

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	510	Press
	487.488	~~Mis.~~
Dated	24-2-	1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 510	Press ~~Mis.~~
487.488	
Dated 24-2-1866	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
24th February 1866.*

No. 487. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue:—

Submitting the further correspondence offered
by Narsimha Puntooloo, Deputy Collector of
Kurnool, in his defence before the Board,
with the views of the Board on each of the
eight charges preferred against that Officer. } (Here enter 31st January 1866, No. 720.)

No. 488. ORDER THEREON, 24th February 1866, No. 510.

Miscellaneous.

Procs. of Government, 28th July 1865, No. 1,761.
" " 26th Dec. 1865, " 3,073.
" " 6th Jan. 1866, " 46.
" " 18th " " 143.
" " 25th " " 228.

1. The Governor in Council has carefully perused the record of the enquiry into the conduct of M. Narsimha Puntooloo and considers that the facts elicited in the course of the investigation show him to be a person in whom the Government cannot place any confidence and whom they ought not, in the interests of the State and the people, to retain in the high and important office of a Deputy Collector.

2. Narsimha Puntooloo will accordingly be dismissed from the date of his suspension, viz., 28th July-1865.

3. With respect to the charge brought against Narsimha Puntooloo of appropriating the funds of the Municipality to his own purposes, the Governor in Council sees no occasion for the interposition of the Government. It is for the Municipality to consider whether they will institute proceedings against him or not.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
" the Accountant General.
" the Collector of Kurnool.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 31st January 1866.

Read the following letters :—

From M. NURSIMHA PUNTULU, Deputy Collector of Kurnool, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq.,
Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 3rd January 1866.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st December 1865, which gave cover to the Proceedings of Government, dated 20th December 1865, No. 3,073, from which it appears that "the Governor in Council entirely approves of the manner in which the inquiry was conducted by the Collector, and considers the record of the case so far complete that he might proceed to pass orders upon it forthwith;" but that, owing to his unwillingness to deny me a last opportunity of clearing myself of the very serious charges brought against me, he is pleased to direct the Board of Revenue to receive any further statement and any additional documents I may have to offer.

2. Of this liberty, I shall avail myself as briefly as possible.

3. With respect to the inquiry being conducted in a manner entitling it to the entire approbation of the Governor in Council, I would most respectfully remind His Excellency that a great part of the evidence was taken behind my back, after I had ceased to cross-examine in consequence of the Collector's refusal to record my questions, which he declined to allow to be put with his objections. An accused person is always allowed great freedom of examination and moreover I submit that the course adopted by the Collector is calculated to distort the evidence to my prejudice, and make my defence impossible.

4. To take an instance or two of the class of questions considered by the Collector irrelevant—

I. The Collector considered irrelevant questions as to the mode in which the merchants have kept their accounts.

II. As to the transactions between these merchants and other public officers.

5. It scarcely requires to be pointed out that the manner in which a person's accounts are kept and the state of those accounts is an important matter for inquiry and consideration when pecuniary transactions, deposed to orally and which may be corroborated by the accounts, are in question. My questions were directed to ascertain how far the oral statements made by the merchant who were examined were capable of corroboration or the reverse by their accounts, and as such were surely not irrelevant. Mala Tippana, one of those merchants whom I sought to question in this way, made contradictory statements as pointed out in paragraph 4 of my defence. In proof of his latter statement he produced his own accounts, which do not tally with the dates he gives, viz., on 23rd December 1864, he enters in my name Rupees 520 for my purchase

of a house, which purpose was no longer in existence, as the registered Bill of Sale (copy* enclosed) alluded to in my defence will prove.

* A.

Mr. Minchin argues that it is not improbable that the payment for the house was made after the Bill of Sale was registered. Such registry is a public avowal of the receipt of purchase money, and if I deceive the man, what security could he have to demand it afterwards; so that no man in his senses would make such a declaration, without first receiving the money. The evidence alluded to by Mr. Minchin on this point will certainly fall to the ground by a searching inquiry of the dates of payment, &c., &c.

Mala Tippana again shows a debit of Rupees 500 for me on 28th February 1865, but states it was asked for on the 1st and paid on the 2nd of March 1865. Is not the payment of his entering in accounts a loan BEFORE it was ASKED and PAID for, a matter for cross-examination on the mode of his accounts? The hand-writing and signature of the chit he produced was not proved, and it is addressed not to him, but to his father who is alive. None was sworn to.

Elkur Vencatsashaya states I owe him for *Loans, Cloths, Gold, and Pearls*. To prove this, no other evidence than accounts was tendered, which show DIAMONDS, LOANS, and COTTON. Am I not to question this witness as to the mode in which he keeps accounts? The chits he produced are not proved. I produce herewith a copy* of the Hoondie alluded to in my defence to show that I paid him 100 Rupees on the date on which he says he paid me a similar sum.

* B.

Madem Venganah states he gave me cloths first, and currency notes afterwards. The first transaction was entered on 2nd and 20th January 1865, and the second transaction on the 17th November 1864!! The notes bearing Nos. 5,830 and 5,961, which he says he gave me on 16th November 1864, he did not purchase from the Treasury till the 28th of that month!! In proof of this, I beg to produce herewith the attested copy† of the Treasury account given to me.

† C.

6. It is charged that I borrowed Rupees 750 from the Soukar Narrain Kristnaya. His account was produced, and it appeared from an entry therein that 750 Rupees were paid into my hands for the purpose of sending to Irrigation Department on 23rd February 1865. This sum I received not on loan as alleged, but in order to obtain for him a cheque for the amount from the Irrigation Department. To obtain it I wrote to Mr. Brunton, and his reply (already put in by me) states that he cannot give me a cheque. Mr. Minchin sent for Mr. Brunton and took from him a statement *behind my back* and *after my defence* on the subject. The object was to ascertain if my subscription of Rupees 750 to the Municipal Fund was paid at the date of the above transaction, and so raise an inference in support of the assertion that the 750 Rupees from the Soukar was borrowed by me on my own account for that purpose.

Mr. Brunton stated that my subscription was paid shortly before 1st March, and this is considered sufficient to connect the two transactions in the face of Mr. Brunton's letter to me of the same date saying that he could not give me the cheque.

7. Other questions of mine, if I had been permitted to put them, would have shown the existence of pecuniary transactions between these very merchants and other public officers. By this means it would have appeared that even if I had such dealings (which I deny) I should have been no worse than many others, whose names and transactions I would have elicited; and further it would have been made clear that such dealings were calculated to give persons ill-disposed towards me a hold over those witnesses, which would be used to my detriment, and which would be all the more readily available the more those persons would be led to believe that they might, with official countenance and assistance, set up false claims against me with the hope of realizing them.

