M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 12.

(2) Date of repair 24.6.68

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1150 Press
B.P. No. Mis.

Dated 29. 5 1875 196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1130
1

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1875.

No. 50. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th April 1875, No. 917:—

Read the following letter from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Palmanair, 14th December 1874, No. 661.

I HAVE the honor to bring to the notice of the Board of Revenue the following circumstances in regard to the official conduct of Venkatarangam Naidu, the Sub-Magistrate and Deputy Tahsildar of the Narrainavanam Division, and to forward, for their perusal and return, the marginally-noted records.

1. Original English Memorandum of the Sub-Magistrate in Calendar Case No. 121 of 1873.
2. Original Calendar sent by the Sub-Magistrate to the Head Assistant Magistrate in Calendar Case No. 121 of 1873.
3. Copy of Proceedings of the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate in Criminal Appeal No. 23 of 1873.
4. Copy of Sessions Judge's Judgment in Calendar Case No. 107 of 1873.
5. Five original statements taken by the District Magistrate marked, respectively, A to E.
6. Translation of statement of second prisoner in Calendar Case No. 121 of 1873.

2. In Calendar Case No. 121 of 1873, on the file of the Sub-Magistrate of Narrainavanam, one Munisami accused (1) Latchminarasu and (2) Chinnigadu *alias* Munigadu of the theft of a sheep, and they were convicted of that offence by the Sub-Magistrate under Section 379 of the Indian Penal Code, and each sentenced to imprisonment for one month and a fine of five Rupees; in default of payment to further imprisonment for seven days.

3. Against this sentence the prisoners preferred an appeal to the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate, who quashed the sentence, and remarked that the Sub-Magistrate (who, at the time of the trial of the case, lived in the house of one Venkatarama Naidu of Nindra, a very wealthy and influencial man,) must have well known that the case was false and concocted at Venkatarama Naidu's instigation, and that the Sub-Magistrate had, as the appellants alleged, played into Venkatrama Naidu's hands, one of his laborers being the prosecutor in the case, and there being previous enmity between the prisoners and Venkatarama Naidu.

4. In subsequently reviewing the Sub-Magistrate's proceedings in this case of theft in connection with a charge of perjury against Chinnigadu *alias* Munigadu (one of the prisoners in the theft case), the Sessions Judge, having gone fully into all the circumstances of the case (*vide* enclosure No. 4), fully concurred in the remarks of the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate that the Sub-Magistrate, Venkatarangam Naidu, had throughout acted in collusion with Venkatarama Naidu, and further recommended, in the concluding part of his judgment, that I should inquire into the conduct of the Sub-Magistrate.

5. It will be seen from the Sessions Judge's judgment that the important part of the charge against the Sub-Magistrate was that he abstained from mentioning in the record of the trial held by him those facts which tended to reveal Venkatarama Naidu's connection with the charge of theft against the prisoners then before him, or from alluding to the circumstance that the complainant in the case was one of Venkatarama Naidu's own people, and that he neglected to record the real defence made by the prisoners which embodied those points.

6. I accordingly summoned before me the prisoners Lutchminarasu and Chinnigadu *alias* Munigadu, two Police officers who were present at the trial of the

case, and the Sub-Magistrate Venkatarangam Naidu, and in his presence took statements from them, which form the five enclosures A to E.

7. From a perusal of these documents and the Sub-Magistrate's calendar of the case (enclosure 2), it will be seen that, although Venkatarangam Naidu has not fully set out how Venkatarama Naidu was concerned in the case, yet he has not altogether omitted mention of his name or of the prisoners connecting him with the case. In his English note of the second prisoner's statement the Sub-Magistrate has briefly mentioned something about Venkatarama Naidu, but in the vernacular statement taken from the prisoner (translation of which is enclosed and marked No. 6) even this slight mention has been altogether omitted, and it is to be borne in mind that it is this statement which forms the real official record of the prisoner's defence.

