

*Proceedings of Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th July 1872.*

Read again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 13th October 1871,
recorded in G. O., 16th March 1872, No. 465:—

Read also the following petitions:—

No. 76. From T. VENCATA SOOBIAH, Tahsildar of Cuddalore and late
Huzoor Sheristadar, South Arcot, dated 24th March 1872.

ABSTRACT.—Appeals against the enclosed Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue (A), directing the removal of the petitioner from the office of the Huzoor
Sheristadar to his present place of Tahsildar on the ground that he failed to place
all the facts and inferences in the remission case of Alamelumungapoorum before
his superior in writing.

Represents that he had no means of ascertaining whether the case was a false
one; but that he did mention to the Collector that the account submitted by the
Curnum is not to be relied upon; and states in detail that he is quite innocent of
the charge attributed to him by the Board without a word from Mr. Garstin to
that effect.

Prays that all the papers connected with his case may be perused, and that the
stain, undeservingly laid on his character, may be effaced by the reversal of the
above Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, and by restoration of the petitioner
to his former place of Huzoor Sheristadar, with arrears of pay.

No. 77. From T. VENCATA SOOBIAH, late Huzoor Sheristadar and at
present the Tahsildar of Cuddalore, South Arcot, dated 2nd May 1872.

ABSTRACT.—States that since his appeal to Government of the 24th ultimo,
which is pending before Government, he learns that the Board of Revenue has
ordered to reduce the petitioner further from the Tahsil of Cuddalore on a salary
of Rs. 225 to either the Tahsil of Tirunamalay on Rs. 150, or of Kullacoorchee
on Rs. 175, to give effect to the Government Order restoring Sambamoorthy Iyer
to the place of a Tahsildar.

Represents that petitioner had no connection in the remission case of Alamelu-
mungapoorum beyond writing his superior's order, that Sambamoorthy Iyer, the
interested party in the matter, has been restored by Government, and that he
(petitioner) had done what he could do consistently with his subordinate position.

Adding that he is a public servant of 30 years' standing; prays that he may
be restored to his former post of Huzoor Sheristadar on a salary of Rs. 250.

No. 78. From T. VENCATA SOOBIAH, Acting Tahsildar of Cuddalore,
South Arcot, dated 4th June 1872.

ABSTRACT.—Referring to his former petition dated 24th March last, submits
for perusal a copy of the Assistant Collector's order issued to him recording his
high opinion of petitioner's conduct.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th July 1872.

No. 79. ORDER THEREON, 12th July 1872, No. 3048.

Miscellaneous.

THE BOARD of Revenue, in a resolution passed on the 12th July 1872, have decided that the petitioner from the post of Huzoor Sheristadar, to which he had lately been promoted, to that of Tahsildar, because he did not place before the Collector, in writing, the objections to certain claims for remission which were admitted by the Collector (with, as Mr. Reade states, full knowledge of the case), but facilitated the issue of the Collector's orders on the subject, and did not bring the case to the immediate notice of Mr. Reade's successor. The Board say that had petitioner laid such a statement before Mr. Reade, he would have been justified in refusing to counter-sign the Collector's order, had the statement not been placed on record. The Government consider that the Board have, in these remarks, taken an exaggerated view of the position and responsibilities of a Collector's Sheristadar on the present footing, and do not consider that petitioner's conduct was deserving of the severe condemnation passed on it by the Board. They will not, however, interfere with the Board's orders for his reduction as they do not bar his future promotion, and he appears to have only recently attained the rank of Sheristadar.

2. The Government are, however, of opinion that petitioner should not be reduced below the pay of Rs. 225 which he received as Tahsildar of Cuddalore.

3. Ordered that the following endorsement be passed on petitions Nos. 957, 994, and 1,240 of 1872:—

"The Government decline to interfere with petitioner's reduction from the post of Huzoor Sheristadar to that of a Tahsildar on Rs. 225.

4. The Board of Revenue have been informed that the Government do not approve of his being still further reduced on this occasion."

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Accountant-General.
Endorsement to Petitioner.

MISCELLANEOUS No. 2978

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 24th April 1872

Read the following

No. 96.

From

J. H. Garstin Esquire
Collector of South Arcot

To

J. G. Esquire
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Madras.

SIR,

At the request of S. Venkatarao, at present Tahsildar of Cuddalore, I have the honor to forward for submission to Government the accompanying Petition from that officer in which he appeals to Government against the order of the Board dated 13th October 1871 at No. 4390 directing his reduction to the position he now holds from that of Huzoor Sheristadar of my office.

South Arcot
Collector's Office
Cuddalore
26th March 1872

I have the honor to
(Sd) J. H. Garstin
Collector
Submitted

Submitted to Government
Accordingly.

1 Enclosure Extracts

J. W. Cunningham
Secretary

The Officiating Chief Secretary
to Government
Revenue Department
with 14 Enclosures.

J. W. Cunningham

Chief Secretary

The Right Honourable
The Governor
in Council
Fort Saint George.

The Respectful Appeal
presented by, J. Venkatasubbiah, the present
Tahsildar of Leerdalore & the late
Theristadar in the Collector's office, in the
South Arcot District, against the orders
of the Board of Revenue recorded in their
Proceedings under date the 13th October
1871 No 4390 (Enc A)

Most humbly Sheweth
That your petitioner feeling himself
greatly aggrieved by the orders of the Board
of Revenue, removing him from his post of C.M.'s
Theristadar & transferring him to the post of
Tahsil, most humbly & respectfully appeals
therefrom on the following grounds. Your petitioner
desires to premise that copy of the Board's
order, which he had applied for on the 12th November
last, was only sent him on the 21st ultimo.
and thus your petitioner has prepared and

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD
OF REVENUE.

Dated 24th April
Despatched 26 April 1872

SUBJECT
Submitting letter from
C.M.'s of S. Therotham,
= his petition from S. Therotham,
= Tahsildar of Leerdalore,
= against the orders of the Board
of Revenue, removing him from his
post of C.M.'s Theristadar to the post
of Tahsil. From that
of his petition.

Submitted this appeal at the very earliest possible date after receipt of the said copy.

2. Your petitioner respectfully urges that the reasons assigned by the Board for the conclusion arrived at by them in the petitioner's case are untenable and unsupported by any Law and Standing Order, & consequently not sufficient to subject him to the serious penalty and disgrace which have been inflicted on your petitioner.

3. The Report of the Collector heading the Proceedings of the Board under Appeal does not contain a single word of blame against the conduct of the petitioner.

4. The Board denied your petitioner even the simplest justice of receiving his explanation before they passed their orders. The petitioner cannot help feeling that this was cruel and a great hardship and that the Board might and ought to have allowed the petitioner to urge what he had to plead in justification of faults not attributed to him by the

Collector and discovered for the 1st time by themselves.

5. The Board say in their orders 1st "that the petitioner was shown to have been fully alive not only to the irregularity of Mr. Reader's procedure, but to the fact that a grossly fraudulent case was being put forward for remission and that instead of hastening in every possible way (to the extent even of performing the functions proper to a common clerk) the despatch of Mr. Reader's order to the Salary Authorities it was his (petitioner's) duty to have placed all the facts and inferences in the case before his superior in writing."

