I have a high opinion of this Officer as regards integrity, and desire to do his duty to the Government and the people of his Taluk which is a very large one. (Sd.) A. Purvis, *Collector.* 11-5-63. |
| | 20th October 1856. | Do. do. ..... | 19 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 30 | |
| | 19th January 1857 | Do. do. ..... | 20 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 25 | |
| Do. Collector's Office | 15th March 1859.. | Sherista Head Madatgar ... | 450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| | 28the March 1859 | Tahsildar of Chintallapoody Taluk. | 470 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 10 | |
| Collector of the Godavery District. | 7th February 1861 | Amaldar of Amalapoorum Taluk. | 100 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | |
| | 17th April 1862... | Tahsildar of do. .. ... | 200 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4 | |

(True Extracts.)

## ENCLOSURE F.

COCANADA,
16*th September* 1865.

No. 207.

From

JAMES FRASER Esq.

*Collector of the Godavery District.*

To

R. A. DALYELL Esq.

*Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue.*

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Board's Proceedings No. 5340 dated 31st August 1865.

2. In Regard to Dronumrauz Nursing Row Tahsildar of Amalapoor Taluk, I beg to state that my attention was first particularly called to his conduct when I was conducting the Jamabundy of that Taluk in the early part of this year—I noticed of finding him fully informed in regard to all little village disputes regarding ownership or irrigation of land boundaries and such like, the settlement of which is often deferred till this season of the year because the collector himself may be at or near the spot, the Tahsildar, though in many cases the disputes had been referred to him long before for enquiry and report, had done and knew nothing about them whatever, so that they very often had to lie over awaiting his liesure instead of being settled in the presence of the disputants.

3. Again he is excessively remiss in answering answers written and reference made to him—This is noticed by the Board in their letter No. 5355 of 31st August and received on 13th instant—Remainders have litte or no effect on him. He is of a sickly habit of body and suffers much from beri beri or some dropsical affection which makes him lazy and sluggish in his habits—He is very irregular in his hours of attending office and often performs work in his own house instead.

4. I found that he had been most culpably remiss in examining into the state of cultivation of the large and valuable Lunkahs in his Taluk. He had not visited some of them for years; in these, large quantities of land held at a very low or nearly grazing rate, ought to to have been assessed atusual lunka rates years ago and would have been under ordinarily active man who could and would move about his talook as he ought,—In this part of his duty. Nursinga Row is particularly remiss. His habits are lazy and indolent, propably the state of his health partly induces this.

5. It is a pity he was ever selected for his present post for which he certainly is not fit—He is a bad sub Magistrate, and not likely to improve I think, being utterly ignorant of English and therefore unable to comprehend the Penal and Procedure Codes in original.

6. Strictly speaking he is not fit for the Head place in any office—such an inefficient head is sure to infect his subordinates and make them inefficient too.

7. If however the Board object to his dismissal as incompetent he might be tried in a Talook such as Peddapoor where the work and Revenue are less than in Amalapoor. He has not served long enough to qualify him for any pension—The Peddapoor man is, I think, deserving of promotion, so also is the Rajamundry Tasildar.

(Signed) J. FRASER,
*Acting Collector.*

---

## ENCLOSURE G.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 20th October 1865 No. 6671.

The Board would not be justified with such a report before them in allowing D. Nursinga Row to remain any longer at the head of any Talook—He appears to be mentally and physically unfit for duty and should at once be removed and desired to retire with such gratuity as may be due to him under the Rules.

---

## H

TO

THE

PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE
BOARD OF REVENUE,
*MADRAS.*

THE APPEAL PETITION OF D. NARASINGA ROW, LATE TAHSILDAR AND SUB-MAGISTRATE OF AMALAPOORUM TALOOK, IN THE GODAVERY DISTRICT.

SHOWITH,

1. That on the 13th November last, your Petitioner was unjustifiably removed from his Office, by the Collector Mr. Fraser, for alleged inefficiency and bodily infirmity, as may be seen from the Collector's Teloogoo order, which is herewith submitted, with a translation.

2. That while the Collector's letter against Your Petitioner was pending before the Board, he addressed three* Petitions on the dates noted in the margin, praying that final orders may not be passed, on the Collector's letter, before allowing your Petitioner, an opportunity of submitting his defence; but as Your Petitioner's request was not complied with by the Board, and as it appeared from the Collector's Teloogoo order quoted above, that it was with the sanction of the Board, that your Petitioner was removed, simply on the statement of the Collector, Your Petitioner addressed the Board on the 18th November last, expressing his desire of preferring an appeal.

