M.G. 1—32,000—18-10-20.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1638 Press Mis.

167-69
Dated 12-9-1820

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following papers:—

No. 147. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 26th April 1870, No. 2,769.

Read the following letters:—

From the Collector of Cuddapah, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 21st January 1870, No. 8.

I HAVE the honour to inform the Board that I have this day ordered the suspension from Office of C. Vencata Krishniah, the Tahsildar of Jamalamadagu, as I believe him to have been guilty of a fraud upon the Government in the matter of a Poligar's pension, and of divers grave irregularities, full reports upon all of which are now under preparation, and will shortly be submitted.

From the same officer, dated 29th January 1870, No. 11.

MY Deputy-Collector A. Sudarsana Row, lately found in the Treasury of the Jamalamadagu Talook, a box, which, on inquiry, the Tahsildar informed* him contained the ornamental jewels of the idol of the "Buruzu Aunjaneya Swamy Pagoda" at Jamalamadagu; and on further inqury it came out that for many years past these jewels have not only been kept in the Treasury, but that whenever required for use they have been sent to and from the Pagoda in the custody of the Deputy-Shroff and Peons of the talook.

* *Vide* translations of the Tahsildar's Arzies, Nos. 413 and 420, dated 5th and 8th November 1869, respectively, herewith sent, marked D. and E.

2. The Tahsildar, who has been in the talook since May 1867, admits in his deposition copy† of which is enclosed, that he never brought this circumstance either to my notice, or to that of my Assistant Mr. Boyle, who examined his Treasury in September last; but he declares (what is very easy to say, and can neither be proved nor disproved) that he verbally informed the late Acting Collector Mr. Molony of it. This declaration I wholly disbelieve, feeling convinced that Mr. Molony would never have passed over any such irregularity, had it been explicitly brought to his notice.

† A.

3. The Tahsildar's main defence, however, lies in a takeed‡ signed by Mr. Wedderburn, when Acting Collector in 1861, and addressed to the then Tahsildar, who had reported the circumstance, and asked for orders. This takeed is of so extraordinary a character that besides a translation thereof I submit a copy in the original Telugu. The Board will observe that the signature of my present Sheristadar K. Simhadri Pantulu is appended thereto. I can only believe that he was the author of it, and that Mr. Wedderburn signed it in ignorance of its contents, and this belief is not unsupported by the fact that the list§ of jewels exhibits the Sheristadar as one of the donors.

‡ B.

§ C.

4. Of course he knew all about the box and its contents, and equally, as a matter of course, he kept me in ignorance of the irregularity. Ever since I have been in the district I have been well aware that all the little energy and still less ability that he possesses have been mainly devoted to keeping me in ignorance of everything my knowledge of which might have benefited the public service. I shall, however, shortly take another opportunity of reporting to the Board my sense of the inquiries sustained by this unfortunate district by the elevation to and retention in his present office of one so incompetent and so corrupt as Sheristadar E. Simhadri Puntulu.

5. Of the character of C. Vencata Krishniah, the Tahsildar in question, I entertain the worst possible opinion. In the great school of corruption presided over for so long and for several years quite unchecked by Simhadri Puntulu, the first prize might justly be awarded to this Tahsildar as the most apt of all the pupils. I am about to make further specific report of his iniquities also.

6. To return to the Pagoda, it appears, on further inquiry, that it has never had any recognized head or manager, except the Tahsildar for the time being, and consequently there was no such person forthcoming to whom I could hand over the box and its contents.

7. It appears that in 1866 the Committee appointed for the talook, under Act XX. of 1863, claimed the management of it, but they were informed under the signature of the late Collector Mr. Smith that the provisions of Act XX. of 1863 did not extend to it, and they appear to have taken no further steps to enforce their claim.

8. Considering, however, that the Pagoda has for some thirty years past enjoyed an endowment, conferred by a private individual, of 25 Coontahs of assessed land, I entertain no sort of doubt but that prior to the passing of Act XX. of 1863 the Board of Revenue might have exercised supervision over it, and that it is consequently a Pagoda that should have been transferred to the Committee appointed under that Act. I have the honour therefore to request the Board to cancel the late Collector's decision on this point, and to authorize me to transfer the property together with the management of the Pagoda to the local Committee.

P.S.—The Sheristadar has seen the draft of this letter, and returned it without offering any explanation.

Enclosure No. 1, A.—Deposition of Tahsildar of Jamalamadagu Talook.

Enclosure No. 2, B.—Translation of order issued by Collector.

Enclosure No. 3, C.—List of Ornaments.

Enclosures Nos. 4 and 5, D. and E.—Translation Arzies.

From the same officer, dated 29th January 1870, No. 12.

I HAVE the honour to draw the attention of the Board to the marginally noted correspondence, the result of which was that, in Government Order, Revenue Department, dated 4th December 1867, No. 2,893, the Government sanctioned the distribution of a Poligar allowance of Rupees 1,750, in equal shares of Rupees 437-8-0 each, to the marginally noted individuals, residing in the village of Corapaud in the Prodatoor Talook of this district.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, 31st July 1867, No. 4,910.
" 7th September 1867, No. 5,806.
" 7th December " " 7,924.

Lutchmenarasamma.
Ranganaikammah.
Latchamma.
Sitaramiah.

2. The Board will note that a share was allotted to the boy Sitaramiah on the faith of the Collector's report that he was the son of deceased Vencatanarasammah, a daughter of the original grantee, and that the family had no other means of subsistence than the Poligar allowance.

3. A petition,* dated 2nd May 1868, was addressed to the 1st-class Deputy-Collector Royappah Puntulu by Danireddy Naraparedy of Corapaud, in which it was asserted that a fraud had been committed that Sitaramiah was not the son of Vencatanarasammah, and that the family had landed property to subsist upon.

* A.

4. It was further alleged that a bribe of Rupees 2,500 had been distributed between the Tahsildar C. Vencata Krishniah, (now Tahsildar of Jamalamadagu,) the Sheristadar and the village-officers.

5. The Deputy-Collector forwarded this petition to the late Acting Collector on the 23rd May, and on the 1st June Mr. Molony returned† it, and directed the Deputy-Collector to ascertain the truth by "special" inquiry, and report the result.

† B.

6. On the 5th September Mr. Molony referred to the Deputy-Collector another similar petition,‡ dated 28th August, presented to himself by the same writer, wherein the Head Sheristadar E. Simhadri Puntulu is mentioned by name as having aided the alleged fraud.

‡ C.

7. On the 17th October the Deputy-Collector sent up, with a Vernacular memorandum,¶ the record of the inquiry which he had *deputed the Tahsildar* (Arnee Kristnarow, now Tahsildar of Madanapally) to make.

¶ D.

8. Mr. Molony, when this communication must have reached him, was very ill. He left the district on the 31st October, and Mr. Storr who only joined the district as Acting Sub-Collector on the 20th October, was left in temporary charge until my arrival on the 16th November.

9. On the 14th November, or two days before I took charge of the district, a Vernacular memorandum,§ signed by Mr. Storr, was despatched to the Deputy-Collector, asking for some further information.

§ E.

10. Deputy-Collector Royappah Puntulu having meanwhile retired from the service on pension on the 15th January 1869, Mr. Pritchard, his successor, despatched to me the enclosed original letter.* The Board will observe that I transferred it to the Sheristadar with a pencilled direction to "bring up and report." This was the first paper that had come before me bearing on the subject, and the Board will observe that it could not have conveyed to me any notion of the actual facts of the matter.

* F.

11. My Sheristadar never produced that letter again until November last, in spite of my continuous calls upon him to bring up every arrear for which he was responsible. No such thing as unanswered lists, except of Board's correspondence, had ever been kept in this district. In the course of last year, however, I established the system in all offices, and succeeded, after considerable trouble, in getting tolerably correct lists made out. I thus got a clue to this letter that had been lying in the Sheristadar's hands for over half a year, but it was not till I threatened to report him to the Board that in November I succeeded in getting it, and the whole of the papers connected with it out of him, together with some other arrears to which I had obtained similar clue.

12. Moreover, in the end of January the enclosed Board's Petitions† from the same Corapaud Reddy were "transferred" to me, as will be seen from the Sub-Secretary's endorsement, under date the 26th January 1869. Observing from the precis of Petition No. 3,236, that the subject-matter had been referred to the Deputy-Collector by the Collector, I at once disposed of these petitions as I thought by the pencilled endorsement which the Board will observe on the reverse side of their endorsement. Until the Sheristadar, under great pressure, produced the papers in November last, I was in ignorance that my endorsement had not been despatched in the usual course. I enclose the original memorandum with which he returned to me the petitions and my draft endorsement.

† G.
Nos. 2,991 and 3,236 of 1868.

13. I may mention, moreover, that the Sheristadar rode by my side past the village of Corapaud on the 16th October last, and even then he never opened his lips to give me an inkling of the serious matter connected therewith that was pending in my office, all the papers being in his hands, and of which he knew that I must necessarily be in complete ignorance owing to his own default of duty. Considering that he himself had been publicly accused of being bribed to defraud the Government, it is absolutely impossible that the affair could have escaped his memory.

14. When at last the papers reached me, and I discovered what a serious allegation of fraud they contained, I placed them in the hands of my trustworthy Deputy-Collector A. Sudarsana Row, with instructions to investigate the matter personally. This he has done, and I now submit copies‡ of his report and of the record of his inquiry.

‡ H.

15. Perusal of these papers will, I believe, convince the Board, as it has convinced me, that the boy Sitaramiah is not the son of Venkatanarasammah, but has been palmed off as such by the three female members of the Corapaud Zemindary family with the connivance of the Collector's subordinates, in order to prevent the pension* lapsing, as it would have lapsed, to the State on their demise.

* I have now stopped payment of the Corapaud pension, pending orders of the Board.

16. The connivance of the Collector's chief subordinates is obvious to any one who knows this district. These ignorant females would never have dreamed of venturing upon so clumsy a fraud had not their advisers assured them that the services of the most influential officials had been secured, and that consequently there was no danger of discovery.

17. The four village-officers concerned are all now out of employ, and two of them are in Jail.

18. The Tahsildar (now of Jamalamadagu) C. Venkata Krishniah is responsible for the report whereon the Collector's recommendation, wherein Sitaramiah is stated to be the son of Venkatanarasammah was based. His sole plea is that he trusted to the report of the village-officers; but it was obviously his duty to have made a proper inquiry, and if he had made any *bonâ fide* inquiry at all, he would, without any difficulty, have ascertained from those who shortly afterwards came forward to proclaim the fraud that Sitaramiah was not a member of the Zemindary family. His only refuge from the suspicion of corruption is, therefore, in what is virtually an admission of the most gross and culpable neglect of a plain duty. But I have not a shadow of doubt but that he was bribed. He is no fool upon whom any one in his talook would have ventured to play such a trick. He is a man of whose character I can only write in the worst possible terms. He is a clever man who knows English; and he is notorious for selling justice systematically, for his tyranny and his corruption. He is hated throughout his talook, and feared so much that it is almost impossible to get any one to say anything against him in public.

19. It is with more regret that I conceive it to be my duty to record my conviction that even this Tahsildar would never have dared to lend himself to the fraud, had he not been assured of the aid and encouragement of the Collector's Sheristadar E. Simhadri Puntulu, who, I have no doubt whatever, shared the bribe with him.

20. It would be a delicate and unpleasant task to go into all the causes of the utter demoralization of the public service in this district, and probably an unnecessary one also, for I believe both the Board and the Government are well aware of what I allude to. I must, however, state the fact the notoriety of which has extended far beyond the confines of this district, that for a long period, embracing that of this fraud, Simhadri Puntulu monopolized all power and influence in the district. It is, moreover, equally notorious that this power and influence were not exercised for good. Every public servant was his slave, and altogether the public service throughout the district fell into a state more lamentable and discreditable to our administration than almost it is possible to conceive. Knowing, therefore, what I know of Simhadri Puntulu's position and influence at this time, I cannot

resist arriving at a positive conviction that not only would the fraud in question never have been attempted by the Zemindary family without his connivance, but least of all would the Tahsildar have dared to move in the matter without his knowledge, consent, and encouragement.

21. He concealed the matter from me deliberately for a whole year, and I cannot doubt but that had I left the district or died, nothing further would ever have been heard of the matter, unless the Corapaud Reddy had again forced it into notice. I believe many other iniquities to which the Collector has now no clue have been burked in the Sheristadar's department.