8. The Collector did not even, on my openly pointing out those persons who, as I alleged, had such dealings, take any steps to ascertain the truth of what I stated, though some of those to whom I alluded were Magistrates, and those with whom they dealt were within their own jurisdiction, thus clearly proving that the Collector's proceedings against me were not undertaken on public grounds, but that they were rather influenced by hostility to me, and partiality to Coomarasawmy Moodeliar, whom he recommended to be confirmed in my place.

9. These supply only a very imperfect illustration of the necessity for the purposes of my defence of the cross-examination I sought to pursue. I confidently assert that it amounts to a denial of justice to dictate to an accused person what questions he shall not put, and to refuse at the same time to record the questions so excluded. Yet this is what has been done in my case.

10. To proceed with my defence, under such circumstances, would be worse than useless—it would be suicidal. Nor is it any answer to me that I might have taken a note of such questions? Had I done so, I might have been told that the Collector's report, and not my notes,

was what the Government would consider, and even if the matter came to a conflict between my notes and the Collector's report, I could not hope that any statement of mine would prevail against the report of the Collector.

11. Mr. Minchin was selected to be my Judge, he being prejudiced against me and influenced by my enemy Coomarasawmy Moodeliar, as I distinctly charge and shall, if necessary, prove, and having actually already and before any inquiry pronounced me guilty, as his letter dated 1st May 1865, No. 2, to the Accountant General will prove. Yet I find that the Government are disposed to adopt his views, inasmuch as they in their Proceedings, dated 28th July 1865, No. 1,761, which were held previous to hearing me at all, state that "the witnesses are respectable" and that "there appears no room to doubt the truth of their statements." Again in Proceedings, dated 20th December 1865, No. 3,073, it is stated that "the Governor in Council approves entirely of the manner in which the inquiry was conducted by the Collector, and considers the record of the case so far complete that he might proceed to pass orders upon it forthwith." Here I humbly beg to submit that there is nothing before Government to show

the respectability of the witnesses, and that the record is not yet complete, as long as no evidence was taken to prove the statements of the merchants, and the hand-writing and signature of the Telugu chits they produced, and furthermore as long as the witnesses I called for my defence and others*, whom I now desire to call also, have not been examined.

- * 1. Echembady Ragava Charla, Head Clerk in the Chittoor Deputy Collector's Office.
- 2. Vennalgunti Ramiah in the Chittoor Small Cause Court.
- 3. Vennalgunti Vencata Gopaula Row, District Moonsiff of Cuddapah.
- 4. Chittoor Boojunga Row, Sub-Magistrate of Kangond, Chittoor District.

12. The eighth charge is the alleged embezzlement by me of Rupees 615 from the Municipal Funds. I pointed out clearly in my defence that the accounts under my signature were concealed, and I was asked to answer on accounts falsely prepared by others. Those accounts too, were prepared up to two months after I left the place on leave. The credit of Rupees 5,000 was misrepresented to be only Rupees 4,319.

13. To say that false accounts on this head were prepared, I beg to produce herewith, as an instance of my proofs, copy† and translation of a letter I received by Post from the Khandan Superintendent and his Goomastah on whose accounts and statements Mr. Minchin convicts me of this charge, and it will be evident from the same what course the Acting Deputy Collector adopted for my ruin by taking advantage of his influence with Mr. Minchin.

† D.

† E.

Also copy‡ and translation of an account signed and given to me by the Kurnool Town Kurnum, which shows that the 227 Rupees, said to have been collected and sent to me on 6th December 1864, was in arrears up to 27th February 1865.

§ F.

Also copy§ and translation of a Persian account signed and given to me on 2nd April 1865, by the Khandan Superintendent, as the names therein given of paid subscribers differ from those given in Mr. Minchin's statement No. 12 H.

|| G.

Also copy|| and translation of a Persian letter, dated 2nd April 1865, written to me by Mohomud Dawood Khan Bahadoor (Kurnool Nabob's grand-son) to show that the money which was said to have been paid to me by him and his grand-mother, viz., Rupees 200, was in arrears until I left Kurnool on leave.

* G.

Also a printed copy* of Mr. Minchin's Proceedings, dated 31st October 1864, which was published in the Kurnool District Gazette of date the 5th November 1864, paragraph 5, therein showing that with the 651 Rupees collected since the commencement of the official year, the total amount of subscriptions promised is Rupees 5,000, which, as I already stated, was actually credited to the Treasury accounts on 1st April 1865, and Government grant in a similar sum was drawn. This proof is now produced, because the Acting Deputy Collector, in his Memorandum, (after the presentation of my defence pointing out the glaring false entry of Rupees 4,319 only when the actual credit was Rupees 5,000,) excludes the said Rupees 651 from the amount of the said credit of Rupees 5,000. The passage will therefore speak for itself.

14. If the Documents D to H be true and genuine, what is to become of Mr. Minchin's Enclosure No. 12 H. I am I incorrect in denouncing it to be a gross and impudent fabrication! and I must not omit to mention that the amount said to have been embezzled by me is in the Treasury, though in names different from those now given by Mr. Minchin.

15. I have thus gone somewhat fully into this eighth charge, said to be the most serious of all: on this head I am threatened with criminal proceedings. These I shall await calmly and with confidence: my answer to the charge I have now indicated and that answer must to any impartial mind be conclusive. Any person who chooses to institute criminal proceedings against me in the face of my answer and with notice of it will do so at his own risk.

16. I hold in my hands the originals of the documents from which copies and translations I have now submitted were made, and shall produce them, if required to do so, for verification.

17. In the foregoing observations I have not attempted to do more than give a bare outline of the way and the means by which I am able and ready to prove my innocence of the charges brought against me. It is not possible for me fully to enter into my defence otherwise than face to face with my accusers, with the evidence against me given upon oath, with my witnesses similarly examined, and also in presence of, and controlled by, a competent and an impartial Judge.

18. This is all I (who have served the Government now upwards of twenty-three years with an unblemished character) ask at their hands. The best part of my life has been spent in the service of the Government; I challenge inquiry into my whole career, and I confidently assert that it will be found neither unfaithful nor inefficient.

19. At the end, I do not ask any favor. I ask for justice only. The Government admit the desirableness of an inquiry into the charges against me. The Collector has been authorized to institute the inquiry. This is I submit very hard upon me. The Collector is my accuser; how can he be my Judge? The Collector has prejudged my case; why should I be called upon to establish my innocence by the overthrow in the mind of my Judge of an expressed conviction of my guilt? The Collector is under the influence of the present Acting Deputy Collector and biassed in his favor, as I distinctly charge and can prove. The Acting Deputy Collector is my enemy and moreover will gain his appointment by my ruin; why should I be required to prove my innocence under conditions so difficult?

