Rev: 3045/69

Inst. 2155/69

Forwarded 6 Augt. 2nd Sept/69

Ordered that the Memorial
received with this paper, be acknowledged
to the Madras Govt., and that intimation
of the Queen may be given to the Memorialist.—

22nd Sept/69.

Rev. Revenue.
Fort St. George 30th July 1869.
No. 3045
From Strinivasa Goudoo, late Head Curnam of Kalapuram & other villages, in the Taluq of Hospet in the District of Bellary
Dated 17th July, 1869
Rec'd 28th Sept.
5 enclosures.

Submitting a Memorial to the address of the Secy of State for India soliciting restoration to his former post of Head Curnam of the villages for which he was appointed Trustee on behalf of the Queen of England.

Rec-30/5/69

L.O. 22 Sept/69
Mis. No 72.

Rec'd 17/5/69
Rec'd 21/5/69 1P

TO

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

The Humble Memorial of MADDALAPURAM SRINIVASAGAUDOO, *(late Reddy Village Munsiff) and Mirasidar of Madalapuram and other Villages in the Taluq of Hospet in the District of Bellary in Madras Presidency.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH.

I. That your Petitioner's family have held the hereditary office of Reddy Mirase or Village Munsiff together with Maniyem of Maddalapuram and other Villages for four generations from the days of Carnatic Nabobs and conducted the duties thereof with great care and attention and your Petitioner himself held the same for 31 years from Fusly $\frac{1246}{1836}$ to 11th May $\frac{1278}{1868}$ and conducted the duties of the same very diligently and faithfully. Vide (F.)

1. His duties consisted of collecting the Revenues and remitting the same to the Taluq Treasury in the capacity of the Reddy of the Village, ; of settling petty disputes connected therewith and of committing all offenders charged with heinous crimes to the higher authorities in the capacity of Village Magistrate.
2. Your Petitioner took much pains in performing the said duties of Government which is quite obvious from the Public Records.
3. Except the Maniems and Mirasi attached to the office granted in the days of Carnatic Nabobs, the Petitioner received no fixed pay from Government.
4. Notwithstanding the small income so derived his ancestors holding the Mirase right, discharged its duties with great care and attention never subjecting themselves on any ground whatever to any sort of punishment sueh as infliction of fine, &c., and he the Petitioner has accordingly followed the examples of his ancestors and maintained the same respect of his family.

II. That in September 1867 Tahsildar of Hospit Taluq received General Orders from Head Assis tant Collector to get the trees planted on the banks of the Canal called Raya Calva running from Toonga Badra River to Camalapuram Tank which were duly communicated to your Petitioner.

1. Two individuals named Sidda and Bhima should be appointed and each paid Rs. $3\frac{1}{2}$ a month and charged under the orders and control of your Petitioner with the special duty of planting, watering and nourishing the trees on the banks of the Canal, the salary with other charges should be paid to them directly from the Taluq Treasury itself.
2. Every possible assistance that is requisite to the gardeners should be rendered by the Reddy the Petitioner.
3. A report as to the existing state of the plantation should be monthly submitted by the Petitioner.

4. No wages should be paid to your Petitioner under the head of the said plantations.

III. That your Petitioner immediately with a view simply to gain a good name in the Government and with a view to decrease expense, and to create profit to Government from the plantation, sent for mangoe plants with a great deal of labor and trouble in order to plant them caused pits to be dug in the portion of the two Villages in the charge of your Petitioner to the extent of 1½ miles, planted 196 trees and rendered every occasional assistance to the gardeners.

IV. That your Petitioner did not only submit a monthly report to the Taluq as to the existing state of trees but also superintended the plantation every day.

V. That your Petitioner occasionally sent for other plants and planted them in the place of the withered ones occasionally.

VI. That in consequence of great deal of labor taken by your Petitioner the growth of 131 out of 196 trees in his charge is in a better state than those of the neighbouring Villages as appears from the copy of a Document marked D.

VII. That when your Petitioner as usual inspected the said plantation on 7th April 1868, 30 out of 65 in number that are subsequently replanted in the place of the decayed ones, having been again scorched he ordered the gardeners to get the plants from the Jera Garden and replace them. A diary to this effect is kept in the office of your Petitioner.