6. In the 1st place, the petitioner was not aware that the account filed by the Amaram (B) for remission of the current demand of Rs 1280 viz. 336. 3. 2 Rs was a fraudulent one. He was not ordered to visit the spot or to find out the correctness of the account. He has never certified its correctness nor signed it and he had no opportunity therefore of obtaining any knowledge of its genuineness or otherwise. All that he did was that he received

the accounts from the hands of the Curnam,
as directed by the Collector, and laid it
before him with the objections and inferences
that occurred to him and prepared the orders
passed thereon by the Collector. There is
no Ruling or Standing Order in support
of the argument of the Board that a Sherist
adar might have placed on record
a written objection or dissent from the
Collector's views. The Standing Order
No 411 (Mr Dalrymple's Compilation)
which defines the duty of a Collector's
Sherist adar does not contain any such
provisions nor vest any discretion or
power, in a Sherist adar, of objecting to the
Collector's orders, nor would such a direct
separate objection be very palatable
to any Collector even to the Board in any
actual case; On the contrary being but
a subordinate, and though a Head, still
a Ministerial officer bound to implicitly
obey the orders of his superior and making
the slightest show of dissent or objection
might and reasonably would have rendered
his position seriously unpleasant; but
even this unprecedented requisition

of the Board, unwarranted as it is by any
Rule, is fully answered, if it is capable
of being answered at all, by the endorsement
on the back of the Curnam's Account (B)
which endorsement in the petitioner's own
handwriting states all that petitioner knew
and could venture to state viz. that this
account was not fully reliable. Any stronger
or more persistent objection to the long drawn
controversy with the Collector, which the
petitioner knows from experience would be
pronounced impertinent even in the case of an
officer holding the position of an Assistant
Collector admitting that petitioners could
have done all this, what room was there
in the present case for him to avail himself
of this extraordinary liberty. The Collector
did not grant this remission simply on the faith
of the entries in that account; He has recorded
that he knew the losses sustained by the
Rajahs of Mamolamangapuram for a series
of years, and the petitioner believes his opinion
was based to a great extent on the Tahsil Dar's
Report (C) & thus the petitioner had no reason
to interfere in connection with an order passed
by the Collector on his own discretion and re-
sponsibility. Neither do the Remission Rules

(Standing order No. 137) give the slightest power to a Sheristadar in this respect.

7. As regards the remission of old arrears, 666. 0. 3, the petitioner knows absolutely nothing of the correctness of the losses in those years. He was not then Sheristadar. The Remission was only in "Konshtu" or water cess in charging or remitting which the collector had vast discretion. The collector has given his reasons at large for granting the Remission in his English order marked (D), wherein he has also noted that Sambamurthy Iyer, the Sahsilar of the Ryot to whom a large amount was remitted and that it was only granted as an act of simple justice & not on the ground of poverty. The petitioner respectfully begs to submit that the Government will on the perusal of the collector's order (D) on this subject, most unmistakeably be convinced that the petitioner had not the slightest reason or power to move in the matter.

The Standing Order of the Board No. 258 holds the collector solely responsible for any remissions in disposing of old balances. Mr. Reade was not a junior civilian of imperfect knowledge and experienced his long experience and acquaintance

in the Revenue matters were unquestionable. The Standing order gives no power whatever to a Sheristadar in such matters. The collector instituted such personal enquiry as he thought fit & passed his orders. By the word "Remission" here expressed it meant the suspension of collection but not the writing off the accounts of the sum, as observed by the Board in the above order. No separate special recommendation is usually made to the Board in such cases. But such items are entered in the Settlement Report with the necessary remarks & the sanction of the Government obtained through the Board. In the present case the same usual course was followed. The Demand, Collection, and Balance Statement for the months of May to September, & up to the date of the Board's order in this case, will establish the petitioner's admission above in as much as the amount of Balance and Demand therein mentioned includes the sum of Rupees 666. 0. 3 proposed to be written off. Enc. E. will prove that there was not the slightest doubt of his integrity in the matter of these

*
Statement of Mr.
Reade before
Mr. Ganshin

Remissions and that Mr. Reade never gave the petitioner the least latitude in the matter nor had he any doubt of the petitioner's honesty in any case of Remissions nor did he give him any opportunity of interfering in such matters. But that on the contrary he frequently snubbed him.

8. As regards the Board's Remark that the Sheriff and are answerable to the Board and Government for the correctness of every account which passes through his hands the petitioner respectfully ventures to urge that he was responsible to the truthfulness of such accounts only as were prepared in his Department & on his personal knowledge or inspection & to examine and check those received from others, only so far as these operations can be performed by comparison & with the assistance of other accounts. In the present case the account was disposed of by the collector without any interval being left ⁱⁿ with which to test its accuracy in the office. The petitioner had no other means of ascertaining the correctness of such an account than by visiting

the locality which he was never asked to do and which in his capacity it was no part of his duty to do without an order and how the Board can hold him responsible for the truthfulness of such accounts, is beyond ordinary apprehension. The petitioner made unhesitatingly in the clearest possible manner expressed his doubts as to the reliability of this account, of which to which the collector has borne testimony in his examination, but the collector saw fit in the face of such doubts to grant the Remission on other grounds & this final decision of his superior over the petitioner could not further oppose. Mainly then, upon this ground that your petitioner has been removed from a superior to an inferior post for the reason that he failed to represent to the collector that the statement (B) upon which Remission was given, ^{was} in his opinion not true & that he thereby intentionally connived at or abetted a fraud upon Government, whereas the evidence of the collector himself proves your petitioner to have made every remonstrance within his power consistent with his

position, your petitioner bases his present
appeal & confidently repose in the belief
that justice must ensue from your
Honorable Hands upon a consideration
of these facts as above set forth, and
which your petitioner was given no
opportunity of urging prior to his sentence.

9. As regards the Board's
further remark that the petitioner
would have been fully justified
in refusing his Counter signature to the
order, the petitioner respectfully
begs to state that there is no Ruling
whatever on this subject. But on
the contrary the Standing order No.
411. directs that all Vernacular
Orders must be countersigned by
the Sheristadars without allowing the
least discretion. The want of the Sheristadars
signature is nowhere held
to vitiate the Collector's orders either
in practice or Law. The Government can
see on the Collector's Record of orders
issued without the knowledge of the
Sheristadars. Read Apistant and
Apistant Collectors are not provided

with Sheristadars. They discharge the
duties of a Collector in their divisions.
Their orders are never countersigned
by the Sheristadars. Thus the Counter-
signature of the petitioner in the order
of the Collector in the present case in no
way strengthens or gives support to the
Collector's orders in the same way as
its absence in many others does not
nullify them. The object of Counter-
signature being that he should know all
that is doing in the office and that he
should act as a Supervisor and Contol
over the Collector's Proceedings.

10. As regards the remarks of the Board
that he hastened the despatch of the
orders to the Local Authorities of the peti-
tioner knows nothing of when it was
despatched. The petitioner wrote the
order next day & got the Collector's
signature. The Government are not
unaware of the Common Practice or Rule
that the orders passed by the Superi-
or are prepared on the very day, if
possible on the day next. It is not the

present order alone which the petitioner
has drafted but it was and is his prac-
tice to write or draft all orders of
any importance or difficulty himself
without delegating the work to the sub-
ordinates. When he was Sahsildar
before, he used to draft & even write
many fair orders himself nor has he
ceased to do so now. There are accidental
circumstances bearing neither one way
nor the other towards the conclusion
to be arrived at & capable likewise
of being made to conduct any argument
in favour of petitioner as against him.