8. The Sub-Magistrate explains that this omission might perhaps have been the result of inadvertence on the part of his clerk who wrote down the statement and who was new to the work. This explanation is, in my opinion, admissible only to a very limited extent; the statement was, of course, recorded in the presence of the Sub-Magistrate. It professes to set out *verbatim* the defence of the prisoner, and to have been subsequently read aloud to, and accepted by, him as an accurate rendering of his defence. In reality, however, it was just the reverse. The whole gist and purport of the defence was that the charge was a false one trumped up against him by a very wealthy man in whose house the Sub-Magistrate was then residing, and subsequent investigation has shown that that defence was quite true. But the whole of this was, I may say, carefully left out. It is perfectly incredible that if, as is asserted, the statement was read over to the prisoner, the Sub-Magistrate (supposing him to have been acting *bona fide* and in collusion with Venkatarama Naidu) did not notice at once that, as recorded, it did not by any means contain the prisoner's defence. In like manner it is incredible that the prisoner would have been content with so grossly incorrect a defence, and accepted it, as it alleged he did, without demur. It is manifest that either the Sub-Magistrate, in order to protect himself in case of some future inquiry, ingeniously inserted in his own note of the prisoner's statement a brief allusion to the mention that was being made of Venkatarama Naidu's name, &c., and so show that he acted honestly in the case, or that, with the most culpable carelessness, he allowed the gumastah to record only such portion of the prisoner's defence as he thought fit, and that even then the statement was not read over to the prisoner.

9. The Sub-Magistrate, in his statement before me (marked 5 E), admits that at the time of the trial in question he lived, and does still live, in a house belonging to Venkatarama Naidu. I consider that, in taking up and disposing of a case in which he was well aware that his landlord was the real complainant, the Sub-Magistrate's conduct is extremely suspicious and deserving of blame. I am of opinion that he was bound to have at once reported fully the whole facts of the case, as known to himself, to his superior, the Head Assistant Magistrate, and requested that the case might be called up, and transferred from his file to that of some other Sub-Magistrate.

1130
2

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1875.

10. It happens that about that time cattle-theft was rife in the district, and I had occasion to notice with disapproval many extremely inadequate sentences passed by the Subordinate Magistrates on parties convicted of that offence. To check the crime I therefore published a notice in the District Gazette desiring Sub-Magistrates of the lower grades to abstain from trying cases of sheep or cattle lifting, but to refer the cases to the Divisional Magistrates. The Sub-Magistrate Venkatarangam Naidu declares that he did report the occurrence of this charge of sheep-stealing to the Head Assistant Magistrate, who ordered him to dispose of the case himself; this, however, is merely a quibble on the part of the Sub-Magistrate. He may possibly have reported the occurrence of a petty case of sheep-stealing and asked instructions, but there can be no doubt that, if he had informed his divisonal officer how he was himself situated as being tenant of the real complainant, the order sent to him by the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate would have been at once to call it up for trial himself, or to transfer it to some other Sub-Magistrate for disposal.

11. I may here observe that it is now upwards of three months since the Sub-Magistrate's Office was removed from Narrainavanam to Puttur, but the Sub-Magistrate still continues to reside in Venkatarama Naidu's house at Narrainavanam, which is more than three miles from Puttur and from his office. He excuses himself by saying that he can get no house at Puttur, but I do not believe this. I have now ordered him at once to remove to Puttur and there reside permanently.

12. The Board will perceive from his statement given before me (marked 5 E) that, when I questioned him as to his living in Venkatarama Naidu's house, he at first asserted that he did so with the knowledge of his divisional officer and declared that he had made a special official report on the subject of his present residence at Narrainavanam to the Head Assistant Magistrate, specifying minutely the number and date of the arzi, but, on an after-thought, he subsequently voluntarily contradicted this statement, and said that he had not sent such a report in writing.

13. Venkatarama Naidu, who has been so often mentioned in this letter, is, though so wealthy a man, of very bad character. He has figured disadvantageously in both the Magisterial and Civil Courts. I have myself convicted him of criminal breach of trust in respect to his own sister's property and fined him Rupees 500, a sentence against which he made no appeal. He has filed false suits against parties with whom he was at enmity in divers Munsifs' Courts on documents which have finally been pronounced forgeries. He turned his own mother out of doors as soon as he came of age, and she had to file a suit against him for maintenance, which he contested vigorously for a length of time, and finally compromised when he found the case was going against him. He has long been unfavorably known to the Police, and some years ago was actually tried by a Deputy Magistrate on the charge of cutting off a man's ears. Altogether he is one of the last persons with whom the Sub-Magistrate should be on intimate terms, and I regard as discreditable to him his having continued to occupy his house needlessly.

