

235

(1) Number of Pages..... 218  
(2) Date of repair..... 15. 6. 66  
(3) Initials of the Referencer..... Bbb

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

## GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

|                     |       |                 |
|---------------------|-------|-----------------|
| G.O. No.            | 235   | Press           |
| <del>B.P. No.</del> |       | <del>Mis.</del> |
| Dated               | 21-2- | 1874 ..         |
|                     |       | -196 ..         |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

235

*Proceedings of the Madras Government. Revenue Department,  
21st February 1874.*

No. 184. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 9th January 1874, Miscellaneous No. 129:—

Read the following letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddapah, 11th November 1873, No. 225.

In submitting copy of a letter\* from the Acting Sub-Collector, together with an appeal petition from Bomma Teperumal Chetty, Sub-Collector's Sheristadar,

\* Dated 27th October 1873, No. 470.

I have the honour to state that I have no remarks to offer, as his case has already been laid before the Board of Revenue, from whose decision his present appeal lies to Government. I understand, also, that Mr. Horsley, the permanent Collector, has nothing to say on his behalf.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. D. B. GRIBBLE, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector of Cuddapah, to H. SEWELL, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, dated Madanapally, 27th October 1873, No. 470.

I HAVE the honour herewith to forward a petition from B. Teperumal Chetty, the Sub-Division Sheristadar, requesting that his appeal against the late decision of the Board of Revenue may be forwarded, through you and the Revenue Board, to Government.

2. I only remain for me to add that, in my humble opinion, the punishment awarded to Teperumal Chetty is more than his offence deserved. It is not his fault that there is no vacancy of similar emolument in the district. I believe the man to be honest, and it is, I think, quite possible that the subordinate officials not only took advantage of the recent arrival of Mr. Lister, but also of the absence of Teperumal Chetty since the first petition was presented when he was absent, from Mr. Storr in charge of the office, and the second when he was absent on casual leave.

3. The history of the transaction, as given by the petitioner, is correct, and as the petition is respectfully worded, I feel no hesitation in forwarding it for consideration.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The circumstances under which the Board arrived at their opinion that Teperumal Chetty should not be allowed to retain the post of Sub-Division \* Sheristadar of Cuddapah are set forth in their Proceedings of 16th January 1873, No. 269 Miscellaneous. They at first contemplated his transfer to North Arcot in the same capacity, but the arrangement having proved impracticable they suggested to the Collector that he should be made a Tahsildar. Mr. Horsley, however, represented to the Board in the strongest terms Teperumal Chetty's unfitness for this position, stating that he is incapable of performing any duties other than those of the most ordinary routine character, and unable to manage the establishment of a Sub-Collector, much less that of a taluq. The Collector further brought to notice an instance in which the conduct of Teperumal Chetty showed his unfitness for the post of Sub-Division Sheristadar; and the Board, impressed with the necessity for removing him, directed his transfer, without delay, to some appointment for which he might be more fitted.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,  
21st February 1874.*

3. The Collector then proposed his transfer to a Sub-Magistracy, and the Board, seeing no other course open, submitted the arrangements for the sanction of Government by whom they were approved\*. The Board are of opinion that he should remain in his present post till he shows himself fit for higher employment.

No. 185. ORDER THEREON, 21st February 1874, No. 235.

Miscellaneous.

It is observed that the penalty which petitioner has incurred is very far beyond what the Board of Revenue intended. In reporting the intrigue which took place some time ago in this Sub-Collector's Office, the Collector laid the blame "wholly and solely" on the Head Clerk, "a designing, mischievous man." Mr. Lister, the Acting Sub-Collector at the time, was also of the same opinion, observing that "unquestionably the Sheristadar (petitioner) had nothing to do with the matter." In proposing to punish the Head Clerk, the Collector did not suggest any penalty for petitioner, who, he observed, "ought to have a chance of showing what he can do to control an office in the absence of Venkatakrishnaya (the Head Clerk)."