20. My character is dearer to me than any thing else involved in these proceedings, and as I have already stated, I am ready to stake my character upon the result of a judicial inquiry into the offences charged against me.

21. At present I am an accused person: a position from which no man, however innocent he may be, can by any act or wish of his exempt himself.

22. The only effect of such a position on an honest man is that he must seek by every effort in his power to escape from it.

23. In the eyes of an impartial public the proceedings of the Collector, though sanctioned and approved by Government, will, I am confident, leave me no worse than I am at present.

24. Still I cannot believe that the Government, will sanction and approve the proceedings of the Collector as the case now stands. To do so would, to my humble understanding, be an act of injustice, of which I cannot believe the Government would be capable.

From the same Officer, dated Madras, 10th January 1866.

1. Having attended at the Office of the Board and presented my further statement with copies and translations of my documents, all prepared and held in readiness for submission on 3rd instant, and I requested the Board to permit me to make any remarks in person which I may have to make on the papers which were kindly handed over to me subsequent to that date. My request was granted, and the Board having directed me to put on paper certain explanations that I mentioned in person, I have the honor to do so accordingly.

2. In the case of loans, I beg to refer to the statement of each witness. Both Narrain Kistnaya and myself admit the payment to, and receipt by me of Rupees 750 on 23rd February 1865. He states it to be a loan given to me, but I say it was for a cheque. His statement is not corroborated by any thing else than his accounts, which do not speak of the same being a loan, but that it was for "sending to the Irrigation Department." This allusion in the account he could have no business to make, if the transaction was not his own, while the entry as a loan to me would have been quite sufficient. My statement on the other hand is supported by Mr. Brunton's letter of the same date declining to give a cheque. In his statement Mr. Brunton says, that he gave me a cheque for my subscription, which is quite true, and to what else can his refusal in the letter produced by me refer except the granting a cheque, and that on account of another, as he readily complied with my wishes in my own case. In the present stage of the proceedings, my statement is entitled to greater weight than the witness, and I showed to the Board the original letter of Mr. Brunton.

Mala Tippana.—I submitted all my objections on his accounts in my previous defence and the one recently submitted. Now it occurs to me again that he states that the 520 Rupees he lent me on December 23rd, 1864, for the purchase of my house (which was paid for on the 8th as my bill* of sale proves) was re-paid by me

* A.

on June 26th. It could not be in 1864, as the date was previous to lending the money, and as I did not then join Kurnool. In June 1865, I was not in Kurnool, having left it on 2nd April 1865.

Madam Venganah's accounts though judicially condemned as being untrustworthy, as pointed out in my defence of the 2nd November 1865, Mr. Minchin believes them to be trustworthy. In his account, No. 8 D, previously submitted by Mr. Minchin to the Board, notes for Rupees 21,000 were entered as having been sold to him on November 17th, 1864. Now in his present account a list is made out that these notes in halves were sold to him on 16th November. In direct contradiction to these two, the attested copy marked C, of the Treasury account, given to me under the signature of the Treasury Acting Deputy Collector, shows that they were sold to him only on the 28th November. On the 16th and 17th, though the halves which were sold to others were entered, none appear in the name of this witness.

3. Imperfect as the proceedings are, the Board will have no difficulty in deciding whether my statement or the witness's account is more entitled to be believed.

4. In enclosure No. 12 H of Mr. Minchin's previous letter, 227 Rupees were entered as paid to me on 6th December 1864, as per statement of Galub Khan Sooriazi.

B

From the Kurnool Town Curnum's accounts, which I marked E, it will be seen that those persons who were said to have paid their subscriptions previous to 6th December 1864, had kept their subscriptions in arrears up to 27th February 1865. The Persian account F, dated 2nd April 1865, gives different names for the same 227 Rupees; and 50 Rupees which were not entered in F, but which appear in Mr. Minchin's enclosure No. 12 H, in the name of Sadut Katoo Masahib, and also 150 Rupees, which were entered in the name of Mohomud Dawood Khan Babadoor, as having been paid to me were due up to the date of my departure, as my document G shows. The promised contributions were entered by Mr. Minchin, in the said No. 12 H, as Rupees 5,700, while showing a credit of Rupees 4,319 only, but on my pointing out in my defence that it was 5,000 Rupees which were credited, it was endeavoured to be shown that 651 Rupees previously collected by Dr. Keess, ought not to be counted, and that the total subscriptions, as shown in the Acting Deputy Collector's Memorandum, was entered as being Rupees 6,426. To prove the latter amount as having been subscribed at all, there is no voucher except what the Acting Deputy Collector states. There is no reason why 5,700, only had been at first entered, if his present account be correct. As he states, if I did not leave any detailed account under my signature at the office, why was not I asked on the subject before holding me responsible for the accounts which they themselves prepared? In the face of Rupees 4,301, subscribed and published in the Gazette, the Acting Deputy Collector, by taking advantage of Mr. Minchin's influence, tries to increase the amount to any extent as circumstances would suit him.

These being the principal circumstances so far as I recollect alluded to by me in person, I shall wait upon the Board whenever directed to do so, and give any further explanation they may require of me.

A. to H. ENCLOSURES, with translations.

1. Ordered that the above papers be submitted to Government with the following remarks with reference to Government Order, dated 20th December 1865, No. 3,073.
2. They would have been sooner submitted had not the Board recently learnt that the Government desire to receive their opinion on the whole case against the Deputy Collector, and not merely on the points indicated in paragraph 5 of the Order.
3. The Board proceed therefore to consider the charges *seriatim*.
4. The first charge against Nursimha Puntulu is that he concealed from the Collector certain important correspondence with the Accountant General.
5. That he did so withhold correspondence the Deputy Collector cannot deny, and the Board consider that his attempted explanation in paragraph 2 of his defence is disingenuous and in fact a misstatement of facts. He says that he was *not* called on by the Accountant General to communicate with the Collector "in connection with the paper currency." It was in consequence of the Deputy Collector's estimate of a lac of Rupees worth of notes monthly, as the probable requirements of the Kurnool Treasury, that the Accountant General required him to revise his estimate of ways and means.
6. He argues that because he did *not* revise his estimate, but maintained the correctness of that already submitted, therefore he was not bound to submit the matter to the Collector. He, however, admits that this may have been an error of judgment. The Accountant General points out that in either case it was equally his duty to have communicated with the Collector in a matter of so much importance, and of this there cannot possibly be any question. That the Deputy Collector failed to do so, indicates a disposition to act altogether independently of the authority of the Collector, which is calculated to lead to dangerous results. His motive for doing as he did must be inferred from what is held proved as to his general conduct. It is, however, obvious to remark, that had the correspondence been submitted to the Collector, his attention would have been sooner drawn to the subject of the issue of the currency notes and perhaps his suspicions might have been sooner aroused.