* 13th September 1865
17th Do. "
21st Do. "

3. The main grounds alleged by the Collector for your Petitioner's removal are as follows:—

1st. That your Petitioner does not possess the requisite qualification to fill the post of a Tahsildar.

2nd. That he has been remiss in examining into the state of cultivation of the Villages under his charge.

3rd. That he has been very careless in disposing of the petty village disputes relative to the ownership of land, &c., and in replying to certain references made to him by the Collector.

4th That he was quite disqualified to discharge the functions of a Sub-Magistrate, not being sufficiently acquainted with the Penal Code, &c

5th. That he was not fit to be at the head of a Talook, as he was a sickly man.

4. In regard to the first, your Petitioner begs to state that he has been in the public service, for a period of nearly fourteen years, filling onerous and responsible situations, such as Revenue Goomastah, Revenue and Magistrate Moonshee, and Tahsildar and Sub Magistrate. During the whole course of your Petitioner's service, he has invariably afforded the highest satisfaction to his several employers,† as will be seen from the testimonials granted to him. These testimonials were unfortunately burnt in the year 1862, when the house in which he lived took fire. This fact will at once be evident from your Petitioner's report to the then Collector Mr. Purvis, and that Gentleman's Takeed or order to your Petitioner expressing his regret for the loss of his papers, &c., The late distinguished Collector of the Godavery District Mr. A. Purvis, who administered the District for about eleven years, and who was pleased to promote your Petitioner from a lower grade of Tahsildarship to a higher grade on 200 Rupees per mensum, entertained a very high opinion of your Petitioner's services, as will appear from the Extract of the Testimonial enclosed * The two letters recently written to your Petitioner by T. A. N. Chase Esquire,† Acting Collector of the Kristna District, and by the Executive Engineer J. W Rundall, Esquire‡ of the Godavery District, who had ample opportunities of observing closely the official conduct of your Petitioner, will also bear testimony to your Petitioner's, efficiency and character. Further the enclosed testimonial granted to your Petitioner, by the Special Assistant M. R. R Seshiah* to the Inam Commission, will show the useful assistance, your Petitioner rendered to that officer, while settling the Inams in the Chintallapoody Talook, of which he was Tahsildar at the time.

† T. D. Lushington Esquire.
W. Knox, Esquire.
A. Purvis, Esquire.
Tweadi, Esquire
W. Holloway, Esquire.
T. A. N. Chase, Esquire.
G. A. Ballard, Esquire.
Bird, Esquire.

* Vide Enclosure E.

† Vide Enclosure B.

‡ Vide Encloure A.

5. Your Petitioner would further beg to add that during the whole period of his seven year's service as Tahsildar and Sub Magistrate, he had not only distinguished himself by a deligent and correct performance of his very responsible duties, as must be evident, from the very fact of his not having, ever, been censured, by any of his employers, either in his Revenue or Magisterial business, but he can also conscientiously state that he has secured the good will of the Ryots, by his upright conduct, as testified to, by the late Collector Mr. Purvis.*

* Vide Enclosure E.



6. The Amalapoorum Talook in which alone your Petitioner was employed as Tahsildar for the past 5 years, is well known to be an important and a very troublesome one, and as such his duties were by no means light. Consequently he was obliged to get over them, with an unusual amount of exertion and promptitude. The Revenue Collections of this Taluk, had always been very backward; but ever since your Petitioner assumed charge of the Taluk nearly five years ago, he has adopted stringent measures for the speedy realization of the Revenue, and the comparative result of the five years prior to, and five years subsequent, to your Petitioner joining the Taluk, is as shown in the margin * It will be observed that the Per Centage of balance, during the first series of years ranged from 10 to 4, whereas in the latter series, it ranged only from 2 to almost nothing. The demand of the more recent years will also show a gradual increase of Revenue in the aggregate, which is attributable partly to the enlargement of the Talook, and mainly to the annual increase of Revenue, under the head of Lunka lands, which your Petitioner was in the habit of inspecting from time to time, and inducing the Ryots to take up for cultivation instead of holding them on a light assessment for grazing purposes