2. The Board of Revenue, however, thought it expedient to direct petitioner's removal to some other appointment, equal emolument, and Board's Proceedings, Miscellaneous No. 269, dated 16th January 1873, rejected a strong recommendation from the present Acting Sub-Collector, begging for a re-consideration of that order. Meanwhile, the arrangements for his transfer to another district as Sub-Division Sheristadar having fallen through, and the Collector not considering him competent to the duties of a Tahsildar, petitioner was posted to a Sub-Magistracy on 70 Rs. a-month, losing a moiety of his former pay.

3. The Governor in Council is of opinion that a transfer involving such a consequence would be an undeserved hardship. His Excellency in Council will not direct his being posted to a Tahsil in the face of the Collector's certificate of his unfitness for the arduous and varied duties of the head of a taluq; but he remarks that the Board of Revenue did not pronounce him disqualified by any negligence apparent in the case of the aforesaid intrigue for a Sub-Division Sheristadarship, merely directing his removal to another district, and that, though the Collector is not in favour of his restoration to that post in Cuddapah, the Sub-Collector, under whose personal supervision petitioner has done his work, is of a contrary opinion, and has made a special application for his retention under him, as a person of experience and strict integrity.

4. Under these circumstances, the Governor in Council considers that, as the intentions of the Board of Revenue for petitioner's transfer to a similar appointment in another district have been frustrated, it would be desirable, as soon as it can conveniently be done, that petitioner should, at all events for the present, be re-appointed by the Board to his former situation; it being left to them to take a

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,  
21st February 1874.*

suitable opportunity of effecting his exchange to the same post in another district, should they, on further reflection, still think fit to disregard the request of the Acting Sub-Collector in his favour. Mr. Storr, for whom Mr. Gribble is officiating, has also, it appears from petitioner's service register, testified to petitioner's carefulness, ability, and good conduct, attributing to "forgetfulness on his part" petitioner's share in the transaction reported to the Board.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,  
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

\* Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Revenue Department

Miscellaneous No 129

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue  
dated 6<sup>th</sup> January 1874

No 225. Receipts following

From

H. Seignell Esquire  
Collector of Cuddalore  
To

J. Grosse Esquire  
Secretary to the Board  
of Revenue  
Madras.  
Sir,

I am submitting copy

\* dated 27<sup>th</sup> Dec. of a letter from the Acting Sub  
Collector 1873 No 470

Collector together with an  
appeal petition from Donima  
Sperumal chetty, Sub Collector  
Sheristadar, I have the honor  
to state that I have no remarks  
to

GOVT. OF 1874

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

21<sup>st</sup> February 1874.

G. O. 21<sup>st</sup> February 1874, No. 235.

FEBRUARY  
Nos. 184-185.

Passing orders on the case of B. Teperumal  
Chetty, late Sub-Division Sheristadar, Cuddalore  
District.



1/20/90/1/14  
17/1/75

to offer, as his case has al-  
ready been laid before the  
Board of Revenue, from  
whose decision his present  
appeal lies to Government.  
I understand also that

Mr. Horsley the permanent  
Collector has nothing to say  
on his behalf. I have seen  
Cuddapah Colr. Office 11.2. Novem-  
ber 1873 - Acting Collector

Submitted for the orders  
of Government.

The circumstances under  
which the Board arrived  
at their opinion that Teperamal  
Chetty should not be allowed  
to retain the post of Sub  
Division

Division Sheristadar of Cud-  
dapat are set forth in their  
Proceedings of 16 January 1873.  
No. 269 Miscellaneous. They  
at first contemplated his  
transfer to North Arcot in the  
same capacity; but the arrange-  
ment having proved im-  
practicable they suggested  
to the Collector that he should  
be made a Tahsildar. Mr.  
Horsley however represented  
to the Board in the strongest  
terms Perumal Chetty's un-  
fitness for this position, stating  
that he is incapable of per-  
forming any duties other than  
those of the most ordinary  
routine.

routine character, and unable  
to manage the establishment  
of a Sub. Collector, much less  
that of a Talook. The Col-  
lector further brought to  
notice an instance in  
which the conduct of Teperumal  
chetty showed his unfitness  
for the post of Sub Division  
Sheristadar, and the Board  
impressed with the necessity  
for removing him, directed his  
transfer without delay to  
some appointment for which  
he might be more fitted.