14. While the present inquiry was going on in my office, it came to my knowledge that a peon attached to the Narrainavanam Sub-Magistrate's Office was

hanging about my cutcherry in a suspicious manner. He had discarded his peon's dress, and I had reason to suspect that he was being employed by the Sub-Magistrate as a spy, or secret agent, to pick up information as to what was going on in my office, and to tamper with the parties I had called up for examination. I called the Sub-Magistrate, therefore, into my Cutcherry and asked him had he brought one of his office peons with him. In reply, Venkatarangam Naidu repeatedly declared, in the most positive manner, that such was not the case; that he had not brought any peon with him, and did not know that one of his peons was at Palmanair, where my office then was; and if, by chance, any of his peons was there, he must have come on business of his own, for that he (the Sub-Magistrate) had nothing to say to his presence there.

15. I then sent for the peon, who was concealed in a private house; and, on asking why he had come to Palmanair, he at once said that he had come under the Sub-Magistrate's orders and with him; that he had no business at all at Palmanair; and that, before starting for my office, the Sub-Magistrate had ordered him to apply for a week's leave, which he then gave him, and to follow him to Palmanair, and that, beyond being so ordered, he had no reason for taking leave.

16. On reference to the Head Assistant Magistrate, I have found that the day the Sub-Magistrate left his office to attend mine this peon did put in an application in writing for seven days' leave, which the Sub-Magistrate granted, and at the same time appointed a substitute to perform the man's duties during his absence, and it is thus clear that the Sub-Magistrate wilfully and deliberately told me, in open cutcherry, a gross falsehood on a matter of fact on which he could not possibly be mistaken.

17. It is, of course, impossible for me hereafter to place any reliance upon any statement made by Venkatarangam Naidu. A Sub-Magistrate who will not hesitate to lie on a matter of comparatively trifling importance to the very face of the head of the district will, I need hardly point out to the Board, be equally ready to resort to falsehood to protect himself from blame under more serious circumstances, or to conceal facts that he is desirous should not come to light. In the course of this inquiry he first falsely declared that he had officially reported his residence in Venkatarama Naidu's house, giving, of his own accord, the number and date of the arzi, and then, doubtless reflecting that I might (as I certainly should have done) possibly call for that arzi in order to verify his statement, he withdrew his assertion and confessed that he made no such report (but the Board will see that that was a matter in which he could not have spoken as he did from inadvertence); and secondly, as I have shown, he has been guilty of wilful falsehood on the subject of his peon accompanying him from Narrainavanam to my office.

18. Under these circumstances, I confess I do not see how it is possible to retain Venkatarangam Naidu any longer in the responsible post of Sub-Magistrate. A man who has been detected in a flagrant untruth, spoken to me in open Cutcherry in the presence of my gumasta, duffadar, and peons, is not one whom I can hereafter treat with or feel respect for, while no confidence could be placed on his verbal or written assertions on official matters.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1875.

19. This is not the first time on which his conduct has formed the subject of official inquiry and comment, and I beg to refer the Board to their Proceedings, No. 193, dated 12th February 1873, in which Venkatarangam Naidu was reduced from the post of Tahsildar to that of Sub-Magistrate.