STATEMENT SHOWING THE DEMAND & COLLECTION IN EACH FUSLI, IN THE TALUQ OF AMALAPOOR

| Fusli. | Demand. | Collection. | Balance. | Collection suspended as per Collector's order | Net Balance. | Per Centage between columns 2 and 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1265 | 1,52,929 15 11 | 1,37,033 10 10 | 15,896 5 1 | 0 0 0 | 15,896 5 1 | 10 6 3 |
| 1266 | 1,62,245 0 10 | 1,51,679 3 10 | 10,565 13 0 | 0 0 0 | 10,565 13 0 | 6 8 2 |
| 1267 | 1,87,481 3 8 | 1,67,150 11 10 | 20,330 7 10 | 0 0 0 | 20,330 7 10 | 10 13 6 |
| 1268 | 2,48,167 9 4 | 2,34,355 4 8 | 13,812 4 8 | 0 0 0 | 13,812 4 8 | 5 9 0 |
| 1269 | 2,64,301 6 2 | 2,52,986 10 6 | 11,314 11 6 | 0 0 0 | 11,314 11 6 | 4 4 6 |
| 1270 | 2,84,526 0 6 | 2,81,530 2 10 | 2,995 13 10 | 0 0 0 | 2,995 13 10 | 1 1 0 |
| 1271 | 4,32,183 7 8 | 4,19,668 15 3 | 12,514 8 5 | 0 0 0 | 12,514 8 5 | 2 10 9 |
| 1272 | 4,70,751 12 4 | 4,63,106 4 8 | 7,645 7 8 | 0 0 0 | 7,645 7 8 | 1 10 0 |
| 1273 | 4,83,348 2 8 | 4,73,834 10 5 | 9,533 8 3 | 590 0 0 | 8,943 8 3 | 1 13 7 |
| 1274 | 5,46,919 4 10 | 5,27,966 2 4 | 18,953 2 6 | 17,300 0 0 | 1,653 2 6 | 0 4 10 |

the settlement of the year 1865, in view to reimbursing the loss sustained by the Ryots This statement will be proved, by the public records in the Collector's Office. Moreover your Petitioner had inspected several of the valuable Lunka Lands prior to the settlement of the year 1865, with the view of ascertaining whether any of them was in a fit state for cultivation, or whether the deposit of sand was such as to prevent their cultivation. It was mainly on your Petitioner's personal explanation to the Collector Mr. Fraser, and his Sheristadar that some of these Lunkah Lands were during the settlement of the year 1865, assessed with Lunka rates, instead of the light grazing rates, on which they were held. This fact will be evident, from the increased assessment of nearly thirty thousand Rupees levied in the year 1865, under the head of Lunkha lands in comparison with the Revenue of the past year. The Collector's Huzur Officers never inspected these Lunkahs, neither do they ever examine into the state of their cultivation. Hence it must be apparent that the Tahsildars alone, of whom your Petitioner is one, are held responsible for these duties. During the settlement of the year 1865, no complaint whatever was preferred about your Petitioner's remissness, in not examining into the state of Cultivation of any of these Lunkas. If there had been any remissness on his part, as is now alleged by the Collector, the Collector would have taken serious notice of it, at the time, or noticed it in the Zemabundy report for that year 1865.

8. The peculiar condition of these Lunkas is too well known to the Board to require any illucidation. The freshes of the Godavery, leave large deposits of sand in one year, on the Lunkas, and render them unfit for cultivation, and it is only when the sand is washed away, replacing the same with clay that the Ryots undertake them for cultivation. This can be proved to the satisfaction of the Board from the public accounts. Ever since your Petitioner was appointed as Tahsildar of Amalapooram Taluk, there had been year after year, a gradual increase of Revenue to Government, particularly under the head of Lunkas, owing to your Petitioner's exertion in bringing under the plough, such of the Lunka lands as were fit for cultivation.

9. In the Ramachendrapoorum Taluk which is a first class one, there had been likewise an increase of Revenue, under the head of Lunkas in the year 1865. From this the Board can at once judge that these Lunkas are cultivated and assessed with Lunka rates only when they are in a fit state, and otherwise held on a low or grazing rate.