22. The state of the public service in this most unfortunate district can never be materially improved as long as Simhadri Puntulu holds office in it. Having for long been *de facto* Collector, wielding all real power and patronage, filling every public office with his creatures, it is impossible for any Collector to make much head against the popular impression of his power and influence. It is true that the officials know well that Simhadri Puntulu's star is not now in the ascendant, but they have almost all been demoralized by him, and are so united to his interests by a common bond of corruption that it is useless to expect any opposition to him from them. Moreover, not a few even of them, and certainly the ignorant public in general, see nothing impossible, or even improbable, in Simhadri Puntulu's again becoming what he has already been the paramount power in the district, and this consideration is quite sufficient to deter any one from running the risk of incurring his displeasure. Moreover, he is a light-hearted man, of good presence, and very pleasing manners, drives a dog-cart, rides a good horse, and altogether lives in great style, and consequently is by no means unpopular, but rather the reverse with natives, while among European gentlemen, these qualities and circumstances have always made him a favourite.

23. Indeed to this last fact, his advancement in the public service must be entirely attributed, for while not unendowed with a certain amount of natural cleverness of a low order, and with a remarkable aptitude for intrigue, he is absolutely wanting in all the higher qualities that a Head Sheristadar ought to possess. He has neither ability, education, nor even application to commend him. Altogether he is the most thoroughly incompetent man of business that I have ever seen raised from the lower ranks of the native public service. Were his character all that it should be, it would be hard enough on the Collector to be saddled with a Head Sheristadar, to ask whose opinion on any revenue matter of importance would be a mere farce, but to have to keep at one's right hand a Head Sheristadar, whom one cannot trust in the smallest matter, and who, one knows, is making it his constant business to thwart every effort one is making to improve the district, which he has been the main agent in demoralizing, is truly disheartening.

24. So worse than useless as a man of business is he to me that I would much prefer to have no Sheristadar at all to retaining him in that post. His services are not, and never could have been worth more than Rupees 40 a-month. Even if no other reasons existed, on this ground of utter incompetence alone, he should be removed from his post. But I trust I may have convinced the Board that regard for the best interests of this district imperatively demand Simhadri Puntulu's removal from office on other weighty grounds.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th September 1870.

25. If judicial proof of all that I have stated is to be waited for, I fear that as long as the Sheristadar holds his post it will be simply impossible to procure it, notwithstanding that many of the circumstances connected with his delinquencies as a public servant are perfectly notorious. For instance, every one knows that he is a partner of Narasanna Chetty, one of the leading merchants of Cuddapah, Messrs. Arbuthnot and Company's Broker, and one of the Abkarry contractors of the district. Again, he professes to have sold almost all the lands he had acquired in this district, but I know perfectly well that he has not sold them all, but is still holding some in other persons' names. In these instances, nothing would come of inquiry at present. The parties concerned would support Simhadri Puntulu in a blank denial of everything.

26. In conclusion, I can assure the Board that it has been a most disagreeable task to me to write in such terms of a man with whom I have maintained pleasant enough relations for a year and more, and whom personally I cannot well help rather liking, but after mature consideration it has seemed to me unavoidable. In all my experience of various districts I have never known any to be in anything like so rotten and disgraceful a condition as I found this one in, and after labouring for over a year the conclusion has been forced on me that neither I nor any other Collector, however able, can effect real improvement in any appreciable degree as long as Simhadri Puntulu holds his present position.

27. Being a hale man of forty-two, in the natural course of things he would remain Sheristadar for thirteen years more. It would be difficult to conceive a more unhappy fate for this already sufficiently unfortunate district. His service for pension is twenty years, but he could not get a medical certificate; nor do I go through the force of suggesting his transfer to any other district, for I consider him to be unfit to hold any responsible appointment. I have done what I consider to be an imperative duty to the district, for the good administration of which I have been made responsible, and the issue I must leave to superior authority.

28. It is my deliberate opinion, after visiting every talook, and using, by the light of a long and varied district experience, every means in my power to ascertain the condition both of the public service and of the people, that it is essential to the best interests of both that Simhadri Puntulu should be absolutely removed from all office under Government in Cuddapah.

29. I send in original my Sheristadar's application* after perusal of the draft of this letter. The only comment that seems necessary thereon is on the reference to Deputy-Collector Sudarsana Row. Sudarsana Row has had nothing to do with this matter beyond under my orders making the inquiry, the record of which is submitted. The general opinions I have expressed regarding the Sheristadar were formed in eleven months' experience of the district before Sudarsana Row joined it in October last, and I do not know Sudarsana Row before-

* Marked I.

30. Similarly, the Jamalamadagu Tahsildar, when I saw him during the Christmas holidays, made insinuations against Sudarsana Row of having set me against him, but my opinion of *his* character also had been formed before I knew anything of Sudarsana Row, and the Tahsildar could not gainsay that my reception of him when I visited his talook in October before Sudarsana Row's arrival in the district was sufficient evidence of this.

31. Sudarsana Row came to me, bearing the highest testimonials for tried integrity and rare moral courage from Messrs. Pechin, Sullivan, and Chase, Collectors under whom he had served, and from Mr. F. P. Hutchins, the Acting Judge of Kurnool. His character is also well known to Mr. Hinchin.

32. He is the "open and determined enemy" of all corrupt officials, and what is still more to his credit is, that, though fully appreciating its unpleasantness, he has the moral courage not to shrink from the odium of acting upon such honest enmity.

Enclosure A.—Translation of Petition.

Enclosure B.—Translation of a Yadast from Collector.

Enclosure C.—Endorsement on a Petition.

Enclosure D.—1 to 3.—Translations of Yadasts and Depositions.

Enclosure E.—Translation of Yadast from Collector, dated 14th November 1868, No. 202.

Enclosure F.—Translation of an Arzi, dated 23rd December 1868, No. 404.

Enclosure G.—Two Petitions Nos. 3,236 and 2,994 of 1868, with Endorsements.

Enclosure H.—Letter from A. Sudarsana Row, Deputy-Collector, dated 22nd December 1869.

Enclosure I.—Letter from Simhadri Puntulu, dated 27th January 1870.

From the same officer, dated 29th January 1870, No. 13.

In connection with my letters, Nos. 11 and 12, I have the honour to submit copy of another report* from my Deputy-Collector A. Sudarsana Row, showing that the Tahsildar of Jamalamadagu, C. Vencata Krishniah, has been remitting and reducing Income-tax assessments where no appeals were preferred, also a translation of the Tahsildar's explanation.

* Dated 17th January 1870, No. 18.

2. I cannot admit this explanation. The Tahsildar has quite sufficient intelligence to be well aware that his only safe and proper course was to act in strict conformity with the Act. This Tahsildar's irregularities are all intentional and for corrupt ends.

3. The Deputy-Magistrate has just convicted the Reddies in one of the cases referred to in paragraph 11 of his report, and he has informed me *dard-officially* that he is confident the money collected by them on the plea of exempting the villagers from Income-tax went to the Tahsildar.

4. Indeed, from the knowledge I have acquired of the ways of the district, I can have no doubt but that this system of fraud was set a-going throughout the talook by the Tahsildar himself. The village-officers dare not do this kind of thing of themselves.

Enclosure No. 1.—Letter from Sudarsana Row, dated 17th January 1870.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th September 1870.

From the same officer, dated 29th January 1870, No. 14.

In connection with my letters Nos. 11, 12, and 13, I have the honour to forward copy of a report* by my Deputy-Collector, with its enclosures (48) in original (to be returned), upon a complaint preferred by J. Streenivassa Row, late Cash Goomastah in the Jamalamadagu, but since transferred to another talook, against C. Vencata Krishniah, the Tahsildar of Jamalamadagu, of having unauthorizedly raised a subscription to build a car for a temple, and of having caused all his subordinates to pay a month's salary for that object.

* No. 194, dated 13th November 1869.

2. Although in a strictly judicial point of view the charge may not be absolutely proved, I quite concur in the conclusions arrived at by the Deputy-Collector, and I feel morally convinced that the charge is substantially true. Unofficial people in this district never dream of subscribing in the proper sense of the term for any public object. Their only notion—and a most natural one I regret to say it is—of such a subscription is a levy enforced upon them by official pressure for some purpose of official origin. This car-project, doubtless emanated either from the Head Sheristadar Simhadri Puntulu, or from the Tahsildar, but in the latter case it must have been, so to speak, "passed" by the Sheristadar; for I can safely assert that no extraordinary irregularity or iniquity is ever ventured upon in this district by any Tahsildar, except under Simhadri Puntulu's sanction. Nothing of this sort could be done without his knowledge, as he has his creatures in every office in the district.

3. And the mere supposition of the Jamalamadagu Tahsildar paying, as he admits, a month's salary towards the car, and not making his subordinates pay too, could not fail to raise a smile upon the face of any one who knew the man and the ordinary goings-on of the officials of Cuddapah. To any such person, as to myself, the whole affair is sufficiently obvious.

Enclosure No. 1.—Letter from Sudarsana Row, dated 13th November 1869.

Enclosure No. 2.—Depositions.

From the same officer, dated 29th January 1870, No. 15.

In connection with my letters, Nos. 11, 12, 13, and 14, and still further to show the complete unfitness of C. Vencata Krishniah, the Tahsildar of Jamalamadagu, for the post of Tahsildar, I have the honour to submit copies of two† other letters from my Deputy-Collector A. Sudarsana Row, from which the Board can readily gather what must be the state of a talook whose administrative head permits his subordinates to neglect their duties so systematically as have the two Revenue Inspectors, whom the Deputy-Collector has handed up to me, and whom I have been obliged to punish severely, although no doubt the Tahsildar is the person most in fault for not keeping them up to their work. But a corrupt Tahsildar like this one encourages irregularity and

† 1 Dated 8th December 1869, No. 202.
1 ,, 13th January 1870, ,, 14.

unpunctuality in the disposal of business as offering facilities for fraud and corruption, nor can he afford to be strict with his subordinates owing to their knowledge of his own delinquencies.

Enclosures Nos. 1 and 2.—Letters from Sudarsana Row, dated 5th December 1869 and 13th January 1870.

From the same officer, dated 20th January 1870, No. 16.

In connection with my letters Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, and to show the Board in what an incompetent, irregular, and suspicious manner the Tahsildar of Jamalamadugu has conducted his duties as a Magistrate, I have the honour to submit, for the Board's perusal, in original, eleven Proceedings* passed by the Deputy-Magistrate since the 5th November last.

1 Letter, dated 5th November 1869, No. 59, with Proceedings in Calendar Case No. 185.
1 Do. of 15th November 1869, No. 61, with Proceedings, dated 15th November 1869.
1 Do. ,, 22nd ,, ,, in Calendar Case No. 206.
1 Letter, dated 24th November 1869, No. 62.
1 Proceedings, dated 27th November 1869, in Case No. 8.
1 Proceedings, dated 4th December 1869, in Case No. 10.
1 Proceedings, dated 4th December 1869, in Case No. 9.
1 Proceedings, dated 13th January 1870, No. 5, in Case No. 11.
1 Proceedings, dated 18th January 1870, No. 6, in Case No. 168.
1-11 Proceedings, dated do. No. 7, in Case No. 198.
1 Judgment in Appeal Case No. 1 of 1869.

* To be returned.

2. The Board will observe that two arbitrary, oppressive, and illegal convictions were quashed by the High Court, and that in two committable cases, after the Sub-Magistrate had fulfilled every preliminary necessary to the commitment of the accused, instead of actually committing them to the Sessions Court as by law he was then bound to do, he kept them in illegal custody for a time, and then most suspiciously illegally discharged them.

Enclosures Nos. 1 to 14.—Papers connected with Appeal Case No. 1 on the file of the Deputy-Magistrate of Cuddapah.

From the same officer, dated 20th January 1870, No. 17.

I have the honour to report another case, illustrative of the tricks that have been going on unchecked in the talooks of this district, and of my Sheristadar's mode of concealing them.

2. I have also to solicit the Board's instructions how to deal with the subject-matter.

3. Many years ago Field No. 1,031, extent A. 1 C. 23 V. 12, assessment Rupees 23-11-5, being a portion of the Curnum Service Inam, was taken up all but A. 0 C. 3 V. 15½, assessed at Rupees 1-7-9, by Government for a public bungalow and encamping ground in the village of Nundalore in the Pullumpett Taluk, and the Curnums were compensated by a reduction of their Jody to the amount of the assessment, Rupees 22-3-8, on the remaining A. 1 C. 19 V. 12.