For instance if petitioner had not
had the order despatched on the same
day but detained it with him it would
require no fanciful stretch of the
imagination to attribute some personal
and unfair motives to him on that
account & likewise if he had the
order written by somebody else
his usual practice may be pointed to
and it may be urged with equal
force that he did this to divert

suspicion from himself

11. The Board further remarks that
it was incumbent on the petitioner to
have brought the circumstances of the case
to the immediate notice of Mr Garston.
There was no patent fraud or illegality
in the proceedings of Mr Read the existence
of which alone would have warranted
the petitioner in reporting it to his successor.
What grows from his short experience
considered a doubtful case for remission,
Mr Read from his more general know-
ledge and acquaintance with the District
considered right and proper. The petitioner
does not see any Rule & is not aware
of any precedent which authorizes a
Ministerial officer to bring to the notice
of his superior's successor, matters in
which he & his late superior may have
differed in opinion, much less in such
a case when such superior was a gentle-
man of acknowledged experience and
long service. The petitioner respectfully
begs to add that in a thing in which

the collector's discretion was unbounded and unqualified, the petitioner could do nothing more than he did without the risk of subjecting himself to the public display of the collector's anger & the Board's displeasure inevitable thereon.

12. The petitioner considers it necessary to urge a few lines on the Board's Proceedings of the 2nd September last to 3789 Enc. **F** in which they direct the commitment of the petitioner to the Sessions Court on a charge of framing and disseminating a false account of the Board's proceedings. This order was based on the collector's Report No 274 dated 22nd August last embodied in the above Proceedings. The petitioner submits that his misfortune alone induced the Board to take such a severe & disgraceful measure towards him. Mr Gardin did not write a word against him in his Report from which the above Proceedings emanated nor did Mr Reade say that he was deceived, so far from even hinting such a thing he (Mr Reade) took

the whole blame if any there was and responsibility in this matter to himself. The petitioner's duty as an executive officer was merely to report to him the facts of any case and to obey his orders. The remark at the bottom of **B** with his own writing fully establishes that the petitioner doubted the correctness of the account. The petitioner is utterly unable to see how the Board could have directed his arraignment as a felon. Mr Reade in his letter to the Board under date the 14th September last Enc. **G** fully admits that he is alone responsible for the Remission granted by him & that there was not the shadow of a pretext for adopting so cruel and extreme a course. He also protested against the criminal trial before Mr Gardin prior to its commencement. But all proved of no avail. (Enclosure **H**.)

13. The petitioner is constrained to submit that the Board were unnecessarily severe on him and that they had already determined on removing the petitioner from the Sheriff's office because they had

appointed a temporary successor (the
present Sheristadar) to act for the
petitioner pending the criminal trial.
The petitioner is a public servant
of 30 years standing. He never heard
of any instance in which a successor
was appointed from a distance of 120
miles without waiting for the result
of the enquiry against a Sheristadar
as in the event of any extraordinary
emergency while there were many on
the spot available to charge English
or Vernacular the and check the Sub
Division Sheristadar or any Sahildar
for the temporary charge of the office.

The Assistant Magistrate who
tried the case criminally does not
impute any suspicion to the petitioner's
conduct. But on the contrary he
records in the Preliminary Register
(Enc. I) that there is nothing to show that
the petitioner was in any way concerned
in the preparation of B. the incorrect account
alluded to by the Board.

15. Mr. Garstin in his Report with
the City of the Assistant Magistrate

23
Preliminary Register does not say a word
against the petitioner but states that
he is fully exonerated from any knowledge
or complicity in the matter. Notwithstanding
such favorable Reports on the petitioner's
behalf & in the absence of any proof to the
contrary the Board have removed the
petitioner from the Sheristadar's post.

16. Mr. Reader again on the 20th

October last (Enc. J) addressed the Board
requesting them to examine him in the
matter of the above Remission mentioning
that: "the responsibility in Ahmed Ali
"manga param case belonged exclusively
"to me, the remission was my own act and
"influenced by any one & not by which
"no one had the slightest control
"with all deference to the Board's opinion
"I beg to add that I am prepared
"before them to defend and justify what
"I did. This Mr. Reader's Application
has been repeated by the Board (Enc. K)

17. The Assistant Collector
who tried the case still maintains the
same favorable opinion towards the

petitioner as to his conduct in this case.

In a letter to the Collector of Sanjore dated 12th Feb. 1880, he writes to say that the petitioner is an excellent public servant and truly honest & that he considers the petitioner's recent reduction from the Sheristadar post has been more through his misfortune than his fault.
(Enclosure I.)

18. Mr. Gershwin in his Report on Settlement for Fussy 1280, under date about the 10th October last or 2 months since this case came to his notice & after the dismissal of the charge, has expressed his high opinion of the petitioner's conduct by stating that he found the petitioner to be a very painstaking and conscientious public officer.

19. The petitioner entered the public service in his 17th year. He has during this period served under nearly 30 European Gentlemen and has obtained voluminous testimonials both to his honesty and ability. (Enc. M.)

20. The petitioner has been recommended as deserving of the post of Deputy Collector by Mr. Reader and this has been recorded by Government in their Proceedings dated 8th June 1871 No 87.88.

21. The present order of the Board being seriously injurious and almost fatal to the petitioner's prospects & inflicting a stain on his character without the least reason, the petitioner most respectfully craves that the Honourable Government will be graciously pleased to cancel the Board's order & restore the petitioner to his post of Collector's Sheristadar together with the salary due to him for the post from the 27th October last, being the date on which he was removed from that post to that of Tahsil Dar.

22. In conclusion the petitioner begs to state that he has confined himself in this address to the prominent features of his case for fear of being tedious, being assured that Government will peruse all the papers connected with his case and that if they find other points in

Ms. A. 9. 57. 9/12

but I am sure that above all else
that they will take them into consideration
notwithstanding they are not allies here
and with this humble prayer, he is with
respectfully and confidently thrust himself
at the feet of Government as the highest
Tribunal of Justice & the Court of
Last Resort

And your Petitioner as
under bound shall ever pray.

26th March
1872
Addelore

Wm. A. Christie

Ms. A. 9. 57. 9/12

of the charge attributed
to him by the Board is
without a word from
Mr. Kerstin to that effect.

Prays that all
the papers connected with
his case may be perused
and that the stain, un-
deservingly laid on his
character, may be effaced
by the reversal of the
above Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue; and
by restoration of the pet
to his former place of Hazoor
Sheristadar, with arrears
of pay.

Office of the Muzoor
 Theistadar to his present
 place of Tahsildar on the
 ground that he failed to
 have placed all the facts
 and inferences in the
 remission case of Ma-
 melumungapooram
 before his superior in
 writing.

Represents that
 he had no means of
 ascertaining whether the
 case was a false one;
 but that he did mention
 to the Collector that the
 account submitted by
 the Curram is not to
 be relied upon; and
 states in detail that
 he is quite innocent

No. 76

C. 24 June 1872

Government of Madras,
 Revenue DEPARTMENT.

No. 2299 of 1872
 Petition No. 957

From S. Venkatasubbiah

Occupation, Tahsildar of
 S.O. No. 1048-12 July 1872

Village.

Talook, Cuddalore

District, South Arcot through
 the Board of Revenue

Dated 24th March 1872

Received 29th April 1872

12th July Enclosures. 16

Abstract.