3. The Collector then pro-  
posed his transfer to a Sub Ma-  
gistracy and the Board, seeing

3  
no other course open, sub-  
mitted the arrangements  
for the sanction of Government  
by whom they were approved.  
The Board also of opinion  
that he should remain in his  
present post till he shows  
himself fit for higher em-  
ployment.

1 True copy & Extract

Attest  
To, Acting Sub Secretary  
The Secretary to Government  
Revenue Department  
with 2 original enclosures  
to be returned

Edmund Karasim Chapp

N<sup>o</sup> 235

Read Profs - Vol. Rev. Musc. No 29

d/9<sup>th</sup> Jan<sup>y</sup> 74

It is observed that the penalty which Petr<sup>o</sup> has incurred is very far beyond what the Vol<sup>ts</sup> of Rev intended. In reporting the intrigue wh<sup>ch</sup> took place some time ago in his Sub Collector's Office, he Col<sup>r</sup> laid the blame "wholly & solely" on the Head Clerk, "a designing, mischievous man". Mr. Sister, he, acting Sub Col<sup>r</sup> at the time, was also of the same opinion, observing that "unquestionably he 'Sauthtadar' (Petr<sup>o</sup>) had nothing to do with the matter". In proposing to punish the Head Clerk, he Col<sup>r</sup> did not suggest any penalty for Petr<sup>o</sup>, who, he observed "ought to have a chance of showing what he can do to control an office in the absence of Venkatarishnaya (the Head Clerk)".

2. The Vol<sup>ts</sup> of Rev, however, thought it expedient to direct Petr<sup>o</sup>'s removal to some other app<sup>t</sup> of equal emolument, and subsequently effected a strong recom-  
-mendation from the present Act's Sub Col<sup>r</sup>,

Act's Profs.  
Musc. No 269  
d/16-1-73

Subto. Musc 5919  
d/12-9-73

Rev: 1874/5/24

N<sup>o</sup> 74

Proceeding of the  
Board of Revenue

Dated 14<sup>th</sup> Jan<sup>y</sup> 1874

Dec<sup>r</sup> 10<sup>th</sup> 1873

Rev<sup>l</sup> 12<sup>th</sup> 1873

in 2<sup>nd</sup> 1873

Submitting to Gov<sup>t</sup>

must report on 10<sup>th</sup> 1873

from 13<sup>th</sup> 1873

with 13<sup>th</sup> 1873

of 13<sup>th</sup> 1873

against his 13<sup>th</sup> 1873

to a 13<sup>th</sup> 1873

7<sup>th</sup> 1873/74

1874

C 11 1874/75 - 1875-76

1874/5/24

1874/5/24

leaving for a reconsideration of that order. Meanwhile, the arrangements for Pet's transfer to another district as Sub division Sautbadan having fallen through, ~~and~~ the Collr. not considering him competent to the duties of a Tahsildar, Pet. was posted to a Sub Magistracy on 70th a month, losing a moiety of his former pay.

3. The E. in C. is of opinion that a transfer involving such a consequence would be an undeserved hardship. The E. in C. will not direct his being posted to a Tahsil in the face of the Collr's certificate of his unfitness for the arduous & varied duties of the head of a Taluk; but he remarks that the Bd. of Rev. did not pronounce him disqualified for a Sub division Sautbadan - merely directing his removal to another district - and that though the Collr. is not in favor of his restoration to that post in Cuddalore, the Sub Collr. under whose personal supervision Pet. has done his work, is of a contrary opinion & has made a special application

by any negligence apparent in the case of the aforesaid intrigues,

as soon as it can conveniently be done,

on further reflections,

14th W. of Revenue  
des. 25. 7. 74

for his retention under him, as a person of experience and strict integrity - ~~and~~ Under these circumstances, being considered that as the intentions of the Bd. of Revenue for Pet's transfer to a similar app't in another district have been frustrated, it will be proper, that Pet. should, at all events for the present, be reappointed <sup>to</sup> his former situation; it being left to the ~~Collr.~~ <sup>Sub Collr.</sup> to take a suitable opportunity of effecting his exchange to the same post in another district, and being still think fit to disregard the request of the acting Sub Collr. in his favour. Mr. Storr, for whom Mr. Little is operating, D. of R. 18/2-74. has also, it appears from Pet's Service Register, testified to Pet's carefulness, ability and good conduct, attributing to 'forgetfulness on his part' Pet's share in the transaction reported to the Bd.