4. On the opening of the railway, which passes through Nundalore, where there is now a station, the public bungalow and encamping ground were no longer

required, and the District Moonsiff's Court was transferred from Tungatoor in 1865, and located in the bungalow. Of the extent of A. 1 C. 19 V. 12 above-mentioned, for which the Curnums are compensated, the bungalow and its compound occupies A. 1 C. 2 V. 8, assessed at Rupees 15-13-0, leaving (excluding the A. 0 C. 3 V. 15½, assessed at Rupees 1-7-9, not taken up for public purposes as above-stated,) a total extent, in No. 1,031, of A. 0 C. 17 V. 4, assessed at Rupees 6-6-8, of Curnum's Service Inam land, which had been appropriated to public purposes.

5. Now in March 1868 some persons addressed petitions both to the late Acting Collector and to the Board of Revenue, stating what turned out to be the fact that the District Moonsiff Jotee Vencata Row (since deceased) and two of the Vakeels of his Court had appropriated the whole portion of Field No. 1,031, not occupied by the bungalow, and had each built a house on it.

6. The Board's Petition is No. 476 of 1868, and was "transferred to the Collector" on the 26th of March 1868.

7. Both petitions appear to have been transferred at different times by the late Acting Collector to the Head Assistant Collector, though there is no record of this. That addressed to the Collector was sent from the Head Assistant's Office to the Tahsildar, endorsed as follows in Telugu "Referred to the Pullumpett Tahsildar to do the needful in regard to the petitioner's prayer for a site to build houses on," the same being a complete misdescription to the contents and object of the petition. The then Head Clerk of the Head Assistant's Office has since died.

8. In April 1868 the Tahsildar made a report to the Head Assistant, which that officer forwarded to the Acting Collector on the 26th June with a Telugu Yadast, and asked for instructions.

9. The late Acting Collector after that, called upon the Tahsildar direct for another report. The reply to this call, dated 15th November 1868, is marked by the Sheristadar as received on the 20th November. Now I took charge of the district on the 16th November, Mr. Storr having been in charge from the 29th October, and this Arzi which might well have reached on the 16th bears the initials of neither of us. It certainly was not reported to me, or I should as certainly have affixed my initials to it.

10. In the undisposed of Board's petition there was, however, a clue to the business, which in the course of last year I managed to get hold of, and followed up, and by dint of considerable pressure, involving a threat to report the Sheristadar to the Board, I succeeded only in November last in getting the papers, along with those of the Corapaud pension fraud case and some other arrears out of the Sheristadar.

11. The Tahsildar's reports to the Head Assistant Collector of April, and to this Office of 15th November 1868, were so unsatisfactory and contradictory that twice, after the papers came into my hands, I had to call upon him for further information and explanation of even further contradictions, before I was enabled to get to the bottom of the facts of the case, as given in the opening paragraphs of this letter, and to follow.

12. It appears that the portion of Curnum's Service Inam Field No. 1,031, in extent A. 0 C. 3 V. 15½, assessed at Rupees 1-7-9 above referred to, as not having

been taken up for public purposes, was in the possession after the manner of this district of a Gyre-missaldar, or not-doing-duty Curnum, on whose death it was resumed by an order of Mr. Wedderburn, when Head Assistant Collector, in Fusly 1259, or twenty years ago, and given out on puttah to the present Curnum Kondappah and others in the following Fusly.

13. The puttah seems to have been transferred several times to the names of different people, till in Fusly 1277 the holder, one Subbaya, formally relinquished the land, and it was entered in the Adungal Accounts of that and Fusly 1278 as "Ayacut Bunjer."

14. As the Tahsildar pleads complete ignorance of the fact of the house having been built by the late District Moonsiff on this piece of ground—a plea which I regard as simply incredible—he does not tell me whether the District Moonsiff ever professed during his life-time to have bought the land from the puttahdar, although, notwithstanding that the latter formally relinquished it to the Government in Fusly 1277, and that it was thereupon entered in the accounts as "Bunjer," it is probable that the District Moonsiff's heirs will allege that he did purchase the land while it was held on puttah, and in ignorance that it was in reality Service Inam land.

15. The Tahsildar says, however, that a report has since reached him that Curnum Kondiah executed a document, dated 1st April 1864, to the deceased District Moonsiff, empowering him to build a house on the spot in question.

16. The Tahsildar of course went through the farce of calling on this Curnum and the other village-officers to report why they had not reported to him the unauthorized occupation of this land, and they are represented to have replied that they did object at the time to the building of the houses, but that the District Moonsiff and Vakeels declared that the Curnums had no right to object as long as Government compensated them for the land, and that the District Moonsiff was prepared to pay that compensation if required to do so.

17. They are not represented to have alleged that they ever did report the matter to the Tahsildar. But the very idea of the Tahsildar being ignorant that the District Moonsiff and his Vakeels were building houses close to the Travellers' Bungalow at Nundalore is to me too ridiculous to be entertained for a moment, and I will go further and say that I have no doubt whatever but that it could not have been done without the express knowledge of the Head Sheristadar E. Simhadri Puntulu also, who, moreover, is the Tahsildar's bosom friend. While the Sheristadar was looking these papers out of my sight, he was in the course of the year twice at Nundalore with me, and never even then said a word to me on the subject.

18. I beg the Board's instructions as to how the question of these houses is to be dealt with. As regards those built by the two Vakeels, the site is unquestionably inalienable State property, and should, when no longer required for the State purpose for which it was temporarily taken up, have been at once restored to the Curnum's office, and the payment of the money-compensation that had been substituted for it should have been stopped.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th September 1870.

19. With reference to the other portion built on by the District Moonsiff, I am also of opinion that Mr. Wedderburn's resumption of the same, when Head Assistant in Fusly 1259, was quite invalid, and that it too, on the death of the Gyre-missaldar holder, should have reverted to the office as also being State property, legally inalienable therefrom.

20. Supposing the Revenue authorities by virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction conferred on them by Act VI. of 1831 over Service Inam lands were, in pursuance of a decree passed thereunder, to order the occupants of these houses to remove them, and that the latter were to refuse; supposing that we pulled the houses down, and that the occupants sued us in the regular Courts; should we, as Judges under Regulation VI. of 1831, have to plead as defendants in perhaps the District Moonsiff's Court? Many nice points of law might arise, the issue of which it would be very difficult to foretell.

21. Not improbably, however, the Board will incline towards the simple imposition on the occupants of the houses of a ground-rent verging on the prohibitive, the proceeds of which might be substituted for the money-compensation now made by the State to the Curnums for the land which, under the very noses of those, who are paid to look after such things, has been quietly appropriated, free of all payment, by a District Moonsiff and his satellites.

22. In my letter of the 18th December 1869, No. 205, I mentioned that this same Tahsildar had on another occasion sheltered himself behind a similar plea of ignorance.

23. He is an old man and an old servant of the Government, who has, I believe, worked well in past times according to his light, and I have no desire to be hard upon him now; at the same time, I do not wish to retain him for another two years till the operation of the 55 years of age rule begins, under which he must quit office as he is already past that age. Any medical man, who saw his feeble and emaciated frame, would at once grant him a certificate for pension. He has acquired lands in his talook, about which I am still in correspondence with him. On the whole, I think a change to be most desirable, and I therefore beg the Board will authorize me to desire this Tahsildar to apply at once for his pension.

24. The Sheristadar has had an opportunity of considering this letter, and I enclose in original the explanation he was invited to furnish. I may observe that he cannot himself write intelligible English.

Enclosure No. 1.—Letter from Simhadri Puntulu, dated 26th January 1870.

For the same officer, dated 29th January 1870, No. 18.

In connection with my letters, Nos. 11, 12, 14, and 17, I have the honour to submit in original* a communication addressed to me by E. Simhadri Puntulu, my Sheristadar, from which the Board will learn how he improved the shining hours during the Christmas holidays.

2. He announced the gift to him by the Rajah of Kolapore of a village worth Rupees 600 or 700 a-year to him.

* Dated 6th January 1870.

3. He asked my permission to go to Kolapore, and I gave it him, but I heard nothing of the village till his return, though I don't doubt it was all settled beforehand.

4. It is by no means improbable that the visit to the Hyderabad country at this juncture had some connection also with what we may safely assume to be the forged document in the Corapaud fraud case.

4. As regards the gift of this nature to a public servant I am not aware of any precedent, but the fact of its having been made will not be unsuggestive to the Board of the position and character of my Sheristadar. Certainly, he would be much nearer to bring the right man in the right place as boon companion to a Hyderabad Rajah, than as Sheristadar to the Collector of a British province.

Enclosure No. 1.—Letter from Sinhadri Pantulu, dated 6th January 1870.

From A. SUDARSANA ROW, Deputy-Collector, to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated Ramaswaram, 25th January 1870, No. 25.

I BEG to bring to your notice the manner in which the important rules for the disposal of applications for lands are being infringed in this division to the injury of the State on one hand, and of the people on the other hand.

2. On the 30th January 1867 Chinna Nurrapoo Reddy and Azoogotty Venkata Reddy have presented severally petitions to the then Deputy Collector, applying on competition for 7½ acres of wet lands, assessed at Rupees 30-2-1, in the village of Yannavaram in Jamalamadugu Taluk for the highest rate of dry assessment by reason that the sources of irrigation on which they depend fell into decay.

3. These applications were referred to the then Tahsildar P. Narasima Row for inquiry and early report on the 12th February 1867. In May 1867 the present Tahsildar C. Venkata Krishniah assumed charge of the taluk on the 23rd idem.

4. On the 18th December 1868 and on the 1st September 1869 the above Durkhastdars again presented severally petitions to the present Tahsildar C. Venkata Krishniah, applying for the same lands on competition.

5. In November 1869, when I was examining the unanswered lists of the talooks composing this division, the Tahsildar submitted a report on the 13th November 1869, No. 423, on these applications, recommending that the lands may be given to the ryots who held them once, and stating that he has rejected the original durkhasts for those lands in July 1867, with a view to have the lands planted with Toomma trees.

6. If the Tahsildar had disposed these Durkhasts one way or other in July 1867, he should have issued a Takeed to the villagers, intimating them the same. He failed to produce such a Takeed.

7. In his report, dated 14th January 1870, the Tahsildar states that a Takeed does not seem to have been issued by him to the villagers intimating them that the Durkhasts were rejected. He further states that he has written in unanswered list of July 1867, which he has forwarded to the Deputy-Collector's Office the fact of his having cancelled these Durkhasts.

8. Such "Tarunkammy" Durkhasts are to be disposed of by divisional officers on the report of Tahsildar. The Tahsildars cannot dispose of them as they think proper.

9. The late Deputy-Collector does not seem to have had an idea of planting Toomma trees on these lands. The Tahsildar's statement that he has cancelled the Durkhasts by reason that the lands may be used for planting Toomma trees is inadmissible.

10. It is a known fact that unanswered lists submitted to divisional officers etc., are not read by themselves. The Tahsildar ought not to have shown in the unanswered list that he has cancelled the Durkhasts. There was no proper ground to use his own discretion in dealing with the Durkhasts when they were *referred* to him *specially* for report.

11. I find from the unanswered list of August 1867 that the Tahsildar has shown therein that these Durkhasts were struck off the file. The talook seems to be then in charge of the Collector. The Tahsildar never received any orders from the Collector or Deputy-Collector, approving the manner in which he has disposed of these Durkhasts.

12. I beg to submit herewith the Durkhast Petitions, A. and B., presented to the late Deputy-Collector, and C. and D., presented to the Tahsildar, regarding the lands in question. The unanswered list E. for August 1867 is also forwarded herewith.

13. I find from unanswered lists several Durkhasts, etc., were struck off the file without making any inquiry into them, with a view to make unanswered lists light.

14. These are the Durkhasts alluded to in my letter, dated 15th December 1869, No. 217, which gave rise to Docket, dated 22nd idem, No. 1,959.

No. 19.

SUBMITTED, in connection with my letters Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16, in further proof of C. Venkata Krishniah, the Tahsildar of Jamalamadugu's untrustworthiness.

CUDDAPAH, (Signed) G. VANSAGNEW,
2nd February 1870. *Collector.*

From the same officer, dated 2nd February 1870, No. 20.

IN continuation of my letters of the 20th January last, Nos. 12 and 18, I have the honour to submit translation of a petition and its enclosures I have received from the complainant in the Corapaud Poligar pension fraud case since those letters were written.

2. The Board will observe that petitioner asserts what I surmise that my Sheristadar's visit to the Hyderabad territory during the Christmas holidays was connected with the Corapaud Poligar pension fraud case.

