

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	278.	Press <u>Mis.</u>
<u>162-163</u>		
Dated	12 th October 1869.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

15

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th October 1869.*

No. 162. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 9th October 1869 :—

Read the following letter from the Acting Collector of the Madras District, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Sydapet, 29th September 1869, No. 343.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for the information of the Board, copy of a letter, in original, from the Deputy-Collector of Madras, in which he professes to explain his reasons for not obeying my order of the 19th June 1868, enjoining on him not to permit the bills in the hands of any one individual to exceed Rupees 2,000 at one time.

From V. RUNGASAWMY IYENGAR, Deputy-Collector of Madras, to the Acting Collector of Madras, Sydapet, dated 27th September 1869, No. 197.

In consequence of the case of embezzlement of the quit-rent collections by Kanakapillay Govindoo Naidoo, that is now under investigation, as reported in my letter to you of the 16th instant, No. 188, my attention has been called, when you were at this office last Thursday, to the plan of entrusting the present fifteen Kanakapillays with bills of only the value of 2,000 Rupees each to remain in hands in any one month, which you laid down in your letter of date the 19th of June, 1868, No. 322.

2. This plan has not been carried out, notwithstanding the suggestion was proposed by myself in my letter, No. 202, of the 19th December 1867, so as to be tried at first in a single Kanakapillay's division; and the reason is, my views on the subject seem to have been formed at the time hastily, but when trying to enforce your orders, and therefore necessarily giving my best consideration to all the details concerned, many difficulties and objections occurred to my mind, which, in my opinion, even now will operate for ever, with all the facilities as to collections provided for in the new Quit-rent Act.

3. The system proposed is not practicable at all to work. Our quit-rent bills comprise "current" year's as well as the past, some years that have fallen into "arrears;" and looking to their several apportionments with the fifteen Kanakapillays, the bills, even separately under these headings, are not only quite up to the prescribed limit of 2,000 Rupees, but in many cases transcend it beyond all comparison; and this the case especially with the "arrears" bills; and this fact will be clear from the statements, which I have prepared for the purpose, and herewith sent, for quit-rent and for ground-rent, and when the latter is also included, the amount in question rising still higher. The scheme therefore involves the necessity of reserving the current and the more recent of the arrears bills, in many cases, until those of the older years have been paid for; because the collections made and credited in the order and priority of the respective fusties to which the bills relate is of importance, as otherwise difficult of adjustment in the accounts, and above all as the older bills, if waived in favour of the subsequent ones, shall have virtually to be written off, the requisition in the Act operating as to the cancelment of all quit-rents of more than six years' standing.

4. But the reservation of the bills is of itself open to objection, for, by giving only a limited number of them, whether of arrears above or a portion of them, or of current, the Kanakapillay shall evidently have to dance his attendance upon one and the same party more than once, to the detriment of his calling upon others. And should the current year's bills be reserved to be handed over after the amount of the old bills have been recovered, we cannot say whether at all, or at all events when, the latter would come to hands, and the result will be that the current fustly may expire and the bills thereof, therefore, falling into arrears as well, without having been ever presented for payment to the parties.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th October 1869.*

5. These facts and objections were all what occurred to me already when I was required to act upon your letter under notice, and it was my intention to enter into a communication with you about them, and devise some other plans for the collection of our quit-rents. But the failure was an oversight, although, certainly, I ought to have been careful myself in calling my attention to the subject on account of its importance; and the oversight, it will be seen, was one of sheer misfortune, for I could have entertained no motives whatever, or evade enforcing the scheme in the face of your clear and decisive orders, which you dictated, though at my own suggestion, and this point therefore I cannot do better than submit to your own discretion.

6. I beg to state, for your information, that in view to my carrying out the recent new suggestion you personally made to me, to go on collecting the quit-rents and ground-rents one division after another, and employ the several Kanakapillays simultaneously in a single division insisting upon their work being done within a stated time, I gave the necessary orders for the preparation of the accounts of balance of bills outstanding in the division of Moottialpet, entrusted to the Kanakapillay Govindoo Naidoo now involved in the case of embezzlement; and in the course of two or three days more I shall be able to work the plan experimentally in this division, giving the seven Kanakapillays whom I shall employ a period of say twenty days, to make up the collections, and I shall report the result in due course for your further orders. I herewith send, for your reference, a list of the outstanding bills in this division of Moottialpet, with particulars of their apportionment to the several Kanakapillays.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government.

2. The Board do not consider it now desirable to comment at length on the Deputy-Collector's explanation which they deem anything but satisfactory.

3. They think that the circumstances of the case as it stands at present render it advisable that the Deputy-Collector should be relieved from his present duties, seeing that there are now under trial defalcators whose peculations are consequent on the laxity of the Deputy-Collector, of which laxity the letter now recorded is an instance.

No. 163. ORDER THEREON, 12th October 1869, No. 2,780.

Miscellaneous.

As it appears that Deputy-Collector Rungasawmy Iyengar has been guilty of very serious neglect of duty, and a

continued breach of the positive orders of the Collector, the Governor in Council deems it necessary to suspend him from office, pending the completion of the inquiry now in progress.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
.. the Acting Collector of Malabar.
.. the Accountant-General

Box of the Rock No. 1
Aug 7, 1871