Appeals against the
 enclosed Proceedings of the
 Board of Revenue (A)
 directing the removal
 of the pet from the
 office

No. 2221 of 1872 D 13th November 1872

Recd 16th

From S. Venkatasubbiah, of
 Muzoor Theistadar of South
 Arcot.

Requests that the
 enclosures of his petition No. 957
 of 1872 may be returned to him
 as the same are required for refer-
 ence.

The enclosures will be
 returned as requested.

No. 2222 of 1872 D 13th Nov 1872

Recd 16th

From Do Do Do

Adverting to the
 Proceedings of Govt. Revenue
 Department, dated 12th July 1872
 No. 1048 brings to notice that
 the Board of Revenue quite
 in opposition to the same have
 declined in their Proceedings of
 16th

23rd November 1872
2222

23rd November 1872
2222

23rd November 1872
2222

No. 3,789.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 2nd September 1871.
Read the following letter from J. H. GARSTIN, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 21st August 1871, No. 274:—

I HAVE the honour to report the following circumstances for the orders of the Board.
2. A petition (No. 923 of 1871) was sent to the Board by one Chinnasami Naick in April of this year, and was referred by them to Mr. Reade for disposal.

3. In this petition the petitioner brought to the Board's notice that an attempt was about to be made to get Mr. Reade to grant 3,000 Rupees of remissions to certain persons in the village of Alamelamangapuram, in the Chellumbrum Taluq, by means of false representations.

4. Mr. Reade held an inquiry into the case, examined the petitioner and the Curnum of the village, Muthusami Pillai, and recorded an order* granting remissions to certain persons in the said village to the extent of Rupees 942-3-5, and gave the petitioner an endorsement on his petition. The remissions and endorsement were both given on the 23rd May, the day Mr. Reade gave over charge of the district.

5. The remissions were for Faslies 1277, 1278, and 1280—Rupees 606-0-3 for Faslies 1277 and 1278, and Rupees 336-3-2 for Fasli 1280. In the endorsement (copy enclosed, No. 4), he says that only Rupees 336-3-2 have been granted, and not Rupees 3,000 as stated in the petition which he dismissed.

6. The same man presented a petition to me on the 12th June to the same effect as that presented to the Board, and I, not knowing what had been done in the matter, referred it to Mr. Sharp, the Acting Sub-Collector, for inquiry and report.

7. Mr. Sharp has submitted a full report (enclosure No. 5) on the petition, copy of which is herewith forwarded, with copies and translations of its enclosures (Nos. 6 to 13).

8. From it the Board will see that the Curnum, Muthusami Pillai, examined by Mr. Reade in May, was only appointed Curnum of the village of Alamelamangapuram on the 11th April last, on his brother's (Pavadai Pillai's) resignation, and (as he says in an appeal-petition since presented to me) on being persuaded to take the post against his will, so that he was not Curnum of the village during any part of the cultivation season of Fasli 1280. They will also observe that Muthusami's statement before Mr. Reade differs materially from that given by him before Mr. Sharp and from the statement of his brother Pavadai Pillai, who had long been Curnum and had resigned in his favour.

9. The following is a brief resumé of the facts elicited during Mr. Sharp's inquiry. The principal landholder of Alamelamangapuram is Subbaray Ayar or Subbarayer, who is the undivided brother (see enclosure No. 14) of Sambamurthi Ayar, the Tahsildar of Cuddalore (at present under suspension), and of Dorasami Ayar, the Monegar of Alamelamangapuram. The last-named individual manages the lands, for which up to Fasli 1276 Subbarayar only held one puttah, No. 26. In that Fasli he fell into arrears, and 50 cawnies were attached and sold to liquidate them. These 50 cawnies were purchased and paid for, and a certificate of sale granted to the purchaser; but, some six months after the grant of the certificate (enclosure No. 15), Mr. Reade cancelled the sale. Hence a suit against him, in which I hear it has been decided that he had no right to cancel the sale certificate. These 50 cawnies went back to Subbarayar, and a new puttah, No. 32, was granted to him for them. In every Fasli since 1276 this man has been in arrears with his revenue, and when Mr. Reade went to Ammapett in March last to do the Jamabandi of the Chedambaram Taluq, this man was in arrears to the extent of nearly 1,600 Rupees.

10. During the Jamabandi at Ammapett, near Chedambaram, no claims for remissions on account of damage by floods were made by the Alamelamangapuram villagers, though they complained of the badness of their soil. A petition (enclosure No. 16) in writing was, however, presented to Mr. Reade on the 17th March by Subbarayar asking for remissions on various grounds (but of this fact Mr. Sharp had no chance of being cognizant), and Mr. Reade decided to make the settlement of this one village at Cuddalore, with a view doubtless to inquiring into

the rights of the claim to remission himself, and this was done, though in the absence of the Tahsildar and Revenue Inspector of Chedambaram Taluq, the result being that on the 23rd May he granted Rupees 942-3-5 remission to the village, of which Rupees 780-12-2 were given to Subbarayar alone, as detailed below :—

Kassar remission for Faslies 1277 and 1278.

	RS.	A.	P.
To Subbarayar	542	3	0
„ other ryots	63	13	3
For Fasli 1280.			
To Subbarayar	238	9	2
„ other ryots	97	10	0
Total...	942	3	5

11. The total Ayan beriz of Alamelamangapuram is Rupees 1,099; the total amount of land-tax entered in Subbarayar's two puttahs amounts to Rupees 506-8-7, so that he may be said to be liable for nearly half the revenue of the whole village. Of the remissions, however, about four-fifths were given to Subbarayar.

12. From a perusal of Mr. Sharp's letter, of his Sheristadar's report to him, and of the statement made by Pavadai Pillai, the late Curnum of the village, as well as from the statement made before me by the peon Muttu Naik (enclosure No. 17) as to his fetching Muthusami Pillai with his accounts from Alamelamangapuram and taking him to the Cuddalore Tahsildar's house, where Subbarayar and Dorasami were, as well as from Muthusami Pillai's statement given before Mr. Sharp (to which I feel disposed to give greater credence than that given by him before Mr. Reade), I can come to no other conclusion than that Mr. Reade was deceived as to the real state of the case, and that the remissions were granted without due cause.

13. As this is, however, a matter for the Board to decide, as also whether, if they think they were wrongly granted, any, and what, steps should be taken to realize them, I submit the whole of the papers in the case for their orders.

14. A list of enclosures is forwarded (enclosure No. 20) for reference.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Deposition of Chinnasawmi Naick before Mr. Reade.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Deposition of Muthusami Pillai before Mr. Reade.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Copy of Mr. Reade's order granting remission,

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copy of Mr. Reade's endorsement on Board Petition.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.

From F. R. H. SHARP, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector, to the Collector of South Arcot, dated Porto Novo, 1st July 1871, No. 338.

I HAVE the honour to report with reference to your letter, No. 422, dated 16th ultimo.

2. The petition (herewith returned) of Chinnasami Naik may be shortly summarized as follows :—

1st.—That the Monegar of Alamelamangapuram, Dorasami Iyer, and his brother, the Tahsildar of Cuddalore, falsely represented to the late Collector that their lands in Alamelamangapuram were waste last season owing to their being flooded from the Paravanar river, and thus procured remission for their own lands to the extent of Rupees 238-9-2, and to the lands of others to the extent of Rupees 97-10-0.