20. I am of opinion that he should now be dismissed from the public service. If, however, that appears to the Board to be too severe a punishment, I beg to recommend that he be removed from the post of Sub-Magistrate and suspended for one year, at the expiration of which period he might be employed in some subordinate capacity such as Revenue Inspector.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Original English Memorandum of Sub-Magistrate in Calendar Case No. 121 of 1873.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Original Calendar sent by Sub-Magistrate to Head Assistant Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Copy of Head Assistant's Proceedings in Criminal Appeal No. 23 of 1873.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copy of Sessions Judge's Judgment in Calendar Case No. 107 of 1873.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Five Original Statements taken by the District Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 6.—Translation of Statement of 2nd Prisoner in Calendar Case No. 121 of 1873.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. Two men, Latchminarasu and his brother-in-law Chinnigadu *alias* Munigadu, were accused by one Munisami of having, on the 5th August 1873, stolen a sheep belonging to him. They were tried on this charge by Venkatarangam Naidu, Sub-Magistrate of Narrainavanam. The evidence for the prosecution, if credible, no doubt fully warranted a conviction, but the accused alleged in defence that the complainant was a servant of one Venkatarama Naidu, and that the charge was a false one maliciously concocted by the latter, who is a very rich and influential person, and is described by the Collector as a man of bad repute. In support of their assertion as to the charge being false, they cited the Head Constable of Agarampet station, who deposed that on the day the theft is alleged to have been committed, both prisoners came to the Police station (three miles distant from their village, Nindra), and the second prisoner then lodged a complaint against Venkatarama Naidu, charging him with wrongful restraint and extortion of a document. Next morning, while still at Agarampet, they were, on the report of the Village Munsif of Nindra, arrested on the charge of theft.

3. It is to be observed that, though the prisoners' allegation as to the charge being concocted by Venkatarama Naidu is briefly alluded to in the notes of the trial recorded in English by the Sub-Magistrate as also in the calendar, no mention whatever is made of Venkatarama Naidu's name in the vernacular statement of the second prisoner. The Sub-Magistrate says the omission may be ascribed to the

inexperience of the clerk who took down the statement, an explanation that cannot be regarded as satisfactory since it was the duty of the Sub-Magistrate to see that the prisoner's statement was fully and accurately recorded as required by law.

4. The prisoners were convicted by the Sub-Magistrate. They then appealed to the Head Assistant Magistrate, alleging that the Sub-Magistrate had, in collusion with Venkatarama Naidu, whose house he then occupied, convicted them on a false charge. Owing to the incomplete way in which the prisoners' statements had been recorded at the trial before the Sub-Magistrate, the Head Assistant Magistrate found it necessary to take fresh statements from them. On these statements and on the evidence previously recorded he acquitted the prisoners, remarking, in regard to the Sub-Magistrate's conduct, that there was only too much ground for believing that the Sub-Magistrate had, as alleged by the appellants, played into Venkatarama Naidu's hands. He further observed that he had no doubt that the charge of theft was concocted at Venkatarama Naidu's instigation, and he thought the Sub-Magistrate must have known it.

5. The charge of wrongful restraint and extortion brought by Chinnigadu against Venkatarama Naidu, regarding which, as before mentioned, complaint was made to the Police, was then investigated by the Head Assistant Magistrate. The result was that he acquitted Venkatarama Naidu and committed the complainant Chinnigadu to the Sessions Court on a charge of perjury. Though the assessors found him guilty, the Judge, believing the charge to be groundless, without hesitation acquitted him. In his decision in this case the Sessions Judge refers to certain facts and circumstances both antecedent and subsequent to the charge of theft which serve to throw light on the nature and origin of that charge and the relative positions of the parties concerned.

6. It appears that Latchminarasu, first prisoner in the theft case, had been in the service of Venkatarama Naidu, who is described by the Judge as "apparently a very wealthy man, who in his own neighbourhood is a perfect rajah," and had incurred his displeasure. One day he was taken to Venkatarama Naidu's house, where, according to his statement, he would have been murdered but for the interference of the women of the house. He then preferred a complaint to the Head Assistant Magistrate, who, as the Judge thinks, injudiciously referred it to the Sub-Magistrate, a man of the same caste* as the accused Venkatarama Naidu, whose house was then occupied by the Sub-Magistrate. Though the written complaint was very full, and the complainant promised to give further details on examination, the Sub-Magistrate took a very short deposition from him, and soon after the matter was compromised by payment of Rupees 100 to the complainant Latchminarasu.

*This the Sub-Magistrate denies.