VIII. That the gardeners declared to your Petitioner that they did replace them accordingly on 8th May 1868.

IX. That your Petitioner received the Tahasildar's Takid dated 8th May 1868 at 6 P. M. of the very day to the effect that the Head Assistant Collector would come for inspecting the plantations in the charge of your Petitioner early in the morning at 6 o'clock A. M. of the 9th Instant.

X. That your Petitioner met the Head Assistant Collector on the road in the morning of the 9th Instant when he was going as usual for the daily inspection of the said plantation and they both proceeded to the garden.

1. The gardeners were then present in the garden itself as usual.
2. On inspection both the Head Assistant Collector and your Petitioner found in 5 or 6 places the branches of the Mangoe trees to have planted in the place of the withered ones and on questioning Bhima what was the meaning of this neglect he (the said Bhima the gardener) plainly admitted that he himself did it. Vide A.

XI. That thereupon the gardener was immediately sent to Tahasildar forr egular Farmal enquiry into the charge of this gross neglect of the gardener.

1. The gardener the said Bhima in his own deposition marked A given before the Tahasildar plainly admitted as stated above "that on the midnight of the 8th Instant, he himself without the knowledge of any body hurriedly planted in 7 or 8 places the branches of the Mangoe trees in the place of the withered ones to cover his neglect and avoid the displeasure of his superiors and that the Reddy the Petitioner knows nothing about it."

XII. That thereupon the Tahasildar dispensed with the services of the gardener on the forfeiture of his monthly salary of 3½ Rs. crediting the same to Government.

XIII. That while the case stands thus the Head Assistant Collector harshly passed first an order and sent a Takid to the Tahasildar to the effect that the Petitioner was dismissed from the office for there being no trees found planted for the space of 2 miles. His grounds for dismissal are—1st, That the Petitioner disobeyed his orders and

disrespected him—2ndly, He considers loss to Government; and 3rdly, He was negligent in the supervision of the growth and nourishment of the trees. Vide B issued by the Tahasildar with reference to C.

1. A second order was issued 4 days afterwards by the very Head Assistant Collector that your Petitioner has been deprived of the Reddy office of all the Villages in his charge which have no concern in the present plantation affair, which your Petitioner is at a loss to understand and seems to be quite astonishing and surprising.

XIV. That your Petitioner begs leave to contend that the said orders are altogether groundless and useless; very properly it may be counted next to nothing for the following reasons :—

For the 1st Order.

1A. While the supervision of your Petitioner extended only to 1½ mile; the wording of the first Order says it is 2 miles.

B—While the report of your Petitioner's successor dated 18th May 1868 appointed in his stead to the office of Reddy by the said gentleman ——— says that the growth of 131 trees is in good condition, the wording of the first Order says that there are "*no trees at all.*" How can it be possible for one to give credit to the validity of the Order. Vide D.

2A—The said Bhima is strictly speaking a Government servant equally with your Petitioner though in the post of a gardener whom your Petitioner has not been authorized to appoint or dismiss.

B—The alleged neglect has occurred by Bhima and the fraud has been committed by him without the knowledge of your Petitioner on the night of the 8th May 1868

C—The said Bhima plainly admitted his having done the same without informing your Petitioner.

D—While the subjectmatter now in dispute hasnot been at all supported by any evidence whatever how can it be possible for the Head Assistant Collector to think that the same has been committed or has been caused to be committed by your Petitioner or had any concern with Bhima in the matter and thereby that he Head Assistant Collector has been disrespected.

3 —While the salaries of the gardeners inclusive of charges for the said plantation have been distributed directly by the Tahasildar from the Taluq Treasury, how can it be possible to imagine that your Petitioner caused loss to Government.

4A—While your Petitioner rendered great assistance to gardeners who now even admit the same and while your Petitioner's successor reported that 131 trees cultivated in the place now under dispute are in good condition, how can it strike even to a common mind that your Petitioner neglected his duty of attending to the growth and nourishment of the said plantatioon.

B—No enquiry was held into the Petitioner's supposed neglect nor is there any evidence to support it.

For the 2nd Order.

While the plantation system has not been extended to the other Villages in which your Petitioner held the office of Reddy Merasidar and while every thing connected with the Revenue and other public Government maters is getting on very satisfactorily from time immemorial, it is very unjust that your Petitioner had been deprived of the office of Reddy Mirasi for such Villages also. No law would support this order.