10. In regard to the third, your Petitioner begs to observe that in the disposal of petty Village disputes, relative to the ownership of land, and water disputes &c., as also in the disposal of Magisterial cases and in replying to the references made to your Petitioner by the Collector, your Petitioner has always bestowed prompt attention. The number of Revenue and Magisterial cases filed in each year in your Petitioner's Taluk, and that disposed of, by him can easily be ascertained from the Dairy books, kept in the Taluk, Kutchery; and this, your Petitioner confidently trusts, will shew that your Petitioner was always attentive to his duties. If your Petitioner had, as is now alleged by the Collector, been remiss in these respects, it is quite natural that the parties concerned must have complained against your Petitioner, or the Collector must have, as is usually the case, reprimanded him



But this was not the case. Even in the disposal of unimportant cases, your Petitioner made no more than ordinary delay. When your Petitioner delivered over charge of his Taluk, in November last, only a very few cases remained undisposed of; and even these, your Petitioner can confidently assert, were ready for decision, the trial in each of them having been mostly closed. In short, your Petitioner begs to state that ever since your Petitioner was appointed as Tahsilldar, he had to dispose of thousands of cases in each year, both in the Revenue and Magisterial line, irrespective of the unusual number of cases, he had to commit to the Principal Sudder Ameen, and Sessions' Courts, and in none of which your Petitioner is happy to state, was any remark or comment ever made by these tribunals. Nor did any of the several Collectors under whom he has served, ever record their dissatisfaction with your Petitioner, in the discharge of his Revenue duties. The monthly statements submitted to the Collector by your Petitioner, showing the number of cases disposed of in each month, out of those referred to him by the Collector, with an explanation as to the cases remaining undisposed of, have also been approved by the Collector, and it is only now, that the Collector attributes to him delay in the disposal of cases.

11. In August last, however, the Board having expressed their dissatisfaction, at the great number of cases remaining undisposed of, in four Talooks of the Godavery District, in which your Petitioner was one, the Collector sent a Circular to the Tahsildars, to dispose of these cases, at an early date, on pain of dismissal in default. Such being the case, the Collector had in his recent report to the Board, pointedly noticed your Petitioner's remissness, as if the Board's remarks against the arrears of work in the District, was exclusively applicable to him.

12. In regard to the fourth, your Petitioner would beg to observe, that the Indian Penal and Criminal Procedure Codes, were introduced so long back, as the year 1862. As Sub-Magistrate your Petitioner had disposed of thousands of cases every year, committing a great number to the Courts. The Courts never remarked that your Petitioner had, in any instance, acted contrary to the provisions of the above Codes.

13. The Sub-Magistrate of Rajahmundry Taluk, who has been promoted to your Petitioners' post, and his successor, who was the Sub-Magistrate of Peddapur Taluk, and several other Sub-Magistrates both in the Godavery and other Districts are not acquainted with English. Consequently, your Petitioner leaves it to the Board to judge, whether the Collector is right in imputing to your Petitioner, that he is ignorant of that language.

14. In regard to the fifth point, it is true that your Petitioner was sick for a month and obtained leave, but was afterwards restored to his health, as certified by the Zillah* Surgeon of the Godavery District, which is herewith submitted. Your Petitioner is not suffering under any permanent disease, which would incapacitate him from effective service. He is only 38 years old, and is quite able to serve many years more. The rapid manner in which he has made his Revenue Collections of the Taluq, ever since his appointment an

* Vide enclosure D.

Tahsildar, which may at once be seen on reference to the Statement noted in para 6, of this Petition, added to the successful way in which he has distinguished himself, both in his Revenue and Magisterial duties, is of itself a sufficient proof, of your Petitioner's activity and capability for further service.

15. Since the arrival of the Collector Mr. Fraser, to the Godavery District your Petitioner had the happiness of his visit but once, and that was during the annual Settlement of his Taluq. The Collector settled only some twenty or thirty Villages in the only Settlement he has yet made for the year 1865, the remaining villages having been previously settled by the Head Assistant Collector Mr. Linton. The Collector had thus scarcely any opportunity of forming an opinion prejudicial or otherwise, to your Petitioner, as his stay in the Taluq during the seetlement was so very short. Indeed, neither during the settlement of the year 1865, nor afterwards, was any thing done by your Petitioner in his public capacity, to incur the displeasure of the Collector. If such had been the case, the Collector would indoubtedly, as is generally the case, have recorded his unfavourable opinion of your Petitioner, either in the Service Register book, expressly kept at the Collector's Office for that purpose, under the directions of the Board and Government, or intimated the same to your Petitioner, by a public order.

16. If on perusal of this petition, the Board see reason to order the restoration of your Petitioner, which he humbly trusts will be the case, he will feel very thankful to them.