7. Shortly afterwards Chinnigadu, second prisoner in the theft case and brother-in-law of Latchminarasu, was taken to Venkatarama Naidu's house, where he was compelled by violence to sign a paper to the effect that Latchminarasu had taken a silver cup belonging to Venkatarama Naidu. Next day Chinnigadu, accompanied by Latchminarasu, went to the Police station and complained against Venkatarama Naidu, and on the following day they were arrested on the charge of theft, the result of which has been already stated.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1875.

8. Venkatarama Naidu's gumastah then brought against Chinnigadu a charge of criminal breach of trust, which the Head Assistant Magistrate dismissed as palpably false.

9. The Head Assistant Magistrate next investigated the complaint preferred by Chinnigadu against Venkatarama. The result was that Venkatarama Naidu was acquitted while the complainant Chinnigadu was committed to the Sessions Court on a charge of perjury, of which he was acquitted by the Court, the Judge remarking that he believed the prisoner had been the victim of a powerful and unscrupulous man, who had the authorities under his thumb, and who, with their aid, had done his best to ruin him, and that he had little doubt that the complaints made by Latchminarasu and Chinnigadu against Venkatarama Naidu were substantially true. The Judge also concurred in the Head Assistant Magistrate's view as regards the charge of theft and the Sub-Magistrate's conduct in connection with it, and directed that a copy of the calendar in the foregoing case be sent to the District Magistrate in view to his taking notice of the conduct of the Sub-Magistrate and of Venkatarama Naidu.

10. The Magistrate accordingly held an inquiry. He examined Latchminarasu and Chinnigadi, who reiterated the assertion that the charge of theft was a false one concocted by Venkatarama Naidu. They added that they had protested against their trial by the Sub-Magistrate, saying they did not expect justice from him, and asked him to refer the case to higher authority. Two Police Constables who had been present at the trial were also examined. They say the prisoners pleaded an *alibi*, and asserted that the charge was false and concocted by Venkatarama Naidu. One of them, Casavooloo Naidu, adds that the first prisoner told the Sub-Magistrate he did not expect justice from him. He also says that witnesses for the defence were not examined, and that he heard the prisoners complain that the Sub-Magistrate had not summoned and examined the witnesses they wanted.

11. In his statement before the District Magistrate the Sub-Magistrate admits that on their trial for theft the prisoners asserted that the charge was false and concocted by Venkatarama Naidu. He accounts for the omission of Venkatarama Naidu's name in the statement of the second prisoner by saying that it was possibly through inadvertence on the part of his gumastah. He does not remember whether the prisoners said they did not expect justice if he disposed of the case, but he says they spoke very loudly and angrily to him, and at first refused to make any statement in defence, alleging that they were sick. He says their witnesses were all summoned, but some of them did not appear, and the prisoners dispensed with their evidence. He did not ask the divisional officer to take the case off his file because he did not suspect that the case was got up maliciously by Venkatarama Naidu, but adverting to a circular he received while the case was pending, prohibiting the disposal by third-class Sub-Magistrates of cases of sheep-stealing, he applied for instructions to the Head Assistant Magistrate, who directed him to dispose of the case himself. He denies that he is of the same caste as Venkatarama Naidu, and says he occupied Venkatarama Naidu's house, as all his predecessors had done, because there was no other suitable house available. He points out that the Head Constable Casavooloo Naidu, when examined as a witness for

the prosecution in the theft case, stated there was no way of entering the prisoners' house except by the door, but he stated the contrary when examined by the District Magistrate.

12. Mr. Whiteside is of opinion that the Sub-Magistrate wilfully suppressed the prisoners' defence in the theft case, and that, in disposing of the "case in which he was well aware that his landlord was the real complainant, the Sub-Magistrate's conduct is extremely suspicious and deserving of blame." He considers that the Sub-Magistrate was bound to have reported the whole facts of the case, as known to himself, to the Head Assistant Magistrate and asked to have the case taken off his file. He describes Venkatarama Naidu as a man of bad repute, and remarks that he is one of the last persons with whom the Sub-Magistrate should be on intimate terms, and that his having continued to occupy Venkatarama Naidu's house needlessly is discreditable to him.