21<sup>st</sup> Feb 1874

40  
2

184-185

G.O.  
Passing orders on  
Bds Prgs - Mrs. No 129  
d/9-1-74.

Docket. Passing orders  
on the case of B. T. Perumal  
Chetty, late Sub division Santhadani,  
Cuddalore district.

*[Signature]*

I am, still inclined to  
support Mr. Board. The  
man was displaced because  
he was considered unfit  
for the duties of his post &  
and he can be peremptory  
if he shows improved capacity.

The Bd say: -  
The man has already  
been removed of  
what they have  
done. I should  
like to see the  
order.

I would interfere  
with the orders of the Bd.  
The Coll. (an officer  
of long standing & the  
Dist. considers him  
unfit for a Subdiv. &  
Subd. has been sent to  
Kara & the Dist. is a  
man of high judgment  
I rate him high.  
The case was most  
carefully canvassed -  
The Bd. (I was a member)

Bds Pro - 9-1-74.

Petition from Perumal Chetty

This man is a Proficient of the  
old Madras University, & has been  
in the service, with good characters from  
good officers - Dyces, Booswell, Marley,  
Lovers - since 1861.

2. His last place was Santhadani in  
the Sub Coll's office, Nellore.

While Mr. Board was absent in England,  
Mr. Lister acted as Sub Coll. & some thing  
had occurred, under Mr. Lister's sanction,  
which had been referred to Mr. Board on the  
transfer of a Clerk from one taluk to  
another, where his presence was thought  
objectionable.

3. The Coll. & Sub Coll. in reporting this to  
the Bd say he chief blame on certain  
other parties & do not propose any  
penalty for the Santhadani, and, what  
is very important, Mr. Lister, the officer  
deceived reports that "unquestionably"  
"the Santhadani had nothing to do into  
the matter". Indeed he was on leave at  
the time it happened; but he afterwards put  
initials to the draft order - what he did, he  
says, without particularly examining it.

Mo. 11/2

4. Rev. Mr. [unclear] has

directed his removal to a place of  
equal pay - On this [unclear] states he  
is not fit for a Tahiti, he puts him into  
a sub-magistracy - by which he loses 70 lbs  
a month -

5. The [unclear] poor opinion of the man,

surely, is not to be accepted in the  
face of Mr. Giffle's contrary opinion,

under whose direct supervision he has  
worked so long. Mr. Giffle declares

him 'to have a very good knowledge

of his revenue duties - to be thoroughly

'conversant with English - and honest

'I am convinced' - His fault is

timidity - owing to his being unfairly

subordinated by Mr. Giffle's predecessor

to a Chief Clerk, whom all now admit

to be a most unprincipled character.

6. I submit Peter ought to be put back

where he was, as the victim of a very

hasty ill considered order - Mr. Giffle

wishes to have him back.

J.H.F.

9/2-74.

I do not think that  
there is sufficient  
reason for reversing  
the action taken

the Board in this  
case, and which  
(I appear to be) approved  
by the Govt.

[Signature]

Approved District  
 C. 10  
 General Order - Sec. 1  
 of Circulars

See no reason & change  
 my mind now  
 14/2

74/75

The punishment  
 inflicted seems  
 to me much beyond  
 the requirements of  
 the case. I should  
 say that 1 year for  
 2 or 3 months would  
 be ample -

J. H.

Sp. Genl

Recirculated interferences  
 to remarks.

It is not the fact that the Govt  
 has already approved this man's  
 degradation. When asked to gazette  
 him as a Sub Major, they did so in  
 the ordinary course; that is all.

With regard to Mr. Proctor's  
 note, I submit the question is not  
 whether the man is stupid - it  
 is quite even ground - but whether  
 he is blameable in the matter of the  
 Clerk's transfer. When he has been  
 excused by the gentlemen immediately  
 concerned "to have had nothing  
 to do with it" - yet he is degraded  
 by 70 Rs. a month? P.S. 13/2.