3. Among the enclosures of the petition are what profess to be copies of letters just received by the petitioner from Veeramah, the daughter of Narasimha Reddy, the grandfather of the last deceased Poligar by his second wife, and from her son, Upperpally Ramakrishna Reddy, Zemindar of Thandoor in Hyderabad territory, and who also holds a post (Military, I believe) at the Court of Hyderabad.

4. The writers of these letters declare not only that the boy Sitaramiah is an impostor, belonging to a different caste from the Corapaud Poligar family, but that Upperpally Ramakrishna Reddy is himself only the existing male

descendant of the Corapaud Poligar stock, and he intimates his intention of moving the Hyderabad authorities to address the Government of Madras on the subject of his claim.

4. My belief is that this Corapaud Reddy, who is evidently a shrewd, as well as an unusually bold man, whatever may be his motive in urging the matter against the Sheristadar, is stating nothing but what he knows, and is prepared to prove to be true. My impression therefore is that the letters *bona fide* proceed from the parties to whom they are attributed.

5. Nevertheless, I think these parties may be left to bring forward any claim they may have, and that as far as the boy Sitaramiah is concerned we have ample evidence before us to pronounce him to be an impostor, without going to Hyderabad for more. The onus of proving the contrary seems fairly to rest on the female pensioners.

Enclosure No. 1.—Translation of a Petition.

From G. VANSANDEN, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 4th March 1870, No. 6.

1 From the Collector of Cuddapah to the Assistant-General Register of an application for Superannuation Pension, dated 7th September 1866.
1 From the Examiner of Claims to the Collector of Cuddapah, Memorandum of Queries, dated 10th December 1866.
1 Letter to the Examiner of Claims from the Collector of Cuddapah, dated 17th January 1867, No. 27.
1 Official Memorandum from the Examiner of Claims to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated 26th January 1867, No. 76.
1 Letter to the Examiner of Claims from the Collector of Cuddapah, dated 29th January 1867, No. 71.
1 Memorandum from the Examiner of Claims to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated 9th August 1867.
1 Letter to do. from the Collector of do., dated 16th August 1867, No. 512.
1 Order of Government, dated 13th September 1867, No. 273.
1 Government Endorsement on Petition of Kowkur Venkata Row, dated 8th October 1867.
1 Letter to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 29th October 1867, No. 30.
1 Government Order, dated 18th November 1867, No. 331.

I HAVE the honour to draw the attention of Government to the correspondence noted in the margin, the result of which was that the Government granted to one Kowkur Venkata Row, Vernacular Record-keeper in the Collector's Office at Cuddapah, a half pension of Rupees 20-12-0, payable from the 1st August 1866.

2. Under the head "Remarks by the head of the office on the past character and conduct of the applicant" in the Register of application, the Government will find the following statement: "The applicant has served the Government for a period of thirty-three years nine months and twelve days, during which time he behaved himself faithfully, and he is therefore entitled to half pension, which the Government will be pleased to grant him from 1st August 1866, on which date he was removed from his office."

3. I received an anonymous petition the other day to the effect that this pensioner had been dismissed from office by the late Collector for misconduct on the 31st July 1866, or on the very day from which his pension was made payable, and that by bribing E. Simhadri Puntulu then, and now the Collector's Sheristadar, all mention of his misconduct and dismissal was suppressed, and he was recommended with a good character for pension.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th September 1870.

4. I have no evidence of the alleged bribery, but my records prove the fact that the pensioner was dismissed from office for misconduct on the 31st July 1866. I submit translation of the office-copy of the late Collector's order of dismissal, and the pensioner admits his receipt of the original on the 1st August 1866. It will be obvious to the Government that there was no intention when this order was issued of pensioning the delinquent. Had the Government been made aware of such dismissal, they would probably have refused to grant any pension, and at all events they would not as a matter of grace have granted a half-pension, when strictly speaking the applicant was only entitled to a one-third pension.

5. The Sheristadar can of course shelter himself behind the late Collector's signature, but there can be no doubt that the act was virtually his, and not the Collector's.

6. I cannot produce regular evidence, because this Sheristadar having for so long been the paramount power in the district and all the public servants at his mercy, no one dare come forward in public and say anything against him for fear that he may again some day hold the same position, and then use his power to their ruin; but I have private information from many reliable sources, and I will tell the Government how I am satisfied this matter happened.

7. The pensioner and the Sheristadar had a grudge of very long standing, and the former was known to the latter to have written anonymous and other petitions, etc., in matters wherein he was concerned. The Sheristadar therefore, when he had the power, got the pensioner, when he was Talook Sheristadar of Sidhout, degraded from that office on Rupees 35 to that of Vernacular Record-keeper on Rupees 30.

8. The Assistant Record-keeper at the time was one Ramayanam Sashiah, who notoriously was a creature of the Sheristadar's, and acted as his go-between in getting bribes.

9. The pensioner, having entered his presence at office on a particular day in the Attendance Book, when in reality he was absent, his Assistant, Ramayanam Sashiah, was made to write across the entry that he was absent and not present, and the matter was reported by the Sheristadar to the late Collector.

10. It would naturally be thought that there was nothing unusual in this, but considering that iniquities of every kind were being daily committed by the public servants all over the district, and that the Sheristadar knew all that was being done, and never brought anything to the Collector's notice, except when it suited his particular purpose; if the Government believe this, and I can assure them it is an unexaggerated fact, then the motive of the Sheristadar in bringing this particular fault of his old enemy, the pensioner, to the Collector's notice and getting him dismissed is obvious.

11. Then comes the question why, having succeeded in satiating his revenge, did the Sheristadar soon afterwards get the Collector to stultify himself, and recommend for pension, as a person of good character, the man he had just dismissed as a bad character.

12. I cannot prove that the Sheristadar took a bribe from him. The man himself on examination does not say so; but to my mind the apparent inconsistency of Sheristadar's conduct cannot be accounted for on any other supposition, and,

as it is well known to me, and is perfectly notorious that the Sheristadar turned his power into money in every conceivable way, my conviction is that he made the pensioner pay for his pension.

(True Copy.)

No. 42.

SUBMITTED for the information of the Board of Revenue.

(Signed) G. VANSAGNEW,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Translation of an Order of Collector, dated 31st July 1866, No. 49.

From the Deputy-Magistrate, to the District Magistrate of Cuddapah, dated Dhoor, 4th March 1870, No. 16.

I BEG to bring to your notice the following circumstance for information.

2. From the enclosed Calendar it will be seen that one Bingimulla Venkaly has preferred a complaint on the 1st December 1869 to the first-class Sub-Magistrate Copparapoo Vencata Krishniah against Chenna Reddy, the Village Magistrate of Jeareddy Collapallai in the talook of Jamalamadagu, and others, that they caused voluntarily hurt to him, and that though the first-class Sub-Magistrate was holding his office up to the date of his suspension on the 25th January 1870, he never inquired into the case.

3. In the Criminal Return for the fourth quarter of 1869 this case was entered as the one remaining undisposed of, though the parties were present.

4. The Village Magistrate, Chenna Reddy, was tried and convicted by me on the 19th January 1870 of having received gratification other than legal remuneration from the ryots, with a promise of exempting them from Income-tax.

5. In my opinion the Sub-Magistrate delayed trying the case as a favour to the Village Magistrate, for fear that if he be tried, he will reveal the truth by saying where the money collected by the ryots found its way to.

No. 44.

SUBMITTED to the Board in further proof of this Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate's unfitness for his post.

CUDDAPAH, (Signed) G. VANSAGNEW,
7th (26th) 1870. *Collector.*

In these letters the Collector of Cuddapah reports a series of instances in which he considers that the conduct of E. Sinhadri Pantulu, Huzoor Sheristadar, and C. Vencata Krishniah, Tahsildar of Jamalamadagu, has been most discreditable. He expresses a strong conviction of the corruption and incompetency of Sinhadri Pantulu, and of the dishonesty and tyranny of Vencata Krishniah, and urges that if the district is to be saved from evils which make it a disgrace to the English administration, these two men must be dismissed.

2. In one of the cases he censures the conduct of Yerkoba Row, Tahsildar of Pullampett, and recommends that he should be required to take his pension

3. The Board will proceed to examine the Collector's letters *seriatim*, recording their views of the conduct of the officials and their orders on the subjects to which the letters relate.

4. No. 11 refers to a box of jewels belonging to a pagoda, which has been irregularly kept for a long time past in the Jamalamadagu Talook Treasury. The pagoda has an endowment, but seems to be an appanage of the Tahsildar for the time being. There are no other Durmakurtas.

5. The Tahsildar, Vencata Krishniah, shelters himself behind a Tukeed, issued by Mr. Wedderburn in 1861, which bears the counter-signature of the Sheristadar Sinhadri Puntulu. This document is of a most singular character. The then Tahsildar had asked what was to be done with the box, knowing that it was against orders to keep it in the public treasury. The Tukeed sternly rebuked him for referring so unimportant a matter to the Collector, and told him to retain the box at the Talook Cutcherry, and contained a strange passage to the following effect:—"If it has been retained without an entry in the public accounts, it must be settled "*amongst ourselves.*" The Tahsildar further states that he informed Mr. Molony, when Collector, about the box, but received no orders from that gentleman.

6. The Board take a most unfavourable view of the conduct both of the Tahsildar and of the Sheristadar in this matter. It is impossible to believe that Mr. Wedderburn altogether understood the tukeed of 1861, and the Sheristadar must be regarded as responsible for it. When the Pagoda Committee was appointed, the Sheristadar knowing well the anomalous condition of things at Jamalamadagu, ought to have got the box and pagoda handed over to them, but he did not do so. Even when the Committee applied for the pagoda and its property in 1866, they were erroneously informed, under the signature of the late Collector, Mr. Smith, that Act XX. of 1863 did not apply to it. The Tahsildar is a man of such ability that he could have had no doubts as to the impropriety of keeping the box in his treasury. His assertion that he told Mr. Molony about it is incredible. If he had done so, Mr. Molony would certainly have issued orders at once on the subject, for it was not one about which there could not be a doubt. It is a significant circumstance that the Tahsildar did not mention the matter to Mr. Boyle, when he examined the treasury last year.

7. The box must of course be handed over to the Pagoda Committee immediately, and the connection between the Tahsildar and the Pagoda must cease.

8. In letter No. 12 Mr. VansAgnew reports on fraud which is proved to have been practised on the renewal of a Poligar pension. The facts are as follow:—

9. Rama Reddy, recipient of a Poligar pension of Rupees 1,750 per annum, died in October 1866. The pension was claimed by his mother Ranganaikamma and by Latchmenarasamma, the widow of an elder brother of his father, and these ladies put forward a boy named Sitaramiah, as a nephew of the deceased, and said they wished to adopt him. They declared that they had no land.

10. The inquiry was held by C. Vencata Krishniah, who was then Tahsildar of Proddatoor. On the 15th December 1866 he reported the result to the Collector. Besides the individuals named above, he mentioned as belonging to the family and resident in the same village, Latchamma, a paternal aunt of the deceased and as belonging to the family, but residing in the Nizam's dominions; Veerammah, another paternal aunt, Ramakistna Reddy, her son, and two brothers of

Sitaramiah. He recommended that as Ranganaikamma and Lutchmenarasamma had no other means of subsistence, the full pension should be granted to them, and left it to the Collector to pass any orders he might think proper about their proposal to adopt Sitaramiah.

11. The Collector in reporting to the Board, submitted a genealogical table, which disclosed the existence of Ranganaikamma, Lutchmenarasamma, Latchamma and Sitaramiah, but did not contain the names of the other members of the family mentioned by the Tahsildar. He recommended that the pension should be reduced one-half and continued to Ranganaikamma, the mother of the deceased, as being his only heir.

12. Poligar pensions have always been declared to be hereditary to lineal descendants, excluding adoptions, during good behaviour, but till this case occurred, it had not been ruled distinctly that females and sons of females are included amongst such descendants, and Government had generally assumed the power to reduce the pension on lapse when there were no other heirs.

13. After some correspondence Government decided that Ranganaikamma, Lutchmenarasamma, Latchamma, and Sitaramiah, were all lineal descendants, and directed in Government Order, 4th December 1867, No. 2,803, that the pension should be continued to them in full. The Government were not aware of the existence of the other members of the family, because they had not been mentioned in the Collector's reports.

14. In May 1868 one Marappa Reddy began to petition the authorities stating that fraudulent representations had been made to Government, inasmuch as Sitaramiah did not belong to the family, and the family had land.