7. The second charge is that Nursimha Puntulu maintained in his own hands a monopoly of the issue of currency notes and sold largely to wealthy Soukars with a view to his private advantage in money transactions with them.

8. The evidence goes to show that the Soukars examined were under the impression that only by direct application to the Deputy Collector could they obtain the notes they required. One of them states that the Cash-keeper had no power to sell. Another that the Cash-keeper told him he could only supply the notes required on the Deputy Collector's order. A third states that all similar applications were made to the Deputy Collector. The Cash-keeper himself declared that he had received orders from the Deputy Collector not to sell notes to any one who required them without his orders.

9. The Board cannot doubt that such an order was given, and consider that it would have been little if at all objectionable, although perhaps not consistent with the instructions on the subject; but the Deputy Collector's denial that he gave any such order induces the belief that his motives for doing what the Board consider it clear that he did, will not bear scrutiny.

10. What those motives were may be inferred from what is held to be established in regard to other charges, although it cannot be held to be *legally proved* that Nursimha Puntulu maintained in own hands a monopoly of the sale of currency notes *with a view to his private advantage*.

11. The third charge is that he was indebted to the extent of Rupees 3,200 to the Soukars to whom currency notes were most largely issued. This Nursimha Puntulu denies, and with it may be considered that part of the second charge as to which Nursimha Puntulu declares that the Soukars have made false statements regarding his pecuniary transactions with them, at the instigation of his enemies.

12. Narrain Krishtaya (who is shown to have purchased notes for Rupees 22,010 in five months) stated on 2nd June 1865, that on two occasions, at an interval of some ten days, he lent Nursimha Puntulu Rupees 750 and Rupees 200 without bond or acknowledgment, which was returned in one sum of Rupees 950 by the hand of the Deputy Collector's delayet Sannaji on demand shortly before he went on leave, and that the money was borrowed by the Deputy Collector for building his house.

13. On the 26th and 28th September he stated more precisely, and after reference to his accounts, that the loan of Rupees 750 was given personally at the Cutcherry on the 23rd February 1865, to be paid to the Officers of the Irrigation Company, as his (Nursimha Puntulu's) subscription to the Municipal Fund, and that the loan of Rupees 200 was given on 15th March 1865, the whole amount of Rupees 950 being re-paid on 1st April.

14. His accounts, produced on the 28th September, contain entries consistent with this witness's last statement, and show that the re-payment was made through one Nadeem Sahib, and not through Sannaji, as stated in June.

15. The witness's account of the loan of Rupees 750 is that he had taken cash to the Cutcherry for notes, and not being able to obtain all that he wanted, he requested Nursimha Puntulu to endeavour to obtain for him a cheque on Madras from the Irrigation Company's Officers, and that as this attempt also was unsuccessful, he (witness) lent to Nursimha Puntulu Rupees 750 in cash, which he had left in hand.

16. He states that Soukar Yelcoor Venkateshaya, who had come to the Cutcherry at the same time for notes, and left with him in the same bandy, was told by him of the transaction, but of this Y. Venkateshaya says in his statement before the Collector on 27th September 1865, that he has no recollection.

17. Nursimha Puntulu declares that there was no loan at all, but that the money was entrusted to him to obtain a cheque on Madras for the amount from the Irrigation Company, and that as he failed to do so, he returned the money. He produces a note from Mr. Brunton, the Company's Resident Engineer, dated 23rd February 1865, which apparently relates to some such unsuccessful application.

18. Mr. Minchin, however, has taken a statement from Mr. Brunton to the effect that shortly before the 1st March, Nursimha Puntulu sent him the sum of Rupees 750, being his subscription to the Kurnool Municipal Fund for the purchase of an iron fountain, for which amount Mr. Brunton got a cheque on 1st March from the Central Office on the Madras Agent.

19. The Board see no reason to doubt that the Soukar's account of the transaction is the true one, and the discrepancies on which the Deputy Collector lays so much stress appear to the Board altogether unimportant and just such as might be expected between a *bond-fide* statement made without reference to accounts, and a subsequent more exact one made after such reference.

20. If Nursimha Puntulu's explanation is to be accepted it must be assumed that this witness has deliberately falsified his accounts with the intention of injuring the Deputy Collector by an elaborate fraud, from which he could derive no pecuniary advantage, as the accounts show no outstanding debt; and yet has so far stultified himself as to discredit this concocted evidence by two inconsistent though equally false oral statements, elicited by the Collector without any volunteered complaint by the witness, and containing a statement as to the object of the loan, which is singularly corroborated by the unimpeachable evidence of Mr. Brunton.

21. The supposition is inadmissible, and the fact to which Nursimha Puntulu points, of this witness having admitted that another transaction appearing in his account relates to such a deposit of money with the Deputy Collector for a cheque and its return when none could be obtained, as he (Nursimha Puntulu) affirms took place in regard to the Rupees 750, appears to the Board to corroborate the credibility of the witness's statement rather than to weaken it.

22. The violence of Nursimha Puntulu's language in regard to the witness also raises an unfavorable impression of a tendency to browbeat. He has certainly not "shown his evidence to be full of discrepancies and utterly untrustworthy," nor has he "convicted him of false statements out of his own mouth." It must be remembered that none of the Soukars came forward to complain against the Deputy Collector, and that they now make no complaint.

23. The next transaction to be noticed is that deposed to by Mali Tippana who on 2nd June stated that Nursimha Puntulu had re-paid him two loans of Rupees 500 and Rupees 400 each, and that he held the Deputy Collector's chit for Rupees 500 which were still due, which chit dated 1st March 1865 he produced. It is in fact an application for a loan of Rupees 500, to be re-paid on the 10th idem, addressed to Mali Tippana's father Mali Iswaraza and signed "Moo Nursimmoooloo." The Deputy Collector's full designation is Moongamoor Nursimha Puntulu.

24. In cross-examination on September 26th, Mali Tippana admitted that the above statement made from memory was not strictly accurate, and that he found no entry in his accounts of the second loan of Rupees 400 formerly mentioned. The first loan of Rupees 520, on 23rd December 1864, was sent by the hand of Oosman Khan, Nakeeb to the "Khandans" at Kurnool, and was re-paid on 26th January* following. The accounts produced support this statement, and the Nakeeb declares that by the Deputy Collector's directions he took the money direct from Mali Tippana to the Khandan Superintendent Goolab Khan Suriazzy, who paid Rupees 17 out of the amount on account of the registration of the sale of a house bought by Nursimha Puntulu.