2nd.—That the Tahsildar of Cuddalore and Dorasami Iyer have also succeeded in getting remissions for arrears of former Faslies on these lands, on account of some of which certain lands were sold in Fasli 1276 and bought by Bava Merkayer, and others were sold in February last and bought by Dorasami Iyer himself.

3. It seems advisable to lay before you the whole of the circumstances connected with the lands in question. The puttah, in which Dorasami Iyer and the Cuddalore Tahsildar are interested, stands in the name of their elder* brother Subbarayar, resident at Matharavelur, of Shially Taluq, in the Tanjore District. It comprises 218-5-2 cawnies, of which cawnies 32-13-3 are wet, and the rest dry. Dorasami Iyer, who lives at Pathuchatram, a couple of miles distant, is the actual possessor and cultivator of the property. After the close of Fasli 1276, 218-5-2 cawnies thereof were attached for arrears of revenue due for that Fasli; but only about 50 cawnies were sold and bought by Bava Merkayer about the 10th October 1867. The sale was subsequently cancelled by the Collector on the ground of certain irregularities brought to his notice by the defaulting Puttahdars, and the 50 cawnies in question were entered in a new puttah, No. 32, in the name of Subbarayar.† Bava Merkayer then brought a suit against the Collector and the Principal Sudar Ameen's Court at Cuddalore, and the assessment on this new puttah has been left uncollected during every Fasli since 1276. It appears from orders† issued from your office to the Chidambaram Tahsildar that the late Collector has remitted sums as per margin on these very lands, i.e., the 50 cawnies sold to Bava Merkayer, and other lands in puttah No. 26, for Faslies 1277, 1278, and 1279. The Curnum states that these 50 cawnies of land have also been annually cultivated by Dorasami Iyer.

* The three brothers are, I believe, "undivided."

† Thus Subbarayar now holds two puttahs, Nos. 26 and 32. No. 32 represents the 50 cawnies above mentioned.

‡ No. 204, dated 23rd May 1871. This order is in the Sheristadar's own handwriting

	Puttah number.	RS.	A.	P.
Fasli 1277.....	32	95	10	0
„ 1278.....	32	138	8	3
„ 1279.....	26	308	0	9
Total...		542	3	0

4. For an arrear of Rupees 529-1-5, due on other lands in the puttah No. 26 for Fasli 1277, cawnies 30-15-3 were attached on the 26th December 1868 and were sold at public auction on May 3rd, 1869, for Rupees 565, being purchased by Muttukumara Pillai and Purushothama Rajah, the former the Goomastah of, and the latter the joint cultivator with Dorasami Iyer. The purchase-money was not paid up in full. The former deposited Rupees 67, and the latter Rs. 26; but this sale also was cancelled by the Collector, and the money deposited was ordered to be repaid. Of the arrears against the 50 cawnies entered in Subbarayar's new puttah for 1277, Rupees 95-10-0 were remitted by the late Collector in your office taked, No. 204, of the 23rd May 1871, to the Tahsildar of Chidambaram.

§ Vide Taked No. 55, dated 5th June 1869.

5. For arrear of Rupees 607-8-1 on other lands again in Subbarayar's old puttah, cawnies 168-5-2 were attached on the 4th April 1870, but were not sold until 17th February 1871, when they were bought by Dorasami Iyer, the actual defaulter in every way but name of Puttahdar, as in accordance with law and custom his elder undivided brother represents the family in the puttah. The sale was conducted by Sundra Pillai, Goomastah of the Chidambaram Taluq Cutcherry. The Tahsildar explains the delay between attachment and sale, as far as he is concerned, by stating he was not in the Taluq till September 1870, when he sent up for sanction for sale, which was accorded in February. Of course, Sundra Pillai must have known perfectly well of Dorasami Iyer's purchasing the land in respect of which he was actually the defaulter, and it was his duty at once to have reported the matter to the Tahsildar as one which, though not directly contrary to the letter of the law, was deserving of notice; and, if the Tahsildar had taken that interest in his work which might be reasonably expected of him, he, knowing, as he must have done, who Dorasami Iyer was, who his brothers were, and the course taken by them in the last two sales of their lands for arrears of revenue, would have conducted the sale in person with the utmost care.

* Vide Collector's taked to Tahsildar, dated 17th March 1871, No. 102, in which it is ordered that the collection of the remaining purchase-money be suspended. This order is also in the handwriting of the Sheristadar.

† Vide taked No. 204, of 23rd May 1871.

6. The balance of the purchase-money, Rupees 970, is not* yet paid, and of the arrears (for Fasli 1278), on account of which the attachment was made, Rupees 308-0-9† were remitted by the late Collector.

7. I now turn to the remissions for Fasli 1280. The Tahsildar of Chidambaram assures me that he was present when the village of Alamelamangapuram was called up for settlement by the late Collector at Ammapet; that no claims for remission on account of flood were then made, but that the villagers complained of the alleged unproductiveness of the lands, for which reason the Collector postponed the settlement and directed him, the Tahsildar, to report on the complaint. He accordingly personally inspected the lands in April last, and even then heard nothing of damage by flood. The settlement of the village was done at Cuddalore when neither he nor the Revenue Inspector was present.

His report submitted thereupon was referred to this office for notice in your office letter, No. 358, of 23rd May 1871.

8. At the Jammabundi at Ammapet, Pavadai Pillai, the late Curnum of Alamelamangapuram, resigned his office in favour of his brother Muthusami Pillai, the present Curnum, as he himself had another village. Pavadai Pillai states that there was no loss from flood while he was Curnum; that there was only a slight flood, which did no harm to the crops; and that he made no entry in the accounts (all of which he prepared) about loss from flood for the very natural reason that there was no such thing. He also states that about ten or fifteen days before his brother Muthusami Pillai was called* to Cuddalore he was asked by Dorasami Iyer to prepare an account of waste by flood; but refused, as there was no such waste, and as he had given over charge of the accounts to his brother.

* i.e., about 22nd May.

9. Muthusami Pillai, the present Curnum, states as follows. A Cuddalore Taluq Peon, Muthu Naik, called him from his village to Cuddalore about the 22nd May as the Cuddalore Tahsildar wanted him and his accounts. He went to the Cuddalore Tahsildar's house, where were Dorasmi Iyer and Subbarayer, the senior brother of the family, and whose name appears in the puttah, and the Tahsildar was inside the house. Dorasmi Iyer then directed him to prepare a list of Sanwar (annual) balance against himself (Dorasami Iyer), which he did after a little delay according to the order of Dorasami Iyer. He also prepared a list of "Vellapal" (submerged) lands at the dictation of Dorasami Iyer after a protest against writing report of flooding of lands he had never seen. He then went with Dorasami Iyer to the Collector's Cutcherry, where the account was handed over to the Collector's Sheristadar, who ordered Muthusami Pillai to fair-copy the same, and afterwards, in the presence of Mr. Reade, sent him back to his village for his accounts for Faslies 1277, 1278, and 1279. He brought back his accounts and gave them to the Sheristadar on the morning of the day on which you took charge of the district from Mr. Reade. After the Sheristadar had dotted down a Sanwar (or yearly balance) account from the items supplied by the Curnum, they went over to the Collector's bungalow, where he was asked by Mr. Reade and the Sheristadar about the lands sold in auction, the arrears on which still appeared in the Sanwar list, as the purchase-money had not been paid. Remissions were then entered in the puttahs, just as you were taking over charge of the Treasury, by Gumastah Nagoji Row under the Sheristadar's orders and stamped with the Collector's (Mr. Reade's) seal, and the remark at the bottom of the Vellapal statement to the effect that certain fields had been submerged for a long time and that the produce had been destroyed thereby was drafted by Nagoji Row, Cutcherry Clerk, and copied by Srinivasa Pillai, Curnum of Mullipallam, at the request of himself (Curnum Muthusami Pillai) as he had a bad finger, and was then signed by himself and Dorasami Iyer.