15. In October Deputy-Collector Royappa Puntulu who had deputed the inquiry on these petitions to a Tahsildar, reported that the family were in the enjoyment of land assessed at Rupees 221, and that the evidence as to Sitaramiah's connection with the family was so equally balanced that the truth could not be ascertained without a reference to the authorities of the Nizam's dominions where he was born.

16. In November Mr. Storr, who was then in the district, sent a yadast to the Deputy-Collector, ordering him to inquire if the ladies had any document to prove Sitaramiah's connection with the family. As no such document had been previously mentioned, Mr. VansAgnew believes that this yadast was intentionally worded by the Sheristadar, so as to prompt the ladies to fabricate evidence.

17. In January 1869 Mr. Pritchard, who was then in charge of the Deputy-Collector's office, replied. His inquiry and report were both extremely careless. He stated that the ladies had produced, in answer to the call for documentary evidence, a bond purporting to be by the natural father of Sitaramiah, giving his son in adoption to the father of the last holder of the pension.

18. This report and the other papers got into the hands of the Sheristadar Simhadri Puntulu. Two petitions on the same subject transferred to the Collector by the Board shared the same fate. It was not till November 1869 that the Sheristadar, after repeated orders and threats, brought them to Mr. VansAgnew. In the meantime he and Mr. VansAgnew had together visited Corapaud, the village where the pensioners reside, and he had not mentioned the matter even then. To appreciate this conduct rightly, it must be remembered that the papers

contained accusations of bribery against himself and other officials, and went far towards proving that Government had been defrauded.

19. Mr. VansAgnew immediately referred the case to his new Deputy-Collector Sudarsana Row, in whom he had and still has the greatest confidence.

20. Sudarsana Row sent in his report on the 22nd December 1869. His inquiry has proved that the bond is a forgery, and that the story of Sitaramiah's parentage is false.

21. The family deserve punishment for the deceit practised on Government, both with reference to their circumstances and to their connection with Sitaramiah, and the Board resolve to recommend Government to discontinue the share of the pension which now stands in Sitaramiah's name.

22. It is probable that the Collector is mistaken in thinking that C. Vencata Krishniah and Simhadri Puntulu were bribed expressly to deceive Government about Sitaramiah, because Sitaramiah's existence or non-existence does not seem to have been a matter of great importance to the family, but the Board are convinced that both of those officers are guilty of collusion in a fraud. The Tahsildar must have known that he was reporting falsely when he stated that Ranganaikamma and Lutchmenarasamma had no means of support except the pension, and looking to precedent, he must have considered this one of the most important parts of the whole case. As regards Simhadri Puntulu's connection with the matter, it must be observed that the inquiries before Royappa Puntulu and Mr. Pritchard show that influence was even then at work to evade disclosure if not to mislead. The Board agree with Sudarsana Row in considering that the Yadast, dated the 14th October 1868, signed by Mr. Storr, betrays an intention on the part of the Huzoor officials to originate a forgery in corroboration of Sitaramiah's claim, and probably connects Simhadri Puntulu with the deception that was being practised. The Sheristadar's subsequent conduct in withholding the papers from the Collector fully bears out Mr. VansAgnew's conviction that he has, if not from the first, at all events through the later stages of this discreditable case, behaved in an unworthy and probably in a corrupt manner.

23. Letter No. 13 relates to the conduct of Vencata Krishniah in reducing and remitting Income-tax assessments without any appeal against them being made. There is no doubt but what numerous assessments were reduced or cancelled after they had been entered in the Register, and even after the formal notices to the parties assessed had been signed. The Tahsildar's defence is that he entered the assessments in the Register on imperfect information, and enhanced, reduced, or remitted the amounts when further information was received, although no appeal might have been made, but always before notices were issued to the parties.

24. The Deputy-Collector Sudarsana Row and the Collector have no doubt but what the alterations were made after the notices had been issued in consequence of bribery, and the notices then taken back. A Curnum told the Deputy-Collector that in one case a notice had certainly been sent and taken back in this way, and the Deputy-Collector saw twelve notices at the Cutcherry, which he had no doubt had been thus manipulated.

25. The Board consider it clear that Vencata Krishniah has knowingly transgressed the provisions of the law and the rules of practice, and the presumption that he has done so dishonestly is confirmed by this unworthy character. Viewing the facts of the case on the light thrown on them by the strong opinions the Collector and the Deputy-Collector entertain of Venkata Krishniah's corruption, the Board consider that his conduct in this matter shows him to be untrustworthy and unfit for the office of Tahsildar.

26. In letter No. 14 Mr. VansAgnew reports on Vencata Krishniah's conduct with reference to a subscription for a pagoda car. A former Goomastah of the talook, who had quarrelled with the Tahsildar, accused him of having forced people to subscribe, and made him and the other talook officials give a month's pay each. Vencata Krishniah says he gave Rupees 200 himself, but did not force any one else to subscribe. Sudarsana Row made an inquiry, but the evidence was conflicting.

27. It is clear that the Tahsildar contravened a Standing Order of the Board and Government by taking part in raising this subscription, and that his conduct was too authoritative and unbefitting his position.

28. Mr. VansAgnew considers that Simhadri Puntulu must have known of this matter and acquiesced in the raising of the subscription, but the Board cannot adopt this view without further information than is now before them.

29. Letter No. 15 describes how Vencata Krishniah neglected his duty as Tahsildar by allowing two Revenue Inspectors to keep petitions referred to them for report undisposed of for periods varying from one to four years.

30. Two or three of the petitions contained charges that cultivation had been concealed, and such charges always require immediate attention. In one case apparently the charge was well founded, and the revenue suffered by the delay.

31. The papers certainly throw discredit on the Tahsildar's Revenue administration.

32. In letter No. 16 Mr. VansAgnew submits Proceedings of the Deputy-Magistrate Sudarsana Row, passed during November, December, and January, reflecting on the manner in which C. Vencata Krishniah performs his duties as a Sub-Magistrate.

33. The papers show great ignorance and carelessness as to Procedure, but do not substantiate the strong condemnation pronounced by the Collector.

34. Letter No. 17 relates to a misappropriation of Curnums' Service Inam land at Kundalore in the talook of Pullumpett. The field in question contains acres 1-23-12, assessed at Rupees 23-11-5, and is made up of the following portions:—

(*a.*) Acres 1-2-8, assessed at Rupees 15-13-0. This was taken up many years ago for a public bungalow, and included in the compound. The bungalow has since been given up, and is at present used as a Moonsiff's Court-house.

(*b.*) Acres 0-17-4, assessed at Rupees 6-6-8. This was taken up for the same purpose, but was not included in the compound. Two Vakeels of the Moonsiff's Court have built houses on it without permission.

35. The assessment on these two pieces of land has been deducted from the Curnum jodi as compensation.

(*c.*) Acres 0-3-15½, assessed at Rupees 1-7-9. This was not taken up for the bungalow, but was resumed twenty years ago by Mr. Wedderburn, because it was occupied by a non-working Curnum. It has since been held on puttah by several persons, and finally has been unoccupied and waste for some years. The Moonsiff has built a house upon it.

36. In March 1868 petitions were presented to the Board and the Collector, pointing out that the Moonsiff and Vakeels had misappropriated Service land by building houses upon it. The petitions were sent to the Tahsildar Vencoba Row for report, and he replied in April. Further information was called for, and he replied again in November. The papers then got into the hand of the Sheristadar Simhadri Puntulu, and it was not till twelve months afterwards, when the Collector who had got a clue to the matter from the list of unanswered Board petitions, pressed and threatened him, that he produced them. In the meantime, he had been twice at Nundalore with the Collector without mentioning the matter. Mr. VansAgnew found the Tahsildar's reports unsatisfactory and contradictory, and had to call for further information twice. Being called on for his defence, he pleaded ignorance of the building of the houses on Inam land.

37. The Tahsildar's conduct supports the Collector's view that he tried to evade disclosures and transgressed his duty to befriend the owners of the houses.

38. The Sheristadar's delay, considering that the matter had been referred by the Board and concerned the interests of Government was most reprehensible. His defence is disingenuous, and the Board consider that the distrust which has been forced on the Collector is fully warranted.

39. As regards the land the simple assessment of the portions occupied by the house-owners must be collected from the current fusly. No other measures are demanded by the exigencies of the case.

40. Letter No. 18 submits a communication from Simhadri Puntulu, stating that the Rajah of Kotapore, whom he had been to see during the Christmas holidays, had given him a village worth between six and seven hundred Rupees a year. This does not appear to the Board to call for any remark.

41. Letter No. 19 refers to C. Vencata Krishniah's misconduct in the matter of durkhasts. In January 1867 the Deputy-Collector referred to him for report a durkhast for 7½ acres of wet land at dry rates. Such "tarm kamme" durkhasts, as they are called, are always disposed of by divisional officers. Instead of reporting, as he ought to have done, the Tahsildar made an entry in his "unanswered list" for July 1867, to the effect that he had rejected the durkhast, because Toomma trees ought to be planted on the land. This entry was not noticed by his superior officer. In November 1869 he addressed the Deputy-Collector on the subject, related what had been done, and recommended that the land should be given to cultivators. It is clear that in many cases he has struck off durkhast from the file without inquiry, in order to make the "unanswered list" light.

42. These circumstances show great slovenliness in the transaction of business, and bear evidence to the Tahsildar's untrustworthiness.

43. Letter No. 20 refers to a petition about the Sheristadar's conduct in connection with the pension case. The Board attach no importance to it.

44. With his letter of the 5th March 1870, Mr. VansAgnew submits copy of a report to Government, the general effect of which is that after Mr. Smith had dismissed a Clerk from the service, an application for pension was submitted, just as if he had not been dismissed, but retired with a good character, and that the Sheristadar is responsible. As the Sheristadar does not seem to have been called on for his defence, the Board will not say more than that they do not consider the Sheristadar's responsibility removed, because the order of dismissal and the application for pension, whilst counter-signed by him, were signed by Mr. Smith.

45. In the letter of the 7th March 1870, No. 44, it is reported that on the 1st December 1869 a complaint that a Village Magistrate had voluntarily caused hurt was laid before C. Vencata Krishniah, that though he held office up to the 25th January 1870, he did not take up the case, and that the Deputy-Magistrate Sundarsana Row afterwards convicted the Village Magistrate of taking a bribe, to cause remission of Income-tax, and is of opinion that Vencata Krishniah delayed the case through fear of disclosures which would implicate him.

46. The Board do not consider this matter of importance, except as exemplifying the conviction of the Collector and his Deputy that Vencata Krishniah is hopelessly corrupt.

47. The Board have now to record their decision as to the manner in which Vencoba Row, Vencata Krishnaih and Simhadri Puntulu, are to be dealt with.

48. The case against Vencoba Row is not a strong one, but he is reported to be old and inefficient, and must be required to retire on pension.

49. The conduct of Vancata Krishniah with respect to the box of pagoda jewels kept in the Talook Cutcherry, his wilful mis-statement as to the private property of the Carapaud pension family, his most suspicious irregularities in administering the Income-tax, in disposing of durkhasts, and in helping to raise a subscription for a pagoda, the numerous proofs of what is at best gross inefficiency as a Revenue and Magisterial Officer, the strong conviction of his corruptibility and tyranny expressed by the Collector and his Deputy, all combine to make it impossible to retain him in the office of Tahsildar. The Board believe he has only a few months more to serve in order that he may be entitled to pension, and they are reluctant to dismiss him under such circumstances, but he must be at once reduced to the grade of Talook Sheristadar and made to retire as soon as possible.

50. The Board have already remarked that they take an unfavourable view of the conduct of Simhadri Puntulu in connection with the pagoda jewel box. The Taking of 1867 shows that even then he was not afraid to make use of his position to get his superior's signature to a most improper order, and it is clear that, whatever may have been his interest in the matter, he was determined that the trust should remain with the Tahsildar in defiance of all rules and regulations. In the Pedagat pension case, there is good cause to suspect that he was cognizant of the fraud from the first, and this suspicion is strengthened by the inexcusable way in which he afterwards conducted the case from Mr. VansAgnew. The conduct of papers in the Nundalore case shows that he cannot be relied upon in one of the most important parts of the duty of a Sheristadar. Making every

possible allowance in the case of the pension application reported by Mr. VansAgnew to Government, it is clear that a grave share of the responsibility attaches to Simhadri Puntulu. If Mr. Smith resolved to re-call the order of dismissal, it was his Sheristadar's duty to see that it was re-called formally and in writing.