25. The Khandan Superintendent on the 7th June deposed that some three months before date, Nursimha Puntulu sent him Rupees 503 to be paid to Goolam Moideen Khan Bahadoor, as heir of Russool Khatoon Masahiba, whose house the Deputy Collector had purchased, and that as before instructed by both Nursimha Puntulu and Goolam Moideen Khan he paid Rupees 300 out of the amount to one Himmat Beg to redeem a bond, but expended the balance for the Deputy Collector, as directed by him on the day the money was sent.

26. Goolam Moideen Khan deposed on 8th June that he had requested Nursimha Puntulu to pay Rupees 300 to Himmat Beg out of the price (Rupees 520) of Russool Khatoon's house, and that the bond held by Himmat Beg was accordingly returned to deponent by the Superintendent

of Khandans some three months before date of statement; the balance of the price Rupees 220 being paid by the Deputy Collector to deponent shortly before he left Kurnool on leave.

27. The Deputy Collector argues in disproof of this alleged loan, that as the price of the house is acknowledged to have been paid on the 8th December in the Bill of sale of that date, which was registered on 16th idem, it is evident that he could not have borrowed money on 23rd idem to pay for it; on which the Collector observes that from the ignorance of the Mussalman gentry of Kurnool in business matters it is quite possible that the sale may have been registered before the price was paid, and the Board are well aware that this is a matter of every day occurrence. They, however, perceive that the discrepancy as to dates, creates a difficulty in the way of connecting the evidence above noticed with the alleged loan, and although the weight to be attached to this discrepancy may not be great, the Board would give the Deputy Collector the benefit of this defect in the evidence.

28. As to the other alleged loan of Rupees 500 on 1st March, for which the witness Mali Tippana produced a chit, he deposed on 26th September, that the document was brought to him by one Gandikotta Govind Row, a dependant of the Deputy Collector, from whom he took a receipt (which also he produced) for the money, which he (witness) sent by his own man Ajum Sahib with Govind Row to the Deputy Collector.

29. Ajum Sahib's statement agrees with this, as does also the entry in the accounts produced, which the Collector observes are not kept with the precision and regularity that characterize those of the other Soukars. This entry is the thirteenth in order after the date 28th February 1865.

30. Nursimha Puntulu repudiates the "Chit" altogether as not written or signed by him, as not even bearing his name, and as being signed in Telugu, whereas since his appointment as a Deputy Collector he has always used an English signature.

31. He remarks on the discrepancy of the entry under date 28th February, of a loan said to have been made on 2nd March on a chit, dated 1st idem, and he imputes malice to the witness on account of an old quarrel between witness's father and Nursimha Puntulu.

32. The Collector took no evidence as to the hand-writing, truly observing that at best it is very unsatisfactory. The Board however consider that in this case the inquiry and recorded evidence are at present incomplete, and insufficient legally to establish the alleged loan transaction.

33. The next statement is that of Yelkoor Vencataseshaya who on 1st June deposed that Nursimha Puntulu owed him Rupees 1,700, for which he produced two acknowledgments, dated 2nd April, one for Rupees 1,600 balance of account closed to date, and the other for 100 Rupees borrowed on that date. The accounts current and ledger produced contain entries fully corroborating the witness's statement.

34. Nursimha Puntulu admits that during a long period his family have dealt with that of witness, and that he may now be in his debt on adjustment of account, but certainly not to the extent stated; he repudiates the "Chits" produced, which he declares were neither written nor signed by him, (the signatures would seem to correspond with that of the "Chit" produced by Mali Tippana,) and he denies the correctness of several details in the accounts produced.

35. On this case as on the preceding one the Board observe that the inquiry and evidence are incomplete and at present insufficient to constitute *legal proof* against the Deputy Collector, but they see no reason to doubt the statements of the Soukar.

36. The fourth charge is that Nursimha Puntulu obtained a compulsory loan of Rupees 1,000, from Soukar Medam Vengana on the occasion of his applying for a large issue of currency notes.

37. This person deposed on 1st and 2nd June and 28th September, that on the evening of 16th November 1864, he gave the Deputy Collector a loan of Rupees 1,000 by two notes for Rupees 500 each (Nos. 5,830 and 5,961) out of notes to the value of Rupees 21,000 obtained by

him, for cash on that date from the Treasury, and entered the loan in his accounts on 17th idem. He produces his accounts which coincide with the statement, but he holds no acknowledgment of the loan.

38. The late Cash-keeper and the Deputy Collector's Peon Samnaji stated on 1st June that they remembered the occasion some three or four months before of Medam Vengana coming to the Treasury for notes, which, by order of the Deputy Collector, were sent to him (Deputy Collector) with the applicant, and the former declared that the Soukar explained to him afterwards the reason for this proceeding, as being that the Deputy Collector wanted to get notes from him, and that he had given him two notes for Rupees 500. The Peon stated that the notes sent were whole notes.

39. The Collector's reports show that according to the Treasury account currency notes, as stated, were issued on the date named to this witness, (the first halves on 16th November and the second halves on 28th idem,) and that the numbers mentioned were included in them; that the witness's accounts are very carefully kept; and that the entries relating to this matter must have been made more than six months previous to any inquiry.

40. The Deputy Collector declares that the charge is totally false; he points out many alleged discrepancies in the evidence, and distinctly denies that the notes said to have been obtained on 16th November were not issued from the Treasury till 28th, in support of which statement he produces a paper purporting to be copy of an "Extract from the Treasury Chittah book of the Kurnool District for November 1861, showing the sale of currency notes" certified by the present Acting Deputy Collector in the Kurnool Treasury.

41. The Collector in a note to Nursimha Puntulu's defence on this charge positively states that the list of the half notes sold to M. Vengana on 16th November 1861, appended to his proceedings, is taken from the Treasury accounts; that list includes the numbers mentioned.

42. The Deputy Collector states that this witness's accounts were judicially condemned "as being incredible" by the Sudder Ameen and Civil Judge of Kurnool in Original Suit No. 209 of 1861, and Appeal Suit No. 27 of 1862.

43. The Board consider that information should be obtained on this last point, and that the alleged discrepancy as to the date of sale of the notes should be explained, before the charge is admitted against the Deputy Collector. The latter point is probably easy of explanation.

44. On charges two, three and four, the Board observe generally that from the evidence it appears unquestionable that Nursimha Puntulu had considerable pecuniary transactions with wealthy Soukars who were in the habit of obtaining currency notes to a large extent for cash from the Treasury, and that he retained the issue of such notes in his own hands mainly if not entirely.

45. It is needless to remark that such pecuniary transactions are distinctly prohibited.

46. The fifth charge of having introduced the practice of granting orders on the Taluk Treasuries, for cash paid into the Huzur to increase his influence with the trading community, is not denied by the Deputy Collector so far as the fact of granting the orders is concerned. The motive is of course incapable of proof.

47. The Board do not consider that the practice is necessarily objectionable, but undoubtedly it should not have been introduced without the Collector's knowledge.

48. Nursimha Puntulu states that he was not aware that it was a novelty in Kurnool.

49. The sixth charge that Nursimha Puntulu bought and sold currency notes (i. e. cashed notes and obtained notes for cash at the Treasury) on his own account, to an extent incompatible with his position as a Government servant, is very much a matter of opinion, in which the Board do not see ground to condemn the Deputy Collector.

50. The seventh charge is that he made improper use of the influence of his official position by inducing subordinates to lend him Government paper to the value of Rupees 1,000, to be deposited as security with a Zemindar in the Kistna District.

51. Soobba Row, a Vernacular Accountant in the Kurnool Treasury Deputy Collector's Office, stated on 3rd June 1863, that about three months previously, Nursimha Puntulu borrowed from him two Government Promissory Notes for Rupees 500 each, standing in the name of witness's minor nephew and ward, and subsequently told him (witness) that they were in deposit in Masulipatam, whence he would send them back to him.

52. Nursimha Puntulu denies the statement, but says that he has ascertained that these and many other notes have been in his divided son's hands since September 1864, in connection with some contract with a Zemindar in the Kistna District.

53. The Collector observes that the date named by the Deputy Collector was shortly after that of his arrival at Kurnool as Treasury Deputy Collector, and the Board consider that the case calls for further investigation, as being by no means satisfactorily explained by Nursimha Puntulu, and being indeed a very reprehensible transaction even according to his own showing, for the Bonds were, as he himself states, really valueless for the purpose for which they were deposited.

54. The eighth and last charge is, that he made use of money paid to him as Treasurer of the Municipal Fund, for his private purposes to the extent of Rupees 615, and on this charge the Board must confess that they are unable to arrive at any conclusion from the evidence before them, while it seems very questionable whether the offence is one that could be charged by Government against the Deputy Collector as their servant. The fund concerned is not a Government fund, and Nursimha Puntulu in his official capacity could have had no connection with it; while nothing but searching inquiry on the spot can suffice to clear up the alleged deficiency which Nursimha Puntulu declares does not exist.

55. The Board having thus reviewed the evidence on the charges specified, deem it right to repeat their conviction that the Deputy Collector has habitually carried on pecuniary transactions with the Soukars examined, although further and more formal inquiry may be necessary to fix his legal liability to them on the *chits* produced.

56. The cumulative evidence of the accounts produced, not in support of any volunteered complaint, but on a requisition by the Collector, cannot be rejected as valueless even in its present form, and the admitted extent to which the Deputy Collector's son is engaged in undertakings involving the deposit of security to a large amount, much of which was obtained in the town where Nursimha Puntulu was holding an important Government office, as also the extent to which the Deputy Collector himself is shown to have paid cash into the Treasury for notes which it must be assumed were required for remittance, point in the same direction to induce the belief that the Deputy Collector was interested in transactions requiring all the funds and security that he or his son could manage to obtain.

57. Whether his official position and influence afforded him special facilities for this purpose and were so employed, must continue matter of conjecture and inference.

58. There is one other point in the case which the Board deem it right to notice, viz., the fact disclosed by the papers that Nursimha Puntulu sought to raise and succeeded in raising in Kurnool District subscriptions for restoring the Masulipatam Hindu School, in first establishing which he took a leading part in 1863.

59. On that occasion he publicly solicited subscriptions in the Kistna District in which he was at the time employed, and the Board directed the Collector to draw his attention to the Circular Order of 17th March 1851, prohibiting public servants from raising subscriptions. On his further representation, the Board in Proceedings dated 12th March 1863, No. 1,477, expressly directed him to abstain from taking an active part in raising subscriptions for any purpose.

487

60. These orders he has now deliberately disobeyed, and the Board can scarcely doubt that pressure of some kind was needed to raise in Kurnool District subscriptions through the Taluk Officers for a purpose in which the people could take but the most remote, if any, interest. Nursimha Puntulu has not been asked for any explanation of his conduct in this respect.

(True Copies and Extract.)

[Handwritten signature]

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.,
with eight Vernacular documents, and their translations.

Copy to E. C. G. Thomas, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool

6.2.66

[Handwritten signature]

Exd. J. Wright.

25 Feb 1866

2/2/66

Very forward Officer. That
Nursimha Puntulu by his
proceedings at Kurnool, has
intended raising money for
his private purposes. The
sum of Rs. 1000, is shown to
be the amount of the
loan taken from the
Treasury, but the same
has not been repaid.
The Collector's dealing
with the Treasury at
Kurnool has been
entirely wrong, and
the result of such
conduct is to bring
the Government into
disrepute.

1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870
349-357	393-305	457-458	182-183	86-87	282-253

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

No. 296.

Department

Dated 31st January 1866.

8 Feb 1866

2.8 with Stamp Office.

No. 720.

1.2.66 510.24 July

Submitting the further correspondence offered by Nursimha Puntulu, Deputy Collector of Kurnool, in his defence before the Board, with the views of the Board on each of the eight charges preferred against that officer.

[Handwritten signature]

I have not the least doubt that Nursimha Puntulu has been making an improper use of the advantages afforded to him by his position. That he has been borrowing money as a loan for his private purposes is proved by the fact that he has not repaid the same. He should be prevented from doing so, and it might perhaps be as well to put his moral character on a pedestal.

Nursimha Puntulu. Deputy Col. of Kurnool.

by impression is that the Collector, Mr. Minchin, has adopted a correct conclusion as to the Deputy Col. system of issuing currency notes.

The Collector considers that this system has rested on the Deputy Col. determination to advance his own private interests by promoting those of certain Soucar with whom it is abundantly clear that Nursimha Puntulu has had private money dealings. There can be no doubt that the Puntulu has been borrowing largely from these Soucar; there can be no doubt, either, that they have had a lion's share of the C. notes issued from the Govt. Treasury at Kurnool. It is obvious that such issues depended on the Puntulu and that he & he

alone, managed & controlled it:
to the entire exclusion of the agency
of the Cash Keeper, Anantaram Singh,
who, as the officer in immediate
charge of the money in the Treasury,
was, of course, the proper person
to meet applications from private
individuals, who, bringing ready
money to the Treasury, deserved currency
notes in exchange for it.

The reason for such exclusion
of the Cashkeeper's agency seems
difficult to explain by the statements
of the Council, that when meeting
their requisitions for C. notes, they
keep for their own advantage of their
opportunity to solicit loans &
money which was granted to him with-
out interest. I can readily understand
that these Provincial Councils, who,
judging from their house names,
I conclude, are members of opulent
Kashmiri Banking firms at Srinagar
& in Central India, - would

not like to refuse a request of
the kind when performed by a
Brahmī public servant, in the high
position of a Deputy Commissioner -
a person, then, that the loan was
made to the Government; and, on a
careful perusal of these papers,
I am satisfied that the Bankers
named by the Councils, have been
speaking the truth in regard to
the money advanced to the Government.
I consider he has been guilty
of the serious offence of making a
most improper use of his official
position for his own personal
benefit, to say nothing of the
salutary to which he has been
neglecting the benevolent plans
of the Govt in respect of getting
currency notes in to furnish
use & circulation by granting them
on application to all comers.

The offence is the more
serious in character when we

Rev. & Prov. 24 - February 1887
Jan 1887

consider that it is an offence by
a Native gentleman, high up in the
unconquered Civil Service - by, in fact,
one of that "crème de la crème" who
has been skimmed off the supposed
élite of our principal officers &
by high pay & rapid promotion
moulded into models for the
rising generation of uneducated
subordinates.

In his letter to the Board of Revenue
Mr. Pautukh denies the truth of the
charges "deliberately & conscientiously"
and says that they have been put
up behind his back.

The origin of the complaint & the
knowledge of it is chiefly from
obtained, could not well be other
than is shown to be by that
gentleman, for, so long as Mr.
Pautukh has in his own hands,
the control he appears to have
exercised over the Revenue Treasury,
it was not likely that his
peculiar

peculiar management of the
Cave: No one would come to light;
and though Mr. Pautukh was not
present when Mr. Minchin examined
the accounts, & recorded the statements
made by them which are now before
you, there does not appear to me
to be the slightest ground for
supposing that these persons have
been precluded from the details
laid by them before the Governor of
Bombay. But such as they are,
Mr. Pautukh has had a fair and
proper opportunity of submitting
his explanation of them to the
Board of R., if he had any to submit.

Instead of doing so, he has
explicated every thing & all, and
we make out that a body of
opulent &, being our knowledge,
highly influential Native Brahmins,
have banded together to calumniate
him & injure him behind his back
by alleging to us what they never said!!!

loan too w^t to persons of their
health & position, an insignificant
amount -

I regard Mr. Pauluter's letter to
the Bd. of R. as a mere warning
of a subject difficult & embarrassing
to answer. There seems to me to
be no necessity whatever for any
further investigation at Burnmoor.
The complaints have been fully
& may say also, fairly treated by
the local authority and the matter
should I think be ended on
what the Bd. have now before
them -

On reference to these papers, I take
but little note of the disappearance
of a portion of the funds subscribed
for Municipal purposes of which
Mr. Pauluter was the depository,
though I much regret that the
liberal contributions of the Pothan
noblemen & ladies of Burnmoor

should have got into the hands
of so faithless a trustee. Still,
the Pauluter must have accepted
the trust in a quasi private capacity
and however deeply discreditable
his conduct, I do not feel that it
represents to be weighed when there
is so much grave matter of a
public kind calling for order.

As regards his acceptance
from one of his own subordinates
of the loan of two Govt. Promy
notes, I feel that there can be no
doubt - and I would simply
remark that if a gentleman in the
Civil Service were to do the same
thing, I should not hesitate to
declare him unworthy of holding
office under Govt. Taking this most
reprehensible conduct into consid-
eration with his proceedings in con-
nection with the sale of the farming
notes & in any opinion that
Sir Edmund Pauluter should
at once be removed from the

service of post. In coming to
this conclusion. I have in mind
the sum lent. awarded by a former
post, to the C. O. Judge of Bellamy,
who was ~~displaced~~ & kept out
of duty for some years, for the
~~purpose~~ ^{purpose} borrowing some money,
at a fair rate of interest, on Bond,
from a long established native firm
doing business in the town of Bellamy.
In the present case we have looking
on purpose - at the borrower, a
high Native official, known & deeply
himself by doing.

Having given an opinion regarding
the guilt of the Lawyer, I would
offer a few remarks as what the
papers connected with his case
bring to light.

Writing as an old collector, it seems
to me a most unusual & anomalous
circumstance that a Deputy
Collector should have been
able to assume towards the
Collector of the District and
he

he was Supervisor, the position
of independence in money
matters, & we see now later that
the Deputy Collector towards his
immediate Superior, Mr. Kimber.

It may be that the relations
between a Deputy Collector in charge of
a Treasury & the Accountant General,
are such as create this independence,
but whilst Act VII of 1857 declares
that a Deputy Collector "shall be
"subject to the same control in all
"respects as a subordinate assistant.
"Collector is subject to" I am unable
to comprehend how Mr. Pantier
can have been permitted to withdraw
(for his own Dept, & funds, no doubt)
Currency Notes from the Delaware Treasury
in the way he did, when at least
a part of them was wanted in
the Delaware, and also keep Mr.
Kimber in ignorance of a correspondence
with the Accountant General ^{with the Accountant General}
which he was holding & Mr. Kimber
had desired to see!!! It seems
to me most strange also, that

a Deputy Com. Thence have been
able to send the Cashkeeper to the place
of his residence, that officer from
drawing C. Notes, when such notes
necessarily formed part of the
money balance placed in the Cash
keeper's personal charge & virtue of
his position as C. Keeper.

I am aware that since my Collection
days, various fullness have been
put prominently forward in many
departments, particularly in that of
accounts & Treasuries; & admitting
to them peculiar arguments, I have
seen the arrangement with interest.
But it cannot have been intended
to make them independent of the
Court to the extent the Parliament has
been at Birmoah. Or if any thing that
has been done or said by the account
General has tended to create this
'imperium in imperio', it seems
to me that it may be advisable
in connection with the account General
to circulate instructions calculated

to replace matters on a proper
footing.
J. R. 65'

W. D. Miller

The Removal of the Pautute Case,

14 +

The charge relative to Smoko³ of the
friends could for some purpose, or say
"misappropriation" will be difficult to establish
judicially. I will not attempt to prove it.

Should I determine on a more
judicial trial, it must be under Act 13 of
1843. In that case there should, in my
opinion, be two commissioners. I will bring
Davidson 100 under and from Kellany.
With L. Foster at Removal. Alone, Foster
would become a loss in the hands of the
Pautute.

Or better than that, Davidson sitting alone,
and secure for the Pautute's trial, a man who
has had nothing to do with the case under 15.
The Pautute is brought forward. I believe enough
Foster is better with a good mission in the
matter.

Should he be ordered to prosecute
the Pautute's suspension from office seems
very essentially necessary, or at the least, as the
man can never be sent back to Removal
under suspension after what has passed, he
(Pautute) should be gazetted by law in another
manner.

✓

The other course would be the trial of the Paentaker for an offence under Chap. 14 of the J. P. Code. For this, too, must have special authority under Sec 167 of the Code (non-Procedum).

If this paper examined by him should deviate from their first statement, a conviction in the Supreme Court would be a matter of course. I think, he is perfectly certain.

But to this course being objected, that there be a right of appeal from the Supreme Court to the High Court, how with all deference to that High authority I think that any special act of the Govt. is likely to be much criticised than a that undoubted attending does exist to oppose Govt. when practicable.

Is it desirable to have a special Court on any subject? I think who is who trouble under Act 13 of 43? Mr J. Clarke was in Langue, Commissioner at special work when the D. Monte case turned up & that case arose out of Mr Clarke's present work. I don't know how the Mr. Hayes

whether was needed.

Let the Paentaker take the Revenue with Act 17 of 57 procedure? He did not. He will make a statement out of the transaction.

Whether the Act of 17 of 57 will be passed in force is a thing which I don't know. I have a case in which it was shown a little received. He himself was a man.

He seemed to feel in the opinion of three men. I repeat however on the statement made by the Paentaker.

It is probable that two such persons will make a statement and perhaps Paentaker says a correct statement. I think it is the same of saying by Paentaker before the Paentaker? I know from what is saying Paentaker that the Paentaker had written them. I think that the Paentaker was a man who was saying that as the Paentaker had written. I know of it with a man & as a man of the best. In all cases the Paentaker of the Paentaker will be sufficient to prevent the Paentaker from being a Paentaker.

The Board of Directors have been very
fully and fairly into this subject and the
conclusions at which they have arrived
seem to me not to be resisted - I will re-
-fer briefly to those parts of their proceedings
which appear most worthy of remark.
P. 5. 6. I concur with the Board that H. P.
was highly culpable in supplanting the com-
-munications with the Colon. in respect to the
estimate of wages & means, and that his
explanation is contrary & disingenuous.
P. 7. 8. 9. - 10 I feel satisfied that H. P. dis-
-regard the issue from the Treasury of America
being entirely in his own hands. The evidence
on this point is irrefragable. and although
such action on his part may not have
been any objectionable procedure, yet his
claim of it involves a direct & gross
fraudulent and unconscionable & to know
that he was aware such interference by
him with the ordinary operations of the
Treasury was improper -
P. 11 to 15. I cannot doubt that the

in a short time he was effectively supplanted
at the instance or instigation of the Board which it was
19th July
W. B. M.

charges considered in their power of
R P's dealings with the Souleys ^{are} ~~in~~
the main & in substance true. There is
no reason to suspect conspiracy or collusion
among R Souleys and the Antichuan
Officials. No accusations were brought
against N.P. by R Souleys. What
detected from them was stated by them
naturally and without premeditation
or apparent malice in reply to the Com
missions. That all the accounts, bills
and receipts showed have been paid
or concerted to have a purpose ap
-proves to me wholly incredible. The
evidence may not in both cases be
born up that of Rancine. His transcript 12
L 22 it seems to me to be too insufficient
to sustain a criminal charge. Their
may be some discrepancies in some
points readily elucidated but of the
correctness of the general conclusion
which the B. & have been in my

24th July 1866
15/17/45
by petition in paras 44 & 55-6 of their
proceedings. I do not see that there can
be any question.
S.D. 53. This charge seems to me proper.
I agree with the Collector that it is in
-dubitable that R P's son should have
been promised money without
his father's joining and assistance.
I believe I am that the whole transac
-tion was R P's own.

On the whole then I am convin
-ced that the facts elicited in this
inquiry amply show that R P is not
a person in whom the Govt can have
any confidence or whom they should
retain in their service. and that
he should therefore be dismissed
from his appointment as Deputy

Col. 1. 8.2.66. J.P.
I have gone over the evidence and I fully agree with
the conclusion arrived at by Mr. Dyce - Mr. Rancine
should therefore be dismissed J.P.

MEMORANDUM

to be returned for immediate
 Requested ~~for~~ reference the undermentioned papers on the subject of
Shore's 14 Feb 11/3 of 1866 on the subject of
William's Portolano's case Deputy Collector of Customs
admitted to go to with Board's P.O. dated 31
January 66 1872.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE,

27 April 1866.

To

The Registrar *in office*
Recd. Depart

Registrar.

011 11
 17 14-13-14

of the State & the
people, but not

24th July 1866

8th 510.

Read prov: of the
Bd of Ref. of 31 Jan 1
1866 N^o 396.

The for^r in Council
has carefully perused
the record of the in-
-quiry in to the con-
duct of M. Marsun.
In Punturoo and
considers that the
facts elicited in
the course of the in-
-vestigation show him
to be a person in whom
the for^r cannot place
any confidence &
whom they ought to
not, in the interests
of the State & the
people, to retain

Pres: of for^r 28 July 1865

- 20 Dec 1865
6 Jan 1866

- 18 Jan 1866

- 25 Jan 1866

MR

W.D.

in the high & im-
portant office of a
Deputy Comm.

Narsimha
Puntolos will
accordingly be
dismissed from
the date of his
suspension - viz
28 July 1865.

With respect to
the charge brought
against Narsimha
Puntolos of ap-
propriating the funds
of the municipa-
lity, ~~the fact~~ to
his own purposes
to the extent of

interposition of
fact. It is for
municipal
consideration
they will in-
terpose
against him
not.

J. D.

14. Ld. Board of Dec. 26. Feb. 1865. & other letters
to the Municipal Comm. & to the
1. & the Collection of Revenue & Dec. 26. Feb.
1. copy of Para 1 & 2 to Mr. Narasimha
Pantulu Dec. 27. Feb.

42

Revenue 1866 Sept 16
No. of Govt for February

12 No 510.

Copy via Atlantic Express

Box 2 6th March 1866

Wm.

Secy of the Madras Govt

27th February 1866.

W. Chavindasam.
Secy of Coll of Madras
dismissed from the date
of suspension.

12/8/66.

From Secy of Madras Govt
7th March 1866 1867 (Per. Chav.)
From Madras Govt Secy
14th March 1866 1867.