

(1) Number of pages 2

(2) Date of repair 6-7-65

(3) Initials of the Referencer JD

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 115 ~~Press~~
B.P. No. 115 Mis.

Dated 19-1-1872 195

Not to be folded or roughly handled

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 20th October 1871.

Read the following letter from J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chittoor, 12th September 1871, No. 459:—

ADVERTING to the Proceedings of the Board, dated 13th July last, No. 2,915, I have the honour to state that from inquiries made in regard to the letter A. J., referred to in paragraph 3, it appears that one Yelakagari Muniappah, late Monegar of Kotaguravipalli, in the Palamanair Taluq, to whom it was addressed, had applied to the then Tahsildar for copy of the Paimash entries affecting his puttah lands and those of other ryots, about which there was then a dispute. The Taluq Peon, Sheik Aji, the writer of the letter in question, was then acting attender in charge of the records. The Tahsildar ordered him to get the copy of the Paimash account applied for by Yelakagari Muniappah prepared. This was accordingly done, and the copy was forwarded to the party with the letter of which there is now question. Such is the explanation now offered by Sheik Aji, but I do not myself attach much credit to it. If the peon had the Tahsildar's orders, there was no need of his getting the copy prepared by a private person, nor of his forwarding it with the secrecy he did, nor would there, in such case, have been any necessity for cautioning Muniappah to keep the matter to himself, much less for asking for a present for himself and the Record-keeper. If the Tahsildar had really ordered the preparation of this copy, he would have forwarded it with a public order, and the application for the copy would also have been openly made.

2. Although there is no actual evidence, the natural inference is that the peon made a private bargain with Muniappah for the copy, and that he got the account out of the Record-room, possibly with the connivance of the Record-keeper, Govinda Rao. As, however, the peon's version of the matter makes the transaction lie between himself and the Tahsildar only, the Record-keeper cannot now be called on for an explanation. The fact is that the Taluq Record-rooms never really are in the sole custody of the responsible Gumastahs. From reports just received it appears that in some taluqs, such as Arcot, Gudithum, Vellore, etc., when business is heavy, one of the taluq peons is very generally deputed to assist the Record Gumastah. If this much be admitted, it is fair to conclude that the taluq records are not so well secured as they should be, and that the Board are accessible to an extent which calls for early reform.

3. On this point I shall not offer any further remarks in this place, as my proposals for the safe custody of the Taluq Records will be submitted in my reply to the Board's Proceedings dated 4th July 1871, No. 2,687.

SUBMITTED to Government in continuation of the Proceedings quoted by the Collector.

2. It seems pretty clear that the copy was irregularly obtained; and, as observed before, the Board have taken steps to put a stop to the practise of allowing any one, other than the Record-keeper, access to the record-room.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

W. Remington
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to the Collector of North Arcot.

MS. August 6/11 Oct 27-88

Revenue Department

1871.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 20TH OCTOBER 1871, No. 4,441

Copy to Madras

Received.

Encl.

OCTOBER.

No. 4,441.

Letter addressed by a Peon of Palmanur Taluk
— in North Arcot District to one V. Muniappah
late Monegar of Kottaguruvempalli, regarding a
Paimash account applied for by latter, — Report
from Collector of result of enquiries made re-
garding, submitted to Government.

For the Board of Revenue, 27 Jan'y

MS. 18-72 1871

MS. 18-72 1871