51. But apart from these special cases, in which Simhadri Puntulu has been guilty of specific misconduct, the general condition of the district whilst he has been Sheristadar is such as to make it essential that he should be removed. Peculiar circumstances, which the Board need not detail, have invested him with an extraordinary extent of authority, and his share of the responsibility for the general administration is proportionately heavy. A long series of facts culminating in the revelation of the levying of a compulsory dispensary cess, and its unauthorized alienation to schools, and of extensive treasury frauds, has been laid before the Board, which confirm all that Mr. VansAgnew states as to the maladministration from which the district has suffered for many years.

52. Having determined that Simhadri Puntulu must be removed from Cuddapah, the Board have to consider whether he can be transferred as Sheristadar to any other district, but they are not prepared to do so in the face of the facts disclosed in the papers now before them, and of Mr. VansAgnew's strong averment of his incapacity. He must be reduced to the grade of Tahsildar, and the Collectors of the neighbouring districts of Bellary and Kurnool will be directed at the first opportunity to provide employment for him in that capacity, in some talook where he will be under the eye of the Collector or a divisional officer. In the meantime, he must be suspended from office.

53. These proceedings will be submitted to Government, in order that they may pass orders on the recommendation contained in paragraph 21.

No. 147-A. From the Collector of Cuddapah, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Gurramkondah, 27th May 1870, No. 25.

ADVERTING to your official memorandum, dated 20th instant, No. 91, I have the honour to state that Reddy Kesavulureddy was convicted in Case No. 55 of 1869 on the Calendar of the Session Court of abetting the commission of the offence of culpable homicide by causing the death of a woman, and of the offence of rioting, and was sentenced on the 8th September last, to two and-a-half years' rigorous imprisonment; that Curnum Vencatramiah was convicted of perjury by the same Court in Calendar No. 66, and sentenced on the 6th October last to one and-a half year's rigorous imprisonment.

2. The other two village-officers who signed the deposition given before C. Vencata Krishniah, the Tahsildar, on the 11th December 1866, are Curnums Sashiah and Narasiah. I believe they were dismissed some time back and the required information is not immediately forthcoming. As soon as I can procure it, I will submit the same.

No. 148. From the Collector of Cuddapah, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madanapally, 30th June 1870, No. 28.

In continuation of my letter of the 27th ultimo, No. 25, I have the honour to state that my records show that the two Curnums in question, Sheshiah and Narasiah, were suspended for six months on the 1st November 1864 for misappropriating public money, restored at the expiration of that period, and again suspended indefinitely on the 19th March 1867 for quarrelling and for irregularity and inattentiveness. It further appears from an order of the late 1st-class Deputy-Collector Royappa Puntulu that on the 13th May 1867 he refused to reinstate Sheshiah on the ground that he had had an active share in misappropriating public money.

2. The last order on the subject is by the same Deputy-Collector permanently transferring these Curnums from the "missal" list to that of "gyre missal" *i.e.*, they were prohibited from performing public duties but allowed, after the custom of the Ceded Districts, to retain their Inams, and do nothing. Thus no statements of their cases were ever submitted to the Board of Revenue.

No. 149. Order thereon, 12th September 1870, No. 1,438.

Miscellaneous.

In the foregoing Proceedings the Board deal with ten letters (seven of which bear the same date) from Mr. Vans Agnew, Collector and Magistrate of Cuddapah, regarding the conduct of his Sheristadar and the Tahsildar of Jammalmadugu. The first letter merely reports the suspension of the Tahsildar. The second contains a charge against both officers in connection with a box of jewels worth Rupees 600 belonging to a Pagoda.

2. The irregularity, so far as the Tahsildar is concerned, consists—

(1.) In the keeping of the box in the Taluq Cutcherry.

(2.) In the sending its contents, when required for ceremonies, in charge of a Taluq Shroff and Peon.

(3.) In not mentioning the matter to the Assistant Collector Mr. Boyle and Mr. Agnew. As to the first of these alleged irregularities it appears, and this is confirmed by a paper written in 1861, that the box had been in the treasury for "a very long time" (the Tahsildar says thirty years), and that a predecessor of the Tahsildar had reported the circumstance to the Collector (Mr. Wedderburn) in 1861, had been censured for doing so, and had been told to continue to keep it, the Police being answerable for the seals and himself and his subordinates for the contents.

3. As to the second point, the arrangement was the natural consequence of the order above referred to. The Tahsildar and his subordinates being responsible for the jewels, the Taluq officials of course took them to the temple when wanted and brought them back when done with.

4. As to the third point, the Tahsildar states that he was not at the Cutcherry when Mr. Agnew visited it, and that when Mr. Boyle came he had just come in from Camp, and in the hurry forgot all about the box. He says, moreover, that he told Mr. Molony of it once, and that he reported it to the Deputy Collector Sudarsana Row when he examined the Treasury on the 2nd November 1869. This last allegation is not noticed by Mr. Agnew.

5. The Tahsildar seems to the Government to have entirely cleared himself in this case.

6. The Sheristadar's offence seems to have consisted in not informing Mr. Agnew regarding the box, and in inducing Mr. Wedderburn to sign the order in ignorance of its contents. As to the first point there was, apparently, no special cause for the Sheristadar to tell the Collector. The matter had been reported to and settled by his predecessor. The second assumption is based on the tenor of the order. Mr. Wedderburn, in it, expresses surprise that the Tahsildar should seek instructions about a box which had been kept so long in the Cutcherry without objection, declares the responsibility, respectively, of the Police and Taluq officials, and adds, that if it has not been entered in the public accounts it must be settled "privately." The latter word is in the *translation* and is underlined, but in the Telugu copy the word is "in the office." The Government can see nothing to warrant Mr. Agnew's assumptions in this case.

7. When to this want of satisfactory evidence is added the fact, that the Pagoda had neither Trustees nor Managers to whom the box could be made over, and that it is not alleged that its contents have been tampered with, the charge appears to be divested of all importance, and the extreme significance attached to it by Mr. Agnew naturally inspires some doubts of his impartiality and sound judgment. At the same time, it is to be observed that the grounds on which the application of the Pagoda Committee were refused custody of the box are unexplained, and the Government must record their opinion that all the officials concerned acted in a spirit very contrary to rules of the service in retaining charge of Pagoda property.

8. The charge contained in the third letter, No. 12, is connected with the succession to a lapsed Poligar pension enjoyed by one Rama Reddy. These pensions are hereditary to lineal descendants, but when female heirs only are left, it has been usual to continue a reduced amount of the original grant according to the discretion of Government. When Rama Reddy died, the usual tabular statement was submitted to the Board and the Government, and showed as his heirs three females, viz., his mother, an unmarried aunt, and an uncle's widow, and a boy, grandson of the original grantee, who was also grandfather of Rama Reddy. The allegation is that this boy (the deceased's first cousin according to his reputed genealogy) was not a relative at all, that he was palmed off on the Government, and that the village officers, the Tahsildar and the Sheristadar, were cognisant of the fraud, and received bribes for their share in the transaction.

9. It is, however, to be observed that the late Collector Mr. Smith left the son out of his recommendation for a grant altogether, and proposed that half the pension should be continued to the *mother* of the deceased *for life*. The Board concurred, with merely the alteration that the moiety should be divided equally among the three females, the share of each lapsing on her death, save that of Narasamah, on whose death her son's claims could be considered. The Government, however, pointed out that while a grandson (the boy in question) was alive,

there *was* a lineal descendant. The Collector, however, adhered to his original recommendation adverse to the boy, urging that grandsons in the female line are not considered heirs to their grandfathers. The Board dissented and recommended that the *full* allowance should be divided among the three females and the boy, and the Government sanctioned this arrangement.

10. The evidence taken by the Deputy Collector Sudarsana Row is, if true, conclusive against the assertion that the boy is the son of Narasamah, but it is all *secondary* evidence, hearsay, and report. The evidence of the Village Officers who made the original report to the Tahsildar is not forthcoming, some of them are in Jail, others dismissed, and no evidence has been taken as to the alleged bribery. Neither the Board nor the Collector notice certain documents which appear to be very important, viz., the original report of the Tahsildar to the Collector, with its enclosures, and the original statements of the females and of the Village Officers. The Poligar died on the 31st October 1866, and the Tahsildar's report is dated 15th December 1866, so that but little time was afforded for a conspiracy. The Tahsildar says distinctly, that it was the intention of the females to *adopt* this boy, who was one of three sons of Narasamah, but he only recommends the continuance of the pension to the two females, leaving the proposed adoption to the Collector's consideration. The females tell the same story, that the late Poligar further told his wife, then pregnant, to adopt this lad, if her expected issue proved to be a girl; that the issue was a boy (the deceased), and consequently the intention was not carried out; and that the lad being now dead, they wished to carry out the intention. Both the females declare that Narasamah had three sons, and they gave in a genealogical table showing this, which table is certified by one of the Village Officers. So also with regard to other property their assertion is verified by the Village Officers.

11. On a due consideration of all the circumstances, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council is unable to consider it in any way conclusively proved, that the Tahsildar was guilty of the offence imputed to him. The argument is that these ignorant females were led, by the assurance of support at head-quarters, to attempt to palm off the boy as an heir, but it is difficult to understand why the pretended adoption should have been introduced into the affair; the simpler plan would have been to put forward the lad as a grandson of the original grantee. Again, on this supposition, how does it happen that Tahsildar and Collector make no recommendation in his favor? If fraud was designed, there was no more risk in putting him forward as next representative, than in taking the roundabout course that was embraced. Moreover, it appears that there is another grandson alive in the Hyderabad country. In the opinion of Government there is something much more natural in the accounts which the females give of the matter, and it is possible that, if the case is further investigated, it will be found that the lad is either the son of Narsamah or a member of the branch of the family which is settled in Hyderabad, and that the ladies meant to adopt him with hope, probably, of getting a larger allowance, but without any such designs as are imputed to them.

12. The charge against the Sheristadar is that he shared the bribe (regarding which there is not a tittle of evidence), helped on the intrigue, and when it was subsequently disclosed, tried to suppress it. The first complaint was made in May

1868, and reports and inquiries were ordered and made with no result. In January 1869, Mr. Vans Agnew called for the papers, but did not get them from the Sheristadar till November 1869. For this lengthened delay, the Sheristadar makes no satisfactory excuse; he could not get the papers, was on circuit, had fever, &c. But unless there was fraud and bribery, or both, in the disposal of the case, and this has not been proved, the delay, though deserving of serious reprehension, is comparatively unimportant.

13. The Government do not deem it necessary to enter into the details of all the other cases referred to in Mr. Vans Agnew's letters, but in none of them is there any satisfactory proof to support the charge of corruption made by the Collector against the Sheristadar; and the Government fail to see any grounds for the degradation of that officer to the post of Tahsildar, still less for the degradation of the Tahsildar to a Talook Sheristadarship. It is impossible to read Mr. Agnew's letters without feeling that he writes and acts under the influence of suspicions which are unsupported by established facts. The Government have no doubt that he sincerely believes in the delinquency of these officers, but if such wholesale corruption really existed, it is hard to believe that there could be much difficulty in satisfactorily establishing at least *one* case, especially as both the officers under suspicion are known to be in disgrace and powerless.

14. Under these circumstances, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council is constrained to overrule the orders of the Board in regard to both the officials concerned, and to direct the restoration of the Tahsildar to his situation. Although no corruption has been proved against the Sheristadar, there is enough to show that he has been very remiss in the performance of some of his duties; and there is every reason to believe that the administration of the District under the late Collector was such as to induce irregularities on the part of his subordinates. It is therefore desirable that Simhadri Puntulu should be removed to another sphere of duty, and the Board of Revenue will accordingly be directed to arrange for his transfer to some other District of which Telugu is the vernacular language.

15. Mr. C. G. Master has been appointed Collector of Cuddapah, and the Government will look to him to examine carefully into the state of the District, and to re-organize the native administration with deliberation and prudence. He will be good enough to submit a report on the subject for the information of Government, through the Board of Revenue, at the close of the present official year.

16. Mr. Master will also discontinue the allowance to the boy Seetaramiah pending further inquiry into the circumstances of the family and his relation to them. Mr. Master should undertake this investigation in the Cuddapah District himself, and should also institute inquiries at Hyderabad through the aid of the Resident. Should the Tahsildar Vencoba Rau be really inefficient from age, he should be pensioned, as proposed by the Board of Revenue.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Accountant-General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

1.8.05

Copy No. 4 of 5 Copies.

COPY OF LETTER dated 30th September, 1870, from the BOARD OF REVENUE, to the Secretary to Government, Fort St. George.

Read.

G. O., 12th September 1870, No. 1,655.

GOVERNMENT

No. 1127-192.