10. I went over the lands, with reference to which the remission for Fasli 1280 has been granted, in company with the Tahsildar of Chidambaram and my Sheristadar on the 27th ultimo, and my Sheristadar examined them in greater detail some days previously, and I am satisfied that there was not the slightest cause for granting any remission on the wet lands, or for deducting the charge for water-rate on those lands arbitrarily classed as dry, which are mixed up with the nunjah, and are wet lands in everything but classification. All the fields which had been cultivated had evidently been reaped, and the real reasons for certain land being untilld were clearly those given by the villagers who accompanied me, namely, a dispute between Dorasami Iyer and Bava Merkayer about their respective contiguous boundries in one place; a dispute about irrigation in another; and the ryots' inability for culti-

vation from their having too large holdings. The lands, however, appeared many of them, to be impregnated with salt to a slight extent, a common result, I believe, when black soil is irrigated and which can be remedied by flooding and vegetable manures. My Sheristadar was accompanied by some respectable villagers in his detailed inspection, and they estimated the average yields at about 20 kalams of paddy a cawny, and, when due allowance is made for their natural wish to depreciate the value of land, it may be inferred that the general yield on the lands cultivated was a very fair one.

Moreover, certain of the villagers inform me that a Court Ameen (probably from the Principal Sudr Ameen's Court) recently attached 190 kalams of paddy, produce of nine cawnies of the land under notice, and sold the same for Rupees 130.

11. I hold, then, that the remission of nunjah rates and water-cess on punjah lands granted without the slightest reference to the local officers and without the slightest inspection was utterly uncalled for. The fields classed as punjah appeared to be interspersed amongst the nunjah lands without any reason for their being classed as dry.

12. None of the villagers, except Dorasami Iyer, expected any remission, and it is clear that the reason why a small amount was allotted to them was to throw a plausible gloss over the account, and also, in some measure, to gain the villagers over to silence. Chinnaasami Naik, the complainant in this matter, received a remission of Rupees 22-1-4,* and, though the giving of rewards for information in cases like the present is beset with many evils in this country, I take the liberty of suggesting the advisability of tendering some present to Chinnaasami Naik on account of the facts brought to notice by him, in accordance with the spirit of the Standing Circular No. 347, page 342, Dalzell's Edition, though the present case does not fall within the exact wording thereof.

13. Dorasami Iyer was appointed Acting Monegar and Munsiff of Alamelamangapuram till Jammabundi by Mr. P. L. Roberts in the room of the Mirassidar formerly holding the office, who was reported to be too old. Dorasami Iyer has no claim to the post, being neither a Mirassidar nor resident of the village, though he has a large landed interest therein; and, viewing these circumstances in connexion with the present case, I have removed him from his acting posts, as well as the present Curnum, whose own admission shows him to be unfit for the office he holds.

14. The statements recorded by me and other records as per margin are herewith forwarded for reference.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,

Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 6.—Tamil List of Vellapal and Nunjah waste, bearing Collector's English order for remission of Rupees 336-3-2.

ENCLOSURE No. 7.—Sub-Division Sheristadar's report dated 26th June 1871, with five enclosures, marked A., B., C., D., and E.

ENCLOSURE No. 8.—Statement given by Dorasami Ayar, Monegar of Alamelamangapuram.

ENCLOSURE No. 9.—Statement given by Muthusami Pillai, present Curnum of Alamelamangapuram.

ENCLOSURE No. 10.—Statement given by Pavadai Pillai, late Curnum of Alamelamangapuram.

ENCLOSURE No. 11.—Statement given by Tahsildar of Chedambaram.

ENCLOSURE No. 12.—Statement given by Chinnasami Naick, of Alamelamangapuram.

ENCLOSURE No. 13.—Tabular Statement showing arrears and remission in Subbarayer's puttah lands which were attached and sold.

ENCLOSURE No. 14.—Deposition of Sambamurthi Ayar, Cuddalore Tahsildar, before the Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 15.—Takeed cancelling sale of Subbarayer's land for arrears up to Fasli 1276.

ENCLOSURE No. 16.—Subbarayer's application for remission.

ENCLOSURE No. 17.—Deposition of Cuddalore Taluq Peon, Muthu Naick, before the Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 18.—Takeed cancelling sale of Subbarayer's land for arrears of Fasli 1277.

ENCLOSURE No. 19.—Takeed granting remission up to Fasli 1280.

ENCLOSURE No. 20.—List of Enclosures.

It appears from the Collector's letter and its enclosures that in March last, Mr. Reade, the late Collector, made the Jumabandi of the Chellumbrum Taluq (which is in the Sub-Collector's Division), at a place called Amapet. Sundry *old* balances appeared against the village of ALAMELAMANGAPURAM, whereupon the Curnum explained that the land was poor, and the next day a petition was presented by one SUBBARAYAR, whose Ayen assessment is about 500 Rupees for one-half of the whole village), on behalf of himself and the other ryots, praying for a formal inquiry into the matter. The lands, it seems, are mostly classed in one of the highest classes of "unirrigated," an assessment termed "Kasar" being charged when Government water is used, whereas, it was contended, they should be put into one of the lowest classes of "irrigated" so as to get the benefit of a remission when the crops partially fail from drought or other cause. The petition further prayed for the cancelment of all arrears since Fasli 1277 inclusive.

2. Mr. Reade on this told the Tahsildar to "keep back" the village, and to report on the lands, after personal inspection. This report was furnished on the 1st May, and on the 22nd idem, being the day before he left the district and the service, the late Collector drew up his order, on the subject. In regard to the conversion of the dry land into wet, he was not prepared, with the information before him, to decide the question; but decided to remit a sum of Rupees 606-0-3, being "Kasar" due for Faslies 1277 and 1278. Of this, by far the greater part was in favor of Subbarayar, the petitioner, who got Rupees 543-3-0 for himself, Rupees 3-13-3 being distributed amongst sundry others, whose names are given in the vernacular order to the Tahsildar, despatched the next day.

3. Now, the Jumabandies of Faslies 1277 and 1278 have long been closed, and these "Kasar" arrears have been formally set down in the public accounts of the district as "Recoverable." Mr. Reade must have been perfectly aware that the sanction of the Board of Revenue was a necessary preliminary to such remission; but, supposing, for a moment, this necessity escaped him, what evidence had Mr. Reade before him of the propriety of the remission otherwise? On the 18th May he had taken a statement from the man who has been the Village Curnum since March last only. This was all he had before him, and he sought no more—no reference to the Revenue Inspector, none to the Tahsildar, none to the Divisional Officer.

4. Mr. Reade is now beyond the censure of the Board, but the conduct of the Sheristadar is open to the gravest suspicion. Not only does he countersign the Collector's order without show of objection or remonstrance, but such is his eagerness to get it passed out while Mr. Reade is still the Head of the District that he despatches it written in his own hand.

5. The petitioner, Subbarayar, besides being a wealthy influential person, is the brother of the Tahsildar of Cuddalore, whose conduct in the matter is, therefore, open to similar suspicion.