17. Your Petitioner has no other means of Support, but his public employment, and he had not been long in the service either to earn a provision for himself, or to entitle him to any pension. As your Petitioner is in a sound state of health, and considers himself fit for effective service, which is testified by the Zillah Surgeon, he does not see how he can be justified in accepting a gratuity, as proposed to him by the Collector.

18. For these reasons, your Petitioner begs respectfully to request, the Board will be pleasd to take his case into their kind consineration, and pass a favourable order; In conclusion, your Petitioner [redacted] can have no hesitation in stating, that his present distress, has been brought about, by the private and personal feelings of certain Subordinates of the Collector's Hugur Kutchery.

FOR WHICH ACT OF JUSTICE, YOUR PETITIONER

AS IN DUTY BOUND, SHALL EVER PRAY.

MADRAS,
*19th January* 1866.

## ENCLOSURE I.

Petitioner having been removed from the Office at Tahsildar under the orders of the Board they decline to interfere on his behalf.

No. 758-66

Byorder
(Signed) C. G. MASTER.
*Acting Secretary.*

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE CHEPAK,
*13th February* 1866.

---

## ENCLOSURE J.

### HIS EXCLLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL

FORT SAINT GEORGE,

*Madras.*

*The humble Petition of Dronumraz Narasinga Row late Tahsildar of Amarapurum Taluk in the Godavery District.*

MOST HUMBLY AND RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,

1. That a patient perusal of the Petitions and endorsements of the Board of Revenue will clearly bring to your knowledge the injustice done to your Petitioner by cashiering him from his post on grounds of supposed inefficiency and bodily infirmity, and the offer of a gratuity by way of indemnity.

2. As to the statement of Mr. Fraser (the Collector), that your Petitioner was unfit for the post of Tahsildar, he begs to state that he had been serving under the Head Assistant Collector as Head Clerk for about 7 years. During which period he acted to the entire satisfaction of the Collector by constantly correcting several Tahsildars when seen doing their business amiss and by conducting the Jamabundy with as much care and ability as the Sheristadar himself. Even in the capacity of Tahsildar which he held for the next seven years he never failed to act with credit to himself and satisfaction to the Public. While he held appointments involving much responsibility for fourteen years acting to the extreme satisfaction of different Collectors who not only promoted him gradually to the Tahsildar's place, but also favored him with testimonials of his good conduct, the members of the Board of Revenue have, nevertheless, sanctioned the dismissal of your Petitioner on the faulty and groundless accusation of the Collector that he was unfit for duty, without looking into the previous records and testimonials of the Petitioner.

3. As to the Collector's reporting to the Revenue Board, the bodily infirmity of your Petitioner, the latter took no measures to ascertain the truth of the vague statement of the Collector, either by referring your Petitioner to any Doctor or by asking the Collector to submit to the Board the grounds whereby he concluded him to be inefficient; but without giving due consideration to the matter, and taking for truth that general statement of the Collector they unhesitatingly carried out his suggestion.

4. The Revenue Board without any inquiry into the matter and in spite of your Petitioner's two letters and a telegraphic message requesting them to take defence from him before they should decide upon the question, unscrupulously approved of the Collector's report and sanctioned your Petitioner's dismissal, without taking his defence at all. When he personally presented to the Board a petition remonstrating against the injustice of Mr. Fraser, the former far four taking trouble to peruse the enclosures and get at the truth, rejected the petition on the policy of supporting their first decision.

5. When any complaint is brought against even a Village Thalari, the policy of the British Government never submits him to any penalty, before giving him every opportunity of disencumbering himself of the charge against him. Relying, therefore, upon this policy of the British Governent for his future security against want, and being big with hopes of future

reward for his honest labor he had been strickingly disinterested and indefatigably zealous in the discharge of his duties, his whole life, strength, and power, being devoted to the Welfare of the Public and to the benefit of the Government. While he was thus conducting the management of a Taluk yielding a revenue of six lacs of Rupees for fourteen years, without giving its malicious inhabitants the slightest cause for dissatisfaction and compalaint, and while his past services strongly merited a speedy promotion, the Collector crediting the charges set up against the Petitioner by one of his antagonists, without any proof whatever recommended to the Revenue Board his dismissal which they unhesitatingly sanctioned without hearing the Petitioner. This is the only instance of any gross injustice being done in the British Government, for which the Petitioner humbly craves redress from your Excellecy's hands.