Secretariat of Government and Translation of Petition.—Petition to Secretary of State for India in Council praying that the Board of Revenue may be relieved from the Collection relating to Cowle Accounts.

I agree in the view taken by the Board of Revenue of the changes proposed by the Collector of Tanjore in the Cowle system, and the Collector's proposals appear to me to be judicious. I would only add that the Collector should be directed to report to Government the progress made in the preparation of the Cowle Accounts, and the difficulties, if any, which he may encounter in the completion of the work, in order that the Government may be in a position to communicate with the Secretary of State on the subject of the petition of the Cowle holders, if it should be necessary to do so.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Reader is earnestly requested to peruse
with attention the following letter
& reflect upon the shameful behaviour
of their Slanderer Vellaiyah
for the perfect ease of the injured gent
to expose the Knavery of the injured
& the fate of the Villain to be exhibited
& let the Reader Shake - Hand accor-
ding to the Advantage for Encouragg
this truth & good conduct & Encourage
the detection of the Repeated Endeavours
of the Villain which have been Staged
for the Ruin of the Gent & Family
by the Villain

Read

that he told Mr Mahony of it once - and that he
reported it to the Deputy Collr Sundarsana Row when
he examined the Treasury on the 2d Novr 89. Thailaud
allegations are not instructed by Mr Agnew -

The Tahsildar seems to me to have entirely cleared himself in the Cote

The Tahsildar Sheristadar Abraw seems to have contented in not telling Mr Agnew and the Cost - and in telling Mr Wedderburn to sign the order in ignorance of its contents - As to the first point there was, as far as I can see, no Criminal Conduct for the Sheristadar to tell the Collr - the matter had been reported to & settled by him before -
The second assumption is based on the Evidence of the Ahmed - Mr Wedderburn - in it - Examination Dec 8th 89 that the Tahsildar should see the instructions what a boy should have had to carry in the Cart charg in that Depositn - declares the Ins have prohibitg the Subordinate of the Police & Forest Officials and adds that if it has not been entered in the Office account it ought to be settled - "privately" - in the letter book is in the translation & is underlined - but

in the Lalleger citing the word is "in the Abee."

I really can see no thing to warrant Mrs Agnew's attempt to turn the evening service of Mrs Pickwick's "Chops & Tomato sauce".

7. When & then is added the facts that the Payroll a book kept by the Trustees nor Managers to show the boy could be made over - that it is not alleged that at its contents have been tampered, with the exception of the whole charge is self-Evident. and, a Think Mr Pratt on & Mrs Vaux Agnew's needs from him is manifestly Responsible.

8. The charge contained in the third letter No 12 is connected with the case by a Codicil Policy on person - enjoyed by one Emma Rodley. These persons are her Boy & lineal descendants. but when female heirs only are left, put a bar on & on time to their joint to benefit on they attain 21 & how & when Emma Rodley died. the actual terminus ad quem statement was the Registrar of the Br

2

and Gen. and stood as his heirs

3 females. (ie his ~~mother~~ mother, - an unmarried aunt - & his uncles widow) and a boy, Grandson of the original grantee (his own grandfather). The allegation is that the boy (the deceased's first cousin once removed) was not a relative at all - was believed of on the part - & that the Village Officers. the Solicitors and the Shareholders were cognisant of the fraud & remained silent for their share in the transaction.

9. It is observed that Pratt, Stamps & Cage the Coll. the Clerk Smith - left the box out of his recommendation - and suggested that half the pension should be continued to the mother of the deceased for life. The Govt concurred, with the alteration, that the money should be divided equally among the 3 females - the same to cease on Marriage, or when death her son attains 21 & the child share of Emma Rodley on her death. The fact however remains that a child a Grandson (the boy

in favour of the accused. There was a Circumstantial evidence - The Collr knows nothing of his character & recommends a reward to the boy - urging that punishment in the female line are not considered keen to them generally. The Govt directed that the full allowance should be granted during the 3 years of the boy - and this not sanctioned.

Of course it may be said that the Govt merely adopted the Collrs recommendation - they knew that the boy's claim could not be overlooked & therefore acted accordingly. This however seems to me a far-fetched -

The evidence taken by the Deputy Collr Sudarsanam Rao is conclusive against the accused - that the boy is the son of Narasamma - but it is all circumstantial evidence - hearsay & report - The evidence of the village officers who made the original report to the Tahsildar is not forthcoming - three of them are in jail - others discontented - No Evidence has been taken as to the alleged bribery -

Neither the Govt nor Collr notice what at least three very important documents viz the original report of the Tahsildar to the Collr with its Enclosures the statements of the females of the village officers - The late Poligar died on the 31 Oct/66 - and the Tahsildar's report is dated 15 March 67 - & that the plot must have been fresh thereby created! The Tahsildar says distinctly that it was the intention of the females to adopt the boy - who was one of 3 sons of Narasamma - but he only became dangerous to the continuance of the pension to the two females, leaving the boy to adopt - The Collr in consideration - The females told the same story - that the late Poligar further told his wife - their adopted son - to adopt the last if her expectant - to adopt the first born male child - that pitched upon the boy (the deceased) and the issue was a boy (the deceased) Consequently the intention was not carried out - and that the last being dead, they resolved to carry out the intention - But the females

declare ~~that~~ Narsamma took 3 trs & the
pre in a genealogical table shewing this - a tab
table is certified by one of the village Offic
So also in the regard to the pre by the
Certificate is certified by the Village Officers. I
must confess my inability to see any
thing meriting the name of Evidence to
show that the Talookdar was guilty of
the ~~Offence~~ imputed to him. The argu-
ment is that these ignorant females acted,
by the assurance of the brat at the Court Inquiry
to allow pt to take off the pre - But it is hard
to understand why all this Parade of oath
should have been introduced in to the obtain -
the simplest plan would have been to put
forward the Land as a Pundra of the original
grant. Again, in the substitution, how does it
appear that Talookdar could make no
further claim in his favor. If fraud was de-
termined after in his favor. If fraud was de-
termined, there was no more risk in putting him for-
ward, than was necessarily taken in taking the
Land as next representative when in taking the
Land about Curse Patwa was taken - Here as it

3/ appears that there is another Pundra alive
in the Hyderabad Country. I must con-
fess that at first mind there is something
much more natural in the account
which the Ladies give of the matter -
and if the case is pursued investigated
I have little doubt it will be found
that the Land is either the Inam or
Nursamma or a member of the Branch of the family
which is settled in Hyderabad and
that the Ladies meant to adopt him
- it has been usage of putting a larger
allowance but in that any such
deception was ~~was~~ intended
them - The Collr says that a further
enquiry would have elicited what he
considers the fact - But I am confident
that the course here adopted of taking
depositions from the parties concerned
and the Village Officers is the normal
one. The case against the Shirastadar is not

he stated the tribe (regarding which there is not a tittle of evidence) helped on the trips and tried to break the code. The first complaint was made in May 1684 & Captn. L Engineer were ordered & warned in the result. In Jan 1685 Mr Ogden called for the papers but did not get them from the Sheriff till November 1689. In the very thread along the Sheriff broke his water bottle & he called another to water bottle Rebecca - he called it at the papers - two or three - but neither had been & to me - But neither there was found a history & both in the Sheriff of the case - & this has not been found - the delay is embarrassingly inconvenient.

It is hard to say to which one case, I ascribe the other cases - but the one case, I think, and Mr Ogden's letter with that feeling that story as his character may be, his prejudices are strong as - I have no doubt he sincerely believes in the delinquency of State officers - but the fact must have some thing in the proof before they can convict - If such whole sale corruption exists, surely one case can be established - Especially as both officers are known to be in disgrace & penniless -?

I observe in the District Judge the Ogden has issued against the State for forty dollars - (in one suit) from one State to another!

It seems true that at first Court dealt with such a State of affairs as Mr Ogden describes in the manner first pointed by the Board. If State officers are guilty of a tittle of what is charged against them. They should be

Revenue Department

Memo: on No. 1382.

and Appeal petitions of
Simhadry Puntulu &
& Venkata Rattnach

In these Proceedings
the Board of Revenue
merely ask the sanction
of Govt to the discontinuance
of a Paligar pension, the
renewal of which has, they
consider, been fraudulently
obtained, & not, on their own
authority, the Board have
suspended the Head Sheristadar of the District and
directed his reemployment
as Tahsildar or a vacancy
occurring in an adjoining
District, and have degraded
one Tahsildar and directed
another to retire on pension.
The grounds of the Board's decision, and the several
causes

Recommend they petitions be not admitted with Journey - but they are entitled to a fair hearing.

I believe a Memorandum of the Board is about to visit Kurnool for a short period that he should be instructed to enquire into & report on the state of the Cuddapah District & the state of its Police - but I am not aware that any such Memo has been issued.

I think for the reasons stated by the President of the Board, the Petitioners should be heard through the President of the Board before any decision is passed on their petitions.

Further Papers if any should be sent to me.

J. D. S.

cause against the Inhabitants of Talaildare
are endorsed on the Board's Proceedings.

2 That Board consider
it to be proved that the
present holders of the Poligar
Pendiary, fraudulently brought
forward one Sethanaiah as
a relative and obtained for
him a sharp of the pension, and
also that they misrepresented
their circumstances.

3 That Board of the 2d
Collector report upon which
the Collector and Board in
formed their opinion should not
satisfy the undersigned
that any proved guilt com-
mitted by the Collector
in the case
deserves censure by the Bd Collector
are a little in excess of those for which
the facts before him warranted,
and there is the cardinal
objection to Medicines taken

by

In their letter of the 25th ult Copy
the 18th ult in the 10 letters C. of a book
from the same date, from the Board Proceed
regarding the conduct of the Talaildars
of the Talaildars of Jammalamadugu.

The first of the three letters refers to the
pension of the Talaildars.

The second contained a charge
against the Talaildars in connection with the
a box of jewels worth Rs 200. belonging to a
Poyda. The irregularity, to for an Talaildars
Talaildars is concerned consists
1. in the keeping of the box in the
Talaildars custody
2. in the seizing its contents, when re-
quired for ceremonies, in charge of a
Talaildars Sheristadar
3. in not mentioning the matter to
the Asst Collr the Board & the Engineer.

& the first it a box - and then is con-

printed by a Kaban written in 1861,
that the box had been in the treasury for
"a very long time". (the Zahsildar says 30 years)
& that a predecessor of the Jahsildar had
reported the circumstance to the Collr
(Mr Wedderburn) in 1861: had been can-
vassed for doing so and had been told to
continue to keep it, the Police being an-
swerable for the seals & himself & his ord.
or dinates for the contents.

3. As to the second hint, the arrangement
in the natural consequence of the order
above referred to. The Jahsildar & his ord.
-inates being responsible for the seals,
the Police officials of course took them to
the Temple when it was visited & brought them
back when done with.

4. As to the third the Jahsildar state
that he was not at the Cutcherry when Mr
Agnew visited it. & that when Mr Boyle came
he had just come in from Camp & for the
hurry forgot all about the box. He has however

by the Board and Collector
that the Collector, in the first
instance, recommended that the
a reduced pension of one
half should be continued
to the deceased's mother only,
and that it was owing
to a remark by Govt that
the full pension was con-
-tinued and a share given
to Seetaramiah.

4 This fact also seems
to exonerate the Head Sheris-
-tedar from blame in the
matter, and Mr Agnew
is clearly incorrect in stating
that

that the Shenistedar was
accused of receiving a
bribe on the Petitioners bring-
-ing the matter to notice,
for a reference to the two
petitions shows that no
mention of the District
Shenistedar is made in
the first, the Talug Shenist-
-dar being clearly alluded
to, and that in the
second it is merely stated
that there was a talk in
the village that the Head
Shenistedar had aided the
offenders.

It

5. It seems to the
undersigned that if the
Head Shenistedar is guilty
to the extent inferred in
this, and the other cases
brought to notice, the pun-
-ishment is much too
light, but if, on the other
hand, nothing has been
proved against him,
his degradation should
not be sanctioned. It
seems hard on the man
to blame him in connexion
with the Treasury frauds
for which he was in no

way

way responsible, she has not been blamed by Govt in regard to the School fees for the collection of which the Coll: himself seems to have been responsible - Moreover, he has had no opportunity given to him of making a formal reply to the Collectors charges against him -

6. Though no corruption has been proved in the cases of the Jahaldars, enough has been adduced to show them to be inefficient and careless -

7. Orders are requested as to whether the pensions is to be stopped

stopped and whether the Boards orders as to the Head Shirestedar and Jahseldars are to be noticed -

Rev: Dept.