6. But worse remains behind. In the same takeed to the Chellumbrum Tahsildar, the late Collector writes off a further sum of Rupees 336-3-2, remission for the last Fasli (1280), namely:—

	RS.	A.	P.
Nanjai waste.....	124	4	7
Crops lost by flood (Vellapad) Nanjai land.....	86	4	7
"Kasar" on dry lands swamped.....	125	10	0
Total...	336	3	2

Of this amount again, Subbarayar obtained as much as Rupees 238-9-2.

7. Now, the absence of all necessity for this is abundantly proved—

(1.) By the village accounts.

(2.) The statements of the Curnum and the Tahsildar as to what was said and left unsaid by the ryots before Mr. Reade in camp in March last.

(3.) The very minute inspection of the ground by the Sub-Collector's Sheristadar, assisted by the neighbouring villagers.

Enclosure 7, with sub-enclosures A. to E.

(4.) By the testimony of the ryots who with Subbarayar shared the remission, at which nobody is more surprized than themselves.

8. More than this, it appears that Subbarayar, a few days before Mr. Reade resigned, attempted to tamper with the late Curnum, and that, on this failing, a peon belonging to the Tahsildar of Cuddalore, who as before observed, is Subbarayar's brother, was sent to Alamelamangapuram to fetch the present Curnum to the Tahsildar's house. He refused to go at first without the leave of the Tahsildar of his own Taluq (Chellumbrum); but ultimately accompanied the peon, after notifying the reason of his absenting himself to his own superior. This was on the 22nd May, and, if his account of the pressure put upon him and the acts done on that and the following day be true, as there undoubtedly exists *prima facie* reason for supposing it to be, then a very gross conspiracy has been hatched with a view of defrauding the State, and those engaged in it should be brought to condign punishment if possible.

9. In this case, therefore, the Board think the Collector should proceed magisterially, offering a pardon to the Curnum, Muttusami Pillai (whose dismissal is reversed, it being obvious that he acted under extreme pressure throughout), for any offence he may have committed, and taking him as a witness against the others who should (in the opinion of the Board) be committed to the Sessions Court for abetment of the offence made punishable by Section 218* of the Indian Penal Code.

* Namely, Public servant framing an incorrect record or writing with intent to save any property from charge to which it is liable by law.

10. The parties *prima facie* implicated in this abetment are Subbarayar, the Puttahdar, Dorasami Iyer his brother Monegar, the Tahsildar of Cuddalore, the Head Sheristadar, and Nagoji Row, Clerk in the Collector's office.

11. It appears to the Board to be a case requiring the fullest and most careful investigation by a perfectly independent tribunal; but they are not disposed to hamper Mr. Garstin in his disposal of it, and prefer to leave it in his hands with the above expression of opinion. He will, of course, report the further steps taken by him on receipt of these Proceedings and in the meantime the Board defer passing final orders on his letter, No. 269, dated 18th August 1871, and on the subject of the first five paragraphs of these Proceedings.

12. Mr. Reade's order granting remissions both for the late and earlier Faslies is, of course, cancelled *in toto*.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) J. B. PENNINGTON,

Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of South Arcot.

Dated 22 May 1872.

No. 684

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The Acting Sub-Secretary is directed in reply to official Memorandum, dated 18th May 1872, St. of Petition Department, to state that no second degradation of Venkatasubbayya has been sanctioned. In order to carry out the order of Government regarding Sambamurti Ayyar, the Tahsildar of Kulitalai in Trichinopoly was transferred to Cuddalore. This displaced Venkatasubbayya who on his dismissal from the post of Sheristadar was first made Tahsildar of Trivemalai and afterwards Tahsildar of Cuddalore; Venkatasubbayya

1871.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 2ND SEPTEMBER 1871, No. 3789.

Received.

Encl.

SEPTEMBER.

No. 3789.

Remissions of assessment.—Order of Mr. Pease, late Collector of South Arcot, granting to villagers of Alamelungapuram in Chellamburam Taluk, South Arcot District, for Pashes 1277, 1278 and 1280, cancelled.—Opinion expressed as to mode in which certain public servants and chief putthadars of village should be dealt with for their conduct in bringing about these irregular remissions.

Plm. 77. Rk 957/72
The as is to govt in the department under the chief Secy is directed to request the Secy to the Bd of Rev. to state whether the Venkata Subhiah Tahsildar of Cuddalore in the district of South Arcot has been degraded a second time. If so, to forward to govt a copy of the Board's proceeding in question.

Dtd 18th May 1872.

Petr appears to have been degraded a second time. It is to be shown and in the appeal Petr to as possible. It is to be shown that he can truly

Both ascertain the names from the what has

had therefore to revert to
Lunomalai a taking of a lower
class, and this is probably the "degra-
dation" alluded to.

(By order)

H. E. Stokes

Acting Sub Secretary

To The Under Secretary to Government
in the Department under the Chief Secretary

[Signature]

Copied & returned again.

Madrass
1st May 1872



From
Mr. J. S. S. S.
Civil Service Retired
To
Honorable Mr. Madras
by Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St. George

Just as I am leaving for
England have received the enclosed Re-
sultion from Venkata Subbiah Iyer the
late Treasurer of the South Arcot Dis-
trict. This man's case is intimately con-
nected with that of Santhamoorthy Iyer
late Treasurer of the Government
that he applied to me before to ask him
in obtaining the same he asked should
I have sent all in my power
his behalf, but he could not get
as I am embarking I have neither
the time or disposition to set down

and

William Roper

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

From
The Sub-Secretary to the
Board of Revenue,

To
The Collector of
Madras District
for the Madras District
Board of Revenue.
Dated 22nd May 1872
No. 687

Mustering informant
= him called for with
reference to degrades;
= long Venkata Subbiah
I. were etc.

W. Roper

and advocate his cause. However I feel
that Venkata Sobra has claims in
my sympathy & that I alone can clear
him of any offending with which he has
been charged by the Board of Revenue &
for which he has been separated to an
inferior Post.

2. My letters to the Revenue Board
which former Enclosures and I accom-
panying the Petition of Sambamurti has
would seem to exonerate Venkata So-
bra has equally with that Officer
but as the Board have not noticed
those letters I may presume that
it is as imperative on me to stand
forth in Venkata Sobra's indica-
tion as in Sambamurti's. Their posi-
tions in the service were different
& their functions also, but if as
already declared by me I alone was
responsible for all that transpired
in the case of the Remission in the
village of Alamilamangapuram,
Venkata Sobra is relieved from any
share

share in that responsibility as much
as Sambamurti, & I again solemnly repeat
that all that transpired was done by
myself & that Venkata Sobra had
not the slightest voice in the matter
as I never allowed any Officer, even
my Chief Ministerial Head & adviser
ever to proffer any opinion to me unless
specifically asked for, & nothing more annoyed
me than any public servant venturing
to do so without my sanction. Thus Venkata Sobra
has as much to do with the remission
in Alamilamangapuram granted by me
as the Board's Sheristadar may have had.
3. Venkata Sobra's Appeal is now
before Government seeking restoration to
his old Post, & in that Appeal, he has well
& truthfully set forth all that took place
so far as he was concerned in the Remission
Case. The novel doctrine laid down by the
Board that as Sheristadar he ought to have
acted otherwise & opposed the Collector in
the manner indicated in Para 3 of their
Proceedings of the 13th October last, can
hardly find support by Government, at all
events it surely cannot be brought to bear
retrospectively

retrospectively, and it seems the height
of injustice to make Venkata Sookiah the
first victim to a new theory, which has
only now been propounded and the im-
possibility of which experience will I think
soon attest.

4. I do not think it worth while to enter
into any explanation on my own account
in reference to the remarks of the Board.
I offered myself for examination in view
at the time to explain matters which they
clearly did not. I do not still understand,
also to point out the incorrectness of the
allegations made by the Sub Collector on
the wilfully false information fur-
nished by his Sheristadar but my offer
was not accepted.

5. My sole object now is to ratify
all that Venkata Sookiah has stated in
his Appeal & to take on myself in his
evaluation a responsibility which I have
already sufficiently aroused belong-
ing to me. I maintain the opinion that
there is no public servant who by up-
rightness of character & a knowledge of

M

Revenue

2

Revenue Administration generally, and
by experience of the District of South
Arcot is more fitted to fill the important
Office of Sheristadar than Venkata Sookiah,
& I only trust that Government will
be pleased to accept my vindication
of him & replace him in the position
from which he has been removed.

6. I sent up the enclosures received
with the letter to me from Venkata Sookiah
& two of these and the copies of my orders spe-
cially relating to the Alamalamamapuram
remission case, which will at once satisfy
Government that all that was done was
my own act, and I leave Government
to judge of the reasons which influenced
me in what I did, as the grounds for
the conditional grant of remission are
clearly and explicitly set forth in
these orders.

7. As I embark for England
this day I request that the enclosures
may be returned to Venkata Sookiah
at Coondal, and further that the
result,

result of my present letter to Govern-
ment may be communicated to him

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servant

Charles Heade

Civil Service - Retired

The Chief Secretary

to Government

Feb. 7 May 22

This & 13 are
circled not
the subject of
Dante's book.

My father's
own notes.

brother

brother and another person
on fraudulent representations

Mr. Reade the
late Collector has taken
upon himself all responsi-
-bility in the matter of these
remissions and he states
in a very positive manner
in his letter to the Chief Se-
-cretary dated the 7th May 1872
that the Sheristadar, in partic-
-ular, had nothing whatever
to do with them.

3. Mr. Reade's vindic-
-cation of the Petitioner is no
doubt generous but it hard-
ly exculpates the Petitioner
who seems to have been well
aware of the transaction &
yet very reticent. It would
scarcely be expedient to restore
petitioner

South India; a view
which is pronounced
by our (Magistrate) as
fair, & I think, justly,
& in an enormous view
the Petitioner appears to
have hitherto borne
a high character and
to have shared the
esteem of all his superiors
and shown an unusual
pursuit of the subject
which has led to his
degradation. I consider
that the case is one
in which his former
conduct is not to be
taken into account.
I must refer the
matter to the
Petitioner's appointment
which he has been
degraded up to that of
Petitioner's South India.

2 July 72

I do not think
but I should in-
-fer. He took
an active part
in the affair
though he knew
the claims were
fraudulent.

I do not share the
view in line 12. 13. from
3. K. pers 13 Oct 71. N. 4390

JOS

petitioner to the Sheristadarship
in the South Arcot. He might
be declared eligible for promo-
tion elsewhere when an opportu-
-nity offers itself - S.M.

Supra 3. of 1872
G. B. R. 7. N. 4390.

The K. decision
does not bar K. pers
promotion in future
& K. I think that
the decision itself is
somewhat & true
in its view. The case
is not one in my
opinion for the
interference of Govt.

LK

Petition - Revenue

I cannot find in the papers that the Shrivastava knew that the claim was fraudulent. But it would appear that, if he did not know, he ought to have known that such was the case: as indeed ought Mr. Reade. It was in my case the duty of both the Reade and the Shrivastava to abstain from ordering receipts in the strength of accounts which they considered were not reliable. On the whole, I should be disposed not to reconstitute the Petitioner as he requests, but to restore him to a position equivalent to that which he held before the second deduction of his salary.

C. 24. June 1872

C. 81/5

A. 5/6

No. 957 of 1872. D 24. March 1872

Recd 29 April

From J. Venkatasubbiah
Tahsildar of Luddalore, South
Arcot through the Board of
Revenue.

Appeals against
the Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue Directing the
removal of the petitioner from the
office of the Muzoor Shrivastava
to his present place of
Tahsildar on the ground that
he failed to place all the
facts and inferences in the
remission case of Channab
mangapuram before his superior
in writing. Represents that
he had no means of ascertaining
whether the case was a false
one, but that he did mention to
the Collector that the account

submitted

101
957.
Government declines
to interfere.

L. H.

I think the decision
in favor of the Govt.
is the best. It is better to be an
inferior in an
inferior. It is not
too far. Can the Govt.
be the same?

Submitted by the Curmm is
not to be relied upon; and
states in detail that he is
quite innocent of the charge
attributed to him by the Board
without a word from Mr. Harston
to that effect. Prays that
all the papers connected with
his case may be perused and
that the stain undeservingly
laid on his character may
be effaced by the reversal
of the above Proceedings of
the Board of Revenue and
by restoration of the petitioner to his
former place of Moazoor Sherista
at with means of pay-

No 994 of 1872 2nd May 1872

Recd 6th —

From Do — Do — Do.

States that since
his

994

Do — Do — Do.

his appeals to Court of the
2nd instance which is pending
before Court he learns that the
Board of Revenue has ordered
to reduce the petitioner further
from the Tahsildar of Buddalur
on a salary of Rs 225 to either
the Tahsil of Sannamalai on
Rs 150 or of Kullacoorchee on
Rs 175 to give effect to the
Court order restoring Sambamorthy
Lyer to the place of a Tahsildar.

Represents that petitioner
had no connection in the remaining
case of Alavalumungapuram
beyond making his superior's order.
that Sambamorthy Lyer the
interested party in the matter has
been restored by Court and that
he (petitioner) had done what he
could do consistently with his
subordinate position. Adding
that he is a public servant

of

of 30 years standing, prays
that he may be restored to
his former post of Muzoor
Sheristadar on a salary of Rs
250.

C. 19/6.

C. 24 June/72 R 2: July/72

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following paper

Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue

(Here enter 13th October 1872 4390)

Read also the following

Petitions from J. Venkatasubrah
Tahsildar of Cuddalore & late
Muzur Sheristadar South Arcot

24th March, 2nd May
+ 4th June 1872 Rs 957,994
+ 1240

Order thereon, 12th July 172, No 1048.

The Board reduced the
petitioner from the post of
Muzur Sheristadar to which
he had lately been promoted
to that of Tahsildar because
he did not place before the
Collector in writing all the
objections to certain claims
for remission which were
admitted by the Collector
(with as Mr. Reade states full
knowledge

[Faint, illegible handwriting]

The Govt are however of opinion
that Petitioner should not be
reduced below the pay of
Rs 225 which he received as
Tahildar of Buddalore.

"The Govt decline to interfere with Petitioner's reduction from the post of Muzur Sheristadar to that of a Tahsildar on Rs 225-

The Board of Revenue have been informed that the Govt do not approve of his being still further reduced on this occasion. "

14. Fort Thos. sec: 17 July / 72
6 acct General " "
1. Enst. S. E. " Sherbrooke Oct 1.

Don't forget

187, No.

Recd.

Notes:

Nos.

64-960