M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 34

(2) Date of repair 8-8-67

(3) Initials of the Referencer 8/8.2.68.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	34.	Press Mis.
Dated	9-1-1875 196 .	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
9th January 1875.

No. 74. Read the following petition from K. KRISTNA ROW, late Revenue Inspector of Peapully Taluq, Kurnool District, to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, dated 2nd December 1874.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That he was unjustly reduced by the Collector from the Revenue Inspectorship to a Gumastah's place in the Ramalakota Taluq on the gross misrepresentation of the Deputy-Collector who was actuated by ill-feelings towards the memorialist, as will be explained presently.

That the Collector, who reduced the memorialist on the ground that he had written* false diaries for the months of March, April, and May last, without performing his duty properly, observes that the memorialist's statements were false in the following respects :—

* *Vide* Extract Collector's order.

(1.) That the memorialist was in attendance upon the Police without leave, engaged in the detection of a theft that had been committed in his house.

(2.) That the memorialist's statement, that he was attending the Sub-Magistrate's Court from 14th to 17th May in connection with a complaint made upon him by a person whose property was examined in view to the detection of stolen property, could not be true, as it appeared from the Sub-Magistrate's diary that the case which had been gone on to some extent on the 14th was adjourned for inquiry on the 21st idem.

(3.) That his statement in the diary, that he was engaged for sixteen days in hastening the collections in Peapully village and eight days in Gudipaud village, could not be true, as the Reddy and the Curnum of the villages deposed that there was no necessity for any interference in the matter.

(4.) That the statement in the diary, that he was engaged in giving information regarding salt madas in his range from 3rd to 8th March, could not be true, as there were not many of that kind in his range.

(5.) That the jummahbundy of the Peapully Taluq having been completed on 11th April, there was no necessity for the memorialist staying at the station on 12th.

(6.) That the memorialist did not attend to his duty from 28th April to 18th May on the false ground of illness.

That adverting to the first point, that a considerable part of memorialist's wife's property, given her by her father, a wealthy gentleman, having been stolen, the memorialist personally waited upon the Deputy-Collector with a request for leave to hunt up the offender, but that officer's reply was that as the detection of crime was a public matter, no separate leave was necessary; had the memorialist known that the Deputy-Collector would thus turn round and deny the grant of the leave, he would have submitted a written application for leave. He was, on the contrary, so confident of the sincerity of the permission that he had no hesitation in recording the circumstance in his diary.

This was not the first time that verbal leave was granted to the memorialist by the Deputy-Collector. For instance, when the Deputy-Collector asked the memorialist to go to Sreerungam with his family (1871) and the memorialist asked for leave, he was told that no leave was necessary. The fact will be found recorded in the diary of that year, in explanation of an absence of twelve days on that occasion. Then again, when there was marriage in the Deputy-Collector's house in 1872, and he asked the memorialist to go along with him to Bellary for six days, only verbal leave was granted by the Deputy-Collector, as may be seen from the diary in which the memorialist wrote it down. As oral leave had been granted on these and many other previous occasions, the memorialist was satisfied with a similar leave in the present unfortunate case.

2ndly.—That when the memorialist attended the Sub-Magistrate's Court on 14th May in obedience to a summons which had been issued to him, the case was gone on to some extent that day and adjourned indefinitely; it was not until the 17th idem that the memorialist was informed of the adjournment up to 21st. Recognizance having been taken that the memorialist should not leave the Court without permission, how could the memorialist leave the station when the date of the adjournment was not announced? If the Sub-Magistrate had been asked either by the Deputy-Collector or the Collector on this matter, this order would not have been passed. A diary being an abstract of the proceedings cannot give all the information in detail.

3rdly.—The ryots of the Peapully and Gudipaud villages have always been notorious for dilatoriness in the payment of Circar dues, and the village servants so notoriously apathetic in the matter that for the last two years the memorialist was specially asked to go to the villages and hurry the collections. The Tahsildar's order directing him to proceed to the village is enclosed. At the time that memorialist was deputed on this duty, there was an arrear of Rupees 4,000 to be collected in the two villages, the collections during the time he spent in the villages amounted to Rupees 2,000.

Enclosure B, dated 17th April 1873.

This the village servants admit, and though they concede that the memorialist was at them and with them every day, still they say that they made the collections themselves, and the Collector and Deputy believe it all to be true; that he did not take part in the collections is a contradiction in terms under the circumstances. Directly the memorialist turned his back upon the villages, there was again a paucity in the collections, and the memorialist is aware that the village servants were seriously punished for their dilatoriness. That the village servants never could do and never did their duty is abundantly clear from the necessity of the punishment which had to be inflicted upon them, and the special order that had to be given to the memorialist for expediting the collections in these villages. The fact is that they were coerced into making these statements by the Deputy-Collector, who felt his vantage safe with such timid and echoing chaps.

4thly.—That the memorialist, who was directed to collect information regarding salt mades in his range against the expected arrival of Mr. Thornhill, Member of the Board of Revenue, nominated to the special duty, was kept waiting by the Tahsildar until it was known that Mr. Thornhill was not coming in that direction. It was not, therefore, merely in the collection of information that the period intervening from 3rd to 8th March was spent. If the Tahsildar had been asked on the matter, or the memorialist's explanation taken, the order which now finds fault with him for having discharged his duty would not have been passed.

5thly.—That the Collector in observing that the jummahbundy of the Peapully Taluq was completed on the afternoon of 11th April, and that the Deputy-Collector left the station on the following morning, forgets that the Tahsildar was still at the station winding up work that day, and the memorialist was waiting upon him, examining the accounts and seeing that orders, etc., were passed upon all cases and puttas distributed.

The Tahsildar left the station on the night of the 12th, as may be seen from the diary, and memorialist went about on his duties early on the 13th; on this point also no explanation was taken either from the Tahsildar or the memorialist, nor was the Tahsildar's diary referred to.

Sixthly and lastly.—Adverting to the remark that the memorialist's excuse, that he had been laid up from 28th April to 18th May last is not true, and that he did not look as if he were sick when seen by the Deputy-Collector, the memorialist begs leave to observe that when the Deputy-Collector, who was only living a few yards from his house, was applied to for leave, he gave it verbally. He now denies this, and says that the memorialist did not look as if he were sick. But he does not say what he said to the memorialist at the time he saