

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1875	Press ~~Mis.~~
¹⁰¹⁻¹⁰² Dated	6-7-	12.18.68

Not to be folded or roughly handled

9/17

1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
6th July 1868.*

No. 101. Read the following letter from the Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort St. George, dated Camp at Coimbatore, 13th June 1868, No. 884-34 :—

1. In forwarding the enclosed appeal from a (Mr. Johnson) late Head Surveyor, against his dismissal by me in October last, I have the honor to submit the Memorandum of enquiry made by me at the time, extracts from my Inspection Order in October 1867, and a few remarks on the present petition.

2. As Mr. Johnson lays particular stress on Mr. Wright, 1st Assistant Superintendent, lately in charge of the Kurnool Survey, being called on for his opinion with regard to Mr. Johnson's guilt, he has, by my desire, written to me an explanatory letter (also enclosed).

3. The original documents referred to in my Memorandum of enquiry are in my office, and can be produced if called for; all other papers are in the Kurnool Survey office.

REFERENCE.

Mr. Johnson's own statement of his own services, 1866.

1. Mr. Johnson submitted the false returns before his attack of cholera; his illness, therefore, and alleged absconding of his servant with money, could not possibly affect the payments that ought to have been made, and were reported to have been made previously.

2. In Mr. Wright's letter, attached, it will be seen that Mr. Johnson was employed in office out of kindness because he was in debt. When no Assistant Superintendent is in office, it will of course happen that to a Head Surveyor, who may be there, work of a similar character will be entrusted, *i. e.*, examination of maps and records.

3. *Same statement 1867.*—See Mr. Wright's letter, paragraphs 2 and 3. Mr. Johnson was merely entrusted with the keys as a convenience during office hours, and was appointed to act as Manager during the time the Manager was sick.

4. *Same statement, 1867, August to September.*—The statement is simply false. He was entrusted with no other duties in the field than were being at the same time carried out in the department by perhaps a dozen Head Surveyors junior to him.

5. Mr. Johnson tried by every means in his power to avoid the enquiry on his conduct, and, among other expedients, tendered his resignation, which was not accepted. It will be seen by the specific charges against him, that the enquiry was not, as he states, into his conduct since he entered the department. He disobeyed the order to attend the enquiry, sending word that "he had taken a dose of medicine."

6. With regard to his having been so frequently recommended for promotion, I beg to refer to Inspection Order (appended), paragraph 7. One of the irregularities in the conduct of the establishment, specially noticed with disapprobation, is the recommendation of men for promotion who were totally unworthy of it.

7. In September 1867, when inspecting No. 2 party, I found that a number of Surveyors, had been guilty of gross irregularities, and considered it my duty to take the responsibility and odium of the severe measures that were required in removing the guilty higher subordinates, instead of leaving the enquiry to be made by the Deputy Superintendent who had not long before taken charge.

CAMP AT COIMBATORE,
13th June 1868.

(Signed) F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Lieut.-Colonel,
Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Copy of a letter from J. H. WRIGHT, Esq., 1st Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, dated Madras, 9th June 1868.

I have the honor to submit the following explanation with reference to Mr. Johnson's appeal against your decision :—

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
6th July 1868.*

1. An enquiry was held to ascertain how much money was due by Mr. Johnson on account of the advances sent from time to time to meet the weekly cooly expenditure, and believing his statement about his servant having run away with the money, he was permitted to refund the amount on pay day, and the matter allowed to pass over; this was in August 1866, to the best of my recollection.

2. Mr. Johnson being in debt, he was permitted to remain in office for a long period, as he would have less expenses than if working in the field.

3. Mr. Johnson was called upon to act for the Manager while he was sick, but was not trusted solely with the keys of either the cash-chest or the stores; for the former there was a Shroff, and the latter, a regular Store Gumastah, who kept the accounts of all the stores, &c. The keys were in my own possession, except in the day time, when given for either the issue of money or stores.

4. From the examination of the documents I have now perused, there can be no doubt that Mr. Johnson did falsify the returns.

(Signed) F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Lieut.-Colonel,
Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

No. 102.

ORDER THEREON, 6th July 1868, No. 1,875.

Miscellaneous.

The Government having carefully perused the appeal petition and records connected with it, including Mr. Wright's

letter, decline to interfere with the order of the Superintendent of Revenue Survey dismissing Mr. Johnson from the service.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Rd. S. T. Augustin.

Memo

Mr. S. Johnson late Head Surveyor in the Rev's Settlement department was dismissed in October 1867 on the following grounds. In June, July and August 1866, he submitted certain returns showing expenditure for coolies paid to 7 Amins amounting to Rs 45-13-11. In the weekly reports of 5 of these amins no sums were entered as received from him. In the reports of 2 Amins certain sums were entered as received from him, but on subsequent enquiry these 2 Amins stated that they had not received the money but had entered it because in one case Mr. Johnson

Johnson, and in the other
his gunastak had informed them
that this money would be sent
shortly. On August 19th Mr.
Johnson's gunastak sent
an arzee saying that one of
these Amias J. Ramiah sub-
mitted weekly reports
showing no work done, for
want of money. Mr. Johnson
sent back an order (not forth-
coming) to the effect that the
amin must show some kind
of work, which was accordingly
done. Mr. Johnson admitted
that the cooly money had
not been paid when he went
into Lumool in 1860 (I
presume after the above
transactions, date not given)
at his request the money
due to Amias was stopped
from

This amount to an
admission on his
part that the money
was not to be paid
for by the Amias

in fact that
it had not been
advanced to them.

3
from his pay for August and
September by Mr. Wright,
the Deputy Superintendent.
On date of enquiry October 5th
1867, Mr. Johnson did not
appear, sending word that
he had taken medicine. From
perusal of the documents,
the Supt. Rev. Survey had no
hesitation in pronouncing Mr.
Johnson guilty of falsifying
the returns of cooly expendi-
ture. The charge of sending
the order to the amin to submit
false returns of work was not
so clear, in consequence of
the said order not being forth-
coming.

1. In defence, Mr. Johnson re-
fers to his former service which
appears to have been good.
2. He alleged a sudden at-
tack of cholera which com-
pelled him to return
suddenly

suddenly to Kumool, and
the absconding of his servant
with some money which
threw his accounts into
confusion. The false
returns however were
submitted by him before
his attack of cholera.

3 He states that he was
subsequently employed
in responsible posts. Such
employment the Superint^{de}
states was only temporary.

4 He refers to Mr Wright
to clear his character. Mr
Wright states that
from examination of the
documents. There is no doubt
that Mr Johnson did
falsify the returns.

St

It was a grave error
of judgment to endorse
such an officer as the
only person making good
a pecuniary statement
of his accounts. But Mr. W.
has been collecting
the balance of his
to his servant
absconded &
used the money
L. P. shows that the
statement was not
correct. & Mr. W.
admits this.
There seems no room
to doubt that the charge
is perfectly well founded.

MS
I think the loss
should be made
treasury's order of domestic
would equal Mr. Johnson's
appeal WDN
2 July 68.

9
It is not clear why Mr.
Wright allowed the matter to
pass in 1866 when it first
came to his notice. In the
appeal petition Mr. Johnson
does not enter into particulars
of the charge; nor does he
distinctly deny having fabri-
cated the accounts. In fact
in his letter to the Dep^t
Supt^{de} above mentioned he
practically admits having done
so, as he requested the amount
might be adjusted by de-
ductions from his salary.

The Supt^{de} points out
that there had been consi-
derable irregularity in matters
of this sort in the depart^{mt},
and he felt it necessary
to make an example.

HS.

Memorandum
Dismissal of Mr. Johnson
from the Survey Dept.

2123

Revenue Depart^{mt}

1875.

Proceedings of the Madras Gov^t

Under date the 6th July 1868.

Read the following
letter from the Sup^t
Rev: Survey.

Submitting with remarks
an appeal from Mr. S. Johnson
against his dismissal from the
Survey Depart^{mt}

(Here enter 13th June 68
H^{rs} 884
34)

The Government having
carefully perused the
appeal petition and records
including Mr. Knight's letter
connected with it, decline
to interfere with the Order
of the Sup^t of Rev:
Survey dismissing Mr.
Johnson from the service.

13 Copies to the Sup^t of Rev: Survey Dept.

2123

Ac 101-102

Disposal of the
from the Survey Dept

Revenue 1868 Depts
to of 4000 for July

1875

to of the blackness
276th July 1868

Cir

Dispatch