No 1438

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 12th Sept 1870.

Read the following
papers:—

Rep. of the B.D. of Revenue dt. 26th Aug 1870, No 2769.

Rep. from S. Seshadry Pentulu
Sheristadar of Cuddapah — 11th May —

Do from S. Narasinha Sastriah — 17th — — —
late Tahsildar of Jammulmadugu, Cuddapah

In the foregoing
Rep. the Board deal
with 10 letters (7 of which
bear the same date) from
Mr. Vans Agnew (Martin Hubert Vans Agnew) regarding
the conduct of his Sheristadar
& the Tahsildar of Jammul
madugu. The first letter
merely reports the suspen-
sion of the Tahsildar. The
second contains a charge
against both officers in

connection

connection with a box of jewels worth Rs. 600 belonging to a Pagoda.

2. The irregularity, so far as the Tahsildar is concerned consists (1) in the keeping of the box in the Talug Cutcherry (2) in the sending its contents, when required for ceremonies, in charge of a Talug Shroff & peon (3) in not mentioning the matter to the Spl. Asst. Collr. Mr Boyle & Mr Agnew when they were in particular

As to the first it appears and this is confirmed by a paper written in 1861 that the box had been in the treasury for "a very long time" (the Tahsildar says 30 years) & that a predecessor of the Tahsildar had reported the circumstance to the Collr of Chingleput in 1861, had been censured for doing so and had been told to continue to keep it, the Police being answerable for the seals themselves & his subordinates for the contents.

3. As to the second point the arrangement was the natural consequence of the order above referred to. the Tahsildar & his subordinates being responsible for the jewels, the Talug Officials of course took them to the Temple when wanted & brought them back when done with

4. As to the third point the Tahsildar states that he

he was not at the Cutchery when Mr Agnew visited it & that when Mr Boyle came he had just come in from Camp and in the hurry forgot all about the box. He says moreover that he told Mr Mulony of it once and that he reported it to the Dr Collr Anderson and Doss when he examined the Treasury on the 2nd Nov 1819. This last allegation is not noticed by Mr Agnew

5. The Tahsildar seems to the Court to have entirely kept himself in the background

6. The Shirastadars office seems to have consisted in not informing Mr Agnew regarding the box and in inducing Mr McPherson to

to [illegible] the order on the receipt of the cash to the Head Head Assistant, after the Head Assistant came for the Cash and to tell the Collector the matter had been settled to prevent any [illegible] for Secrecy. The Shirastadar accompanied us to the Treasury at the time of the order of the Head Assistant [illegible] Tahsildar about the cash [illegible] about the box [illegible] Collector [illegible] Shirastadar [illegible] Head Assistant [illegible] Tahsildar [illegible] Shirastadar [illegible]

been entered in the
public accounts it
must be settled "privately".
The latter word is in the
translation is underlined
but in the Telugu
copy the word is
"in the office"
The first can see
nothing to warrant
Mr. Ayrs assumption
in this case.

7. When to this
want of satisfactory evidence
is added the fact,
that the Pagoda had
neither Trustees nor
Managers to whom
the

xxx
At the same time, it
is to be observed, that
the grounds on which
the application of the
Pagoda Committee were
refused custody of the
box are unexplained, and
the first must want their
opinion that all the officials
concerned acted in a spirit
very contrary to rules of the
service in retaining charge
of Pagoda property.

The charge appears to be
directed of all
importance and the
whole significance
attached to it by Mr.
Ayers naturally inspires
some portion of his
contributory and hard
judgment. xxx

Whether the Naib Tahsildar is merely a minor criminal charge.

the boy could be
made over and
that it is not
alleged that its con-
tents have been tam-
pered with, the
worthlessness of the
whole charge is
self-evident and a
doubt as to Mr.
Ayers freedom
from bias is natu-
rally engendered.

8. The charge
contained in the
third letter No 12

is

is connected with
the succession to a
lapsed Poligar pen-
sion enjoyed by one
Rama Reddy. These
pensions are hereditary
to lineal descendants,
but when female
heirs are left, it has been
usual to continue
to them (only so much
as the Govt think fit.)
When Rama Reddy
died, the usual
tabular statement
was submitted to
the Board
and

Sirdar Sadasheb's
Enclosure N.

a reduced amount of the
original grant according
to the discretion of
Government.

the
and Govt, and showed as his
three
heirs ~~3~~ females, viz: his mother,
an unmarried aunt, and an
uncle's widow & and a boy, grandson
of the original grantee (his own
grandfather) - The allegation
is that this boy (the deceased's
first cousin, according to his
reputed genealogy) was not a
that he
relative at all, was palmed
off on the Govt - and that the
village officers, the Tahsildar
and the Sheristadar were cog-
nisant of the fraud, and
received bribes for their share
in the transaction.

9. It is, however, to be
observed that the late Coll.
Mr. Smith left the con
for a grant
out of his recommendation
altogether

The name after grandfather
J Rama Reddy.

altogether, and proposed that half the pension should be continued to the mother of the deceased for life. The Board concurred, with mere by the alteration that the moiety should be divided equally among the three females — the share of each lapsing on her death, save that of Narasamah, on whose death her sons claims could be considered. The Govt, however, pointed out that while a grandson (the boy in question) was alive, there was a lineal descendant. The Collector, however, adhered to his original recommendation adverse

adverse to the boy — arguing that grandsons in the female line are not considered heirs to their grandfather. The Board dispented and recommended that the full allowance should be divided among the three females and the boy, and the Govt sanctioned this arrangement.

10 The evidence taken by the Depy: Coll: Sadarsana Row is conclusive against the assertion that the boy is the son of Narasamah, but it is all secondary evidence — hearsay & report. The evidence of the village officers who made the original

report

report to the Tahsildar is not forthcoming – some of them are in jail – others dismissed, and no evidence has been taken as to the alleged bribery – Neither the Board nor the Collector notice certain documents which appear to be very important documents – viz: the original report of the Tahsildar to the Collector with its enclosures and the original statements of the females and of the village officers – The Poligar died on the 31st Oct.r 1866 and the Tahsildar's report is dated 15th Decr. 1866 so that but little time was afforded for a conspiracy – The Tahsildar says distinctly

that

appears to be very important

that it was the intention of the females to adopt the boy, who was one of three sons of Narrasaiah, but he only recommends the continuance of the pension to the two females leaving the proposed adoption to the Collector's consideration. The females tell the same story – that the late Poligar further told his wife – then pregnant – to adopt the last issue whether expected issue proved to be a girl – that the issue was a boy, the deceased

deceased) and conse-
-quently the intention
was not carried out-
and that the lad being
now dead they wished
to carry out the intention.
Both the females de-
-clare that Narsamah
had three sons, and
they gave in a genealo-
gical table showing
this, which table is
certified by one of
the village officers. So
also with regard to other
property their assertion
is

is verified by the Village
officers.

11. On a due con
-sideration of all the
circumstances the Right
Honorable the Governor
in Council is unable
to consider conclusively
that it in any way proved
that the Jahsildar was
guilty of the offence
imputed to him.
The argument is that
these ignorant females
were led, by the
assurance of support
at Head Quarters to
attempt

attempt to palm off
the boy as an heir
but it is
difficult to understand
why the pretended adoption
should have been intro-
duced into the affair - the
simplest plan would have
been to put forward the
lad as a grandson of
the original grantee -
Again, on this supposition,
how does it happen that
Jahoildar and Collr
make no recommendation
in his favor. If fraud was
designed, there was no more risk
in putting him forward as next
a presentative than in taking the round-
about course that was taken. Moreover it
appears -

it: pass the seal,

appears that there is
another grandson alive
in the Hyderabad coun-
try. In the opinion
of Govt. there is some-
thing much more na-
tural in the accounts
which the females give
of the matter - and if
the case is further in-
vestigated they have
little doubt it will
be found that the
lad is either the son
of Narsanah, or
a member of the house
of the family which
is settled in Hydera-
bad and that the
ladies meant to adopt
him with hope pro-
bably of getting a
larger allowance but
without any such
designs as are im-
puted to them. —
12. — The case against
the

the Sheristadar is that he shared the bribe (regarding which there is not a little of evidence) helped on the intrigue ~~to trace~~ & (hunt to) the case.

The first complaints was made in May 68 and reports and enquiries were ordered & made with no result. In Jan.y 69 Mr. Agnew called for the papers but did not get them from the Sheristadar till Feb.y to November 1869. To this lengthened delay the Sheristadar makes no satisfactory excuse. He could not get the papers. was on circuit. had fever &c.a. But unless there were fraud and bribery

and when it was discovered tried to suppress it N.

Trying & burning of serious opposition

bribery or both in the disposal of the case. and this has not been proved. the delay is comparatively unimportant.

13. The Govt. do not deem it necessary to enter into the details of all the other cases referred to in Mr. Agnew's letters, but in none of them is there any satisfactory proof to support the charge of corruption made by Mr. Agnew against the Sheristadar, and the Govt. fail to see any grounds for the degradation of that officer to the post of Tahsildar, still less for the degradation of the Tahsildars of

30

Da Valdosta Sheriffs-
dom ship. It is impos-
sible to read Mr.
Agnew's letters without
feeling that (strong
as his conviction
may be, his preju-
dices and strongest)
The Govt have no
doubt that he sin-
cerely believes in the
delinquency of these
officers, but if such
wholesale corruption
really existed, it is
impossible to sup-
pose that there could
be any difficulty
in satisfactorily
establishing one
case, especially as
both the officers
under suspicion
are known to be in
disgrace and power-
less. —

Under

the supposition?
I would say rather
"that he writes and
acts under the influence
of the morbid suspicions
and dangerous misapprehensions
that he writes N.
under the influence of hyperæmia
which are (certainly) unsupported
by extraneous facts."

hand
difficult to believe

he must do difficulty

doubt

constrained

very

14 — Under these
circumstances the
Hon. the Govt
in Council is re-
luctantly compelled
to direct the orders
of the Board in re-
gard to both the of-
ficials concerned,
and to direct the
restoration of the
Valdosta District —
although
no corruption has
been proved against
the Sheriff of Lowndes, there
is enough to show
that he has been
remiss in the per-
formance of some
of his duties, and
there is every rea-
son to believe that
the administration
of the District
under

under the late Collector was such as to induce irregularities on the part of his subordinates. It therefore is desirable that Sundaram Pantulu should be removed to another sphere of duty, and the Board of Rev. will accordingly be directed to forward a recommendation for his transfer to the Kistna, Guntoor or Bellary District.

15.— Mr. G. Master has recently been appointed Collector of Cuddapah, and the Govt. will look to him to examine carefully into the state of the district and gradually to re-organize the Native administration which from the circumstances alluded to in the preceding paragraph has doubtless been allowed to fall into disrepute, and he will be good enough to submit a report on the subject for the information of Govt. thro' the Bd. of Rev. at the close of the present official year.—

16.— Mr. Master will also discontinue the allowance to the boy Seetaramiah pending further enquiry into the circumstances of the family & his relations thereto.— Mr. Master

Change it must be
either to
"in some State District
"of which Telugu is the
"vernacular Language"
Telugu it must be either
"in which Telugu is a
"Court language"
by direction
he has assumed
purport.

to deliberation and prudence.

omit. N.

Master should undertake this investigation in the Godda-dad Dist. himself, and should also institute enquiries at Hyderabad with the aid of the Resident. Should the Talukdar Vencoba Rao be really inefficient from age, he should be pensioned as proposed by the Board of Revenue.

If this substitution is made I must be transferred to the Secretariat and soon.

W.

I think we might add—

P.S. The Governor General having sanctioned the transfer of Mr Ogrew to the District of Lahore the Govt does it right to remark that this is the third occasion on which this Officer has been named in connexion

I doubt the expediency of adding this paragraph. It must be remembered that the Bombay Govt has opportunities of knowing much more than we can. I cannot help thinking that in all probability his opinion of the measures pursued under the instructions of the Authorities in Candeish is substantially correct. It must be stated, but the Govt should be officially told that we have not the slightest wish to screen him and Govt will be compelled not to bring charges against him which are substantiated by other Govt Servants, however strong his recommendations may be.

W.

42
V

of serious errors or indiscretions in the performance of his official duties. We cannot recognize the good intentions of Mr. Ogrew but they cannot but ameliorate upon a want of [illegible] reflection which renders these qualities unsuitable for the public service. We do not think that in his present charge he appears will not again render himself amenable to imputation of the same nature. W.

I should omit from 15. and join the warning here stating that we may be thereby upon in right in the meantime.

J. O. L.