13. Mr. Whiteside further charges the Sub-Magistrate with having told a deliberate falsehood in denying that he knew anything about the presence of a certain peon at Palmanair. The peon says that, at the request of the Sub-Magistrate, he accompanied him to Palmanair. Mr. Whiteside also points out that this is not the first time the Sub-Magistrate's conduct has been brought to notice, and refers to Board's Proceedings, dated 12th February 1873, No. 193, reducing him from the post of Tahsildar to that of Sub-Magistrate. He is of opinion that Venkatarangam Naidu should be dismissed the service; but, if that be considered too severe a punishment, he suggests removal from the post of Sub-Magistrate and suspension for one year, after which he might be employed as a Revenue Inspector.

14. In his petition to the Board the Sub-Magistrate submits that the defence of the prisoners in the theft case was recorded with his own hand and prominently noticed in the calendar that the evidence in the case fully warranted a conviction, that he passed an honest decision, and had no motive to do otherwise, that the complainant in the case was one Munisami and there was nothing except the bare statement of the prisoners to show that Munisami was in any way connected with Venkatarama Naidu. He denies the charge of falsehood preferred against him by the District Magistrate. The view taken by the Head Assistant Magistrate and the Sessions Judge is that the charge of theft was a false one concocted by Venkatarama Naidu, and that, in convicting the prisoners, the Sub-Magistrate acted in collusion with him. The Board see no reason to question the correctness of this view of the matter; but, assuming that the Sub-Magistrate did not actively collude with Venkatarama Naidu, he cannot be acquitted of having acted most improperly. He must have known that the complainant was Venkatarama Naidu's man, and that the witnesses were under Venkatarama Naidu's influence. He should have at once brought the facts to the notice of the Head Assistant Magistrate, and stated that he was living in Venkatarama Naidu's house, and asked to have the case taken off his file. Although he did not keep Venkatarama Naidu's name entirely out of sight, he certainly did not put the defence in the clear light in which it should have been placed. No doubt the defendants must have pleaded strongly that it was all Venkatarama Naidu's doing, but this is not shown in the record as it should have been.

1130/5

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1875.

15. As to the Sub-Magistrate's living in Venkatarama Naidu's house, if it is true, as the Board presume it is, that his predecessors lived in the same house, he is not very much to blame, but he ought to have been doubly careful in his official dealings with Venkatarama Naidu.

16. The Board consider that the charge of having told a falsehood is not established. There is simply the peon's word against that of the Sub-Magistrate, and there was no very strong motive for him to employ the peon in the way suggested.

17. The Sub-Magistrate was only lately reduced* from the grade of Tahsildar to his present post. The Board are of opinion that the present case shows that he is unfit to be trusted with magisteral powers; they accordingly recommend that he be reduced to the post of Revenue Inspector.

* Board's Proceedings, dated 12th February 1873, No. 193.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

No. 51. ORDER THEREON, 7th May 1875, No. 698.

Miscellaneous.

THE recommendation of the Board is approved. Orders will be issued in the Judicial Department for striking off Venkatarangam Naidu's name from the list of Magistrates.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Officiating Chief Secretary.

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

Order in the Judicial Department 11th May 1875 No. 1130.

Venkatarangum Naidu's name will be removed from the list of Magistrates accordingly

/True Extract/

D. F. Carmichael

Offg Chief Secretary

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

To the Revenue Department
" Magistrate of North Arcot

1130/9

Govt. of {1875} Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated May 7th.

Rcd. *Encl.*

G.O., 7th May 1875, *No.* 698.

MAY.
Nos. 50-51.

Venkatarangum Naidu, Sub-Magistrate of Narrainavanam in North Arcot District.—Approving the recommendation of the Board of Revenue to reduce — to the post of Revenue Inspector for improper conduct in disposing of a case of theft, and requesting the issue of orders in the Judicial Department for striking off his name from the list of Magistrates.

№ 2024.

Revenue 1875 Department.

Proc: of Govt. Jud. Dept.

Dated 14: May 1875
Recd 25: "
Rect 28th "

№ 1130.

Ordering removal from the list of Magistrates the name of Venkatramyum Naidoo Sub Magistrate of Narainavanam N. Arcot

№ 1150

Recorded

29 May 75