

(1) Number of Pages.....18
(2) Date of repair.....25.6.68
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....D.S.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1133	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	28.5.1875	196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

D.S.

Revenue Department.

Miscellaneous No. 4372

1133

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 18th May 1875

Read the following
No. 89

From

The Ag. Collector of
Trichinopoly

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir,

⁺ 14th May 1873.
His. No. 2903.
18th June 1873
His. No. 3754.

Adverting to the Board's proceedings
as per Margin reversing the collector's order de-
-grading M. Srinewasa Iyengar Sub-Magistrate
of Lalgudi, and approving the suggestion of
the Collector that he be re-employed in the
grade of Tahsil Sheristadar, I have
to solicit sanction for the payment to him
of the arrears due from 1st February to 1st
July 1873 at the rate of 60 Rupees per mensem
being the period he was under suspension.
Although

Board's
Mis. Pro: No 2903
8/11 May 1873.

the Board on the ground that no offence
had been proved against him but was sub-
sequently on the Collector's representation
with the Board's approval reemployed in
the grade of Sahy Sheristadar. It

Board's Mis. Pro:
No 3754, 27/18 June 1873.

Collector now requests sanction to disburse
to him the pay of the latter post Rs 600
per mensem for the five months during
which he was under suspension.

As he was acquitted by the Board
he is entitled to full salary under Clause 2
Circular Order No 2011 of 1866. The amount
Rs 300 can be met from Savings
under "Land Revenue".

1 True Copy & Extract

W. H. C. M.
Acting Sub-Secretary

To The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department with copies
of Board's Proceedings dated 14 May
1873 - Mis. No 2903 and 18 June 1873
Mis. No 3754.

Cap. L.

2. Although H. Steenevaca Syngar was
reinstated, if he cannot hereafter shew that
he drew the salary for the period he was
under suspension there will be a break in

which will be more disastrous
to him than the loss of time from the order
of suspension which was reversed. As I
consider him entitled in accordance with
the Board's order on his Appeal to the full
pay of Sahy Sheristadar, I beg the
Board will accord their sanction to the
payment.

I have for
Trichinopoly } Miss J. B. Pennington
Collis office } By Collector.
3rd April 1875

Submitted for the favorable con-
sideration of Government.

Steenevaca Syngar, late Sub-
Magistrate of Lalguvi was reinstated by

133/3

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 14th May 1873.

Strimivasa Iyengar late Sub-Magistrate of
Calcutty, Trichinopoly District, praying for
his restoration to the post of Sub-Magistrate
from which he was degraded.

On a review of the charges on which the petitioner was arraigned and the facts relating to the alleged offence of which he was found guilty, the Board see reason to doubt whether any offence was proved to have been committed by petitioner, and resolve to reverse the Collector's order, and to direct that A. Srinivasa Iyengar be reemployed as a Sub. Magistrate.

Signed S. Goodrich
Ag Sube

To the Collector of Lichmopolis with the Petition
/ True Copy //

Ag. Sub-Sekretary.

Edw. M. Hoff
Capt. B.

Aug. 1875: 200 ft
1874 to 1875
Proceedings of the

Board of Finance

Feb 1877

David 18 }
 Aug 18 } May 18 75
 Recd 24 #

Dear?

Rocky Mt. May 1876

Submitting for the

favorable consideration of
your remarks, letter
from the 14th of Nov. of
evening party, soliciting
answers for the present to
the answers due to A. White was
deposited at about 1942.
I also from 1842 to 1843
to 1843 at the rate of
10 to 100 manumissions had
10000 manumissions.

Revenue Department

Miscellaneous No 3454

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 18 June 1873.

No 290 Read the following

From The Acting Collector of
Tamilnadu

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir,
In acknowledging the receipt of Board's
Proceedings No 2903 dated 14th May 1873 directing
that H. Srinivasa Aiyengar "be reemployed
as a Magistrate" because the Board "see reasons
to doubt whether any offence was proved to have
been committed by him", I have the honor
to request that I may be informed whether
the Board acquit him of having sent in a
practically false report as to the appearance
of Vyapuri Pandaram before him? I have
still

Enclosure in Proceedings of
the Board of Revenue is the
Certificate to Government
Revenue Deptt dated 18 May
1873 No 4392

No 1
14/75

En 1950/25

Copy of Board's Pro-
ceedings sent this day
1873 - also: No 2903.

still no doubt ^{whatever} ~~whether~~ that Dyapuri Pandarum
was present at Lalgudi and that the petitioner
knew he had been and had seen him when he
was ^{present} ~~in~~ ^{Assistant} Magistrate that
he could not proceed with the enquiry be-
cause of his non-attendance; and I thought
a false official report of that kind
sufficient to disqualify a man from exer-
cising the powers of a Magistrate. If the
Board ^{(without apparently ever}
seeing the evidence) decide that the report
was not intentionally false I will endeavour
to believe it was not, and treat petitioner
accordingly; but I cannot help thinking
it would be in every way more convenient
if he could be employed in any other District.
He bears the worst character of any official
in his position in this District and the
Board may have observed that he produced
no