6. If your Excellency at least shall peruse with due, and deep consideration the Board Petitions, Doctor's certificates and testimonials &c., herein enclosed, your Excellency will certainly be led to believe that your Petitioner has a strong constitution ; that he had been discharging his duty of Tahsildar with great skill and ability; that the report of the Collector was all untrue ; and that the grounds he employed for his dismissal do not warrant it at all.

7. If your Excellency shall be pleased to examine the Petitioner in person your Excellency will be easily persuaded to form a right notion of his ability strength and power to continue as Tahsildar. Your Petitioner who is going in his 38th year, and could, in consequence, boast of living long, provided Death curtail not his life, has a large family to support. He trusted fully that his faithful services would secure for him a handsome pension, with which, he hoped to maintain his family in future. If under such circumstances he is forced to accept a gratuity which could last him but a few months, where is he to find an asylum against hunger after it is exhausted.

8. Your Petitioner had been unjustly and hardly dealt with, by the evil genious of a single individual not being even allowed to plead his defence. The present case of his dismissal tends to discourage the hopes of faithful servants who have the greatest reliance on the order No. 840 (passed by the Governor in Council on the 8th August 1856) which is rendered ineffectual by this exception. He in conclusion, implores your Excellency to peruse with a paternal case, the enclosures, restore him to his former post, relieve him from the cruel effects of his hard fate and spread through the British dominions the justice which characterizes their Government.

I most humbly beg to remain.
Your most obedient and humble Servant.

MADRAS,
*20th March* 1866.

---

ENCLOSURE K.

*Petition Department.*

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read again Petitions from D. Narasinga Row, late Tahsildar of Amalapur, Godavery District, dated 20th March and 3rd May 1866 Nos. 852 and 1434 of 1866.

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

(Here enter 26th June 1866 No. 4344.)

Order thereon 10th July 1866.

The Government desire that the Collector will at once appoint the Petitioner Nursinga Row to a post in the grade next below that of a Talug Sheristadar, to which the Collector states he has no objection.

(True Extract)

J. HUDLESTON,
*Secretary to Government.*

Memorial of A. Hamilton Rowan, late
Marshal. Sessions. ||

To the Hon. the Commissioners
of the Revenue, the Petition of
the undersigned Inspectors of
Distillery Districts in
the County of the Province
aforesaid

Sh: That by an Act of Parliament
of this Province made in the
last Session, it is enacted
that, from and after the
passing of the said Act, no
Distiller shall be allowed
to make any Spirits from
Corn, Grain or Pulse of
any kind, between the first
day of May and the first day
of October in any year
unless he shall have taken
out a License for that
purpose, and shall have
given Security for the
due observance of the
Regulations prescribed
by the said Act, which
Security is required to be
taken by the Inspectors
of the Districts in which
the Distillery is situated
before the License can
be granted

Rec'd 4th Aug 1866 Lr No 88

A 2135 /66

Lr No 1975/66

Referred to Comptd
24th August/66 No 36 Mem

Refund D. Cus
24 Aug 55 Pt

(which men are paid & will be paid
bdd. Bonds be required (when a
case arises &c. admts of such)
Secondly therefore I think the Bd
to call on the Com. to explain what
is alluded to in para 20 & I would
ask them for an opinion whether
as a general rule it is advisable
to limit a Collector as to his
only a few days in the month.
The limit, so far as I can see
might be productive of serious
hardship and prejudice
and (in my opinion) ought not to
be allowed to exist.
27 July 56 WM

Copies
JPP

1955. 12/1

Ordered that the
Memorial received with
the foregoing letter be
forwarded to the Board
of Customs and that an
intimation of the fact
be given to the Memo-
rialists

JC
Sec. Aug 56.

obtained, & to bring him to his former Post.

Further beg leave to be informed if he can be appointed as Tahsildar by any other Gentlemen who is acquainted with the Telinga ability.

Rd & Encd 24th Aug 1866 No 39 Mem

No 88 of 89

26 July 1866

Rev
Ans. 19 Sept 1866 No 2135
Ltr. of Govt. Mem. August

From D. Narasinga
Row late Tahasil
dar of Amalapuram
Taluq in Godavary
Dated 14
Recd 19 July 1866
No 1955 & Encl
3 enclosures

Withdrawing

Stating his faithful services rendered to Govt in different Capacities for the last 40 years & requesting to Govt order directing his appointment in an important post & submits herewith a Memorial in triplicate to the address of the Secy of State for India praying that his Memorial may be forwarded to its proper destination & in order &