XV. On the—Appealing of your Petitioner to the Collector of the Districtt on the above mentioned grounds, he without holding any enquiry into the subject whatsoever disregarded all the reasons contained in head Assistant Collector's order but confirmed it simply on the mere supposition that neglect might have occurred on the part of your Petitioner.

XVI. That your Petitioner petitioned the Board of Revenue against the Collector's harsh confirmation of the order of Head Assistant Maigstrate.

XVII. That the Board of Revenue on the 20th October 1868 passed upon the said Petition the following order viz. " It seems as the dismissal is an extreme measure for the offence, they request that the Collector will report a little more upon the case stating the length of Petitioner's Service and his general character, the deposition tendered with Petition No. 3146 should also receive due consideration." The Collector called upon the Tahsildar for a report in the case—The latter sent an arzi marked **F.**

XVIII. That on the 16th December the Honorable Board of Revenue without taking into consideration the F passed the following order, viz. the Board have given full consideration and received a report on the subject. They decline to interfere on Petitioner's behalf.

XIX. That the Government too without penetrating into the records just simply approved the confirmation of the Board and passed an endorsement dated 5th March 1869 No. 323.

XX. That your Petitioner having been thus aggrieved most earnestly solicits your majesty to take the following points into your candid consideration and grant him relief.

1. Whether any neglect appears on the part of your Petitioner as regards to the said plantation and even supposing it to be so whether is it not the punishment awarded for such supposed trifling neglect too severe or too extreme a measure.
2. Whether is it not uncommon for the plantation in India being occasionally withered where for 14 years a long period no drop of rain and consequently a great famine is prevalent in these quarters.

XXI. That your Petitioner lastly relying further on his unblemished character of 31 years spent in the public service of collecting Revenue and of deciding the Civil suits and of committing to the higher authorities such Criminial cases as would fall with, his cognizance and on his ancestral claims according to Regulations IV & 11 of 1816 and to the office of which he has been unjustly deprived respectfullybegs leave to state that while there is no evidence to the supposed neglect and while Tahsildar to whom your Petitioner is a direct subordinate not able to find a least mistake with him, and has not got any bad opinion of him as it appears especially from his office Records the Collector who knows nothing of him formed an opinion that it should have been the gross neglect of your Petitioner and deprived him of his hereditary office of the Reddy Mirasidar which is approved and confirmed by the Board and Government your Petitioner cannot but attribute the same to his misfortune.

That your Petitioner in conclusion most humbly request the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India will upon a due consideration of all the records connected with the Petitioners case direct the Madras Government to grant orders to the Collector of the District to restore him to the office of Reddy Mirasidar as he is quite innocent in the trival charge of the neglect with which he is now charged as regards to the said Plantation.

For which act of Indulgenceche Petitioner is as in duty bound shall ever pray.

(Signed.)

dated 17th July 1869, MADRAS.

East office & prays
for its transmission
to the said authority
with the recommen-
dation of this Govt.

[illegible] Govt
Cate Reg. [illegible]
of Murala[illegible]
Rosebery in
Bellari
Dated August
Recd. Septr. 3/86
7 encls.
State that with
refere to the rule
g for transmiss
of memorials to the
Home Authority under
which the memorial
was relad to him,
he has authenticated
with his signature
all the enclosures
of his memorial he

5 Aug 1853
20 Sept 1853

To

His excellency the Right Honorable Lord
Napier H.E. Governor of Madras in Council

The Humble Petition of Shreenivasa Gow
Cole Reddy Merasedar of Moodlapooram
in the Taluq of Dorapat in the Zillah of
Bellary.

Respectfully Sheweth,

That I most respectfully beg
leave to state for the information of your
excellency in Council that the Collector of Zillah
Bellary Confirmed the decision of the Head of Ta
Collector regarding my situation, dated 11th May
On the 16th December of the said year I presented
to the Board of Revenue Petition Nos 3146 & 3022,
and they confirmed the same decision. Against
this, I presented to the Government a Petition
No 333 on the 5th March 1869 but they were pleased
to endorse thereon, stating that they see no reason
to interfere in the matter.

Therefore, I most humbly solicit your
excellency in Council will be graciously please
to submit to the right Honorable the secretary

of State for India the (Premises) Appeal Petition with its Enclosure annexed herewith.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

Madras — 3.
7th July 1869 3.