1133/6
no Testimonial of later date than 1869; and
I doubt if even Mr. Banbury (his immediate
patron) would speak so well of him now. I
should be glad to take any Sub-Magistrate
from ~~the same~~ ^{for instance, on view of}
him if Mr. Whiteside will agree, or if the
Board will be pleased to take him into
their own office on Rspees 70 I shall be
glad to give any clerk in their office ~~on~~
that salary the appointment of Head
Assistant here on 85 Rspees ~~and if~~
I try to be informed if he is to be employed
in the office from which he was degraded,
(the pay of which has been raised in the
meantime) or whether the Board will allow
me to make him a Sheristadar Sub Magis-
trate, where at any rate he will be under
some control, and will be incapable of
doing so much harm as he is reported to
have done in Lalgudi.

To Magistrate of the District, I
cannot willingly allow him to have such
independent powers again, and therefore trust
H. N. will see fit to agree to this last

suggestion, namely to remove him from
his being removed from the District altogether.

Trichinopoly } I have &
Collis office } (Signed) J. B. Pennington
19 May 1890 }
Ag Collector.

I agree to the suggestion of the
Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, given in his
letter of the 19 May 1890; that M. Strivasa
Sugan should be reemployed in the grade of
a Sub Sheristadar.

The Board will be willing to sanction
his transfer to another district if Mr Penning-
ton can arrange for an exchange.

(True Copy & Extract)

(Signed) H. Goodrich

Ag Sub Secretary

To The Collector of Trichinopoly
(True Copy)

L. M. H. H.
Collector

(Signed)
Ag Sub Secretary

Ans: B. & Rev

Subms for favorable considⁿ, with remarks
letter from H. E. 18 May 1875, relating sanction for pay of arrears due
H. Strenuous & capable, late Sub Mag. of Telgus, from 1st July
1873 at Rs 60 per mensem &c

Memo for order.

H. E. 18 May 1875 No. 4372
In these papers the sanction

of Government is requested
to disburse to H. Strenuous a
Rangar. the pay due to him
for 5 mensem from 1st July to
1st July 1873, during which he
was under suspension by
order of his Collecting District
Magistrate & which under the Board
of Revs reversed with the
remark that they see agree-
ment to do with whether any of-
fence was proved to have
been committed by Petitioner
(H. Strenuous Rangar) & that they
resolve to direct that he be
re-employed as a Submagistrate.
The man was Submagistrate
of Halpooty when he was sus-
pended. Before the order of
re-instatement was passed,
the pay of the officer out of
 regard to the impudence of
the District, was raised from
70th to 100th.

The question is whether the
man is to be paid the pay of 100
as he was in receipt of at the

Do. Give only
But the H. E. Government
viz: back pay at Rs 60.
monthly. [Signature]

Enclosure in proceedings
of the Board of Revenue
of the sanctioning to Govern-
ment of Revenue of 18 May 1875
No 4372

Ans 2
13/50/75

Copy of Sanction No 4372
dated 18 June 1875. No 1
No 3754.

time of the suspension or lack
of a Taluk Sheristadar as now
recommended by the Bd. of
Rev. In deciding this question
the points in favor of the man-
age.

1. That he was in receipt of
a salary of 7000; & had
realized Rs. 60 monthly from
Registration fees. having also
been Sub Registrar.
2. That the Board of Rev. de-
-clared his re-instatement
in the first instance as
a Submagistrate.

The points against him are

1. That on second report from
the Collector, the Board agreed
with that officer that he
shd be taken back into
the Bd. as Taluk Sheristadar
at Rs. 60; thus modifying
their first decision.
2. That the Collector had re-
commended the pay of the
Taluk Sheristadar being
given him for the period
he was under suspension.

In cases of re-instatement in
the original appointment, the
pay of that appointment is usually
sanctioned. This case is a
peculiar one.

The Standing order on this subject
is quoted in the margin. Censure
or admonition shall ~~not~~ ^{be}
entitle him to full pay after
re-instatement - ~~in the case of~~
~~re-instatement~~ -

"Should an officer be rein-
stated, he may at the dis-
cretion of his local govt. he will
be allowed full salary if he
shall have been fully ac-
quitted; or a portion of his
salary, if the result of his
enquiry shd be censure or
admonition - but where
censure or admonition is
awarded the duties done at
Ludhiana during suspension shd
be so adjusted as not to involve
any change."

Handwritten text, mostly illegible due to fading.

*Les Mises
Hon. W. B. ...*

*From aders
N^o 1133*

*He got to see us reason
to give more than the
best recommend - viz,
lack pay at 60 Ws
a month*

25/5/5

28 May/5

- 1 To the Board of Revenue for 5*
- 1 To the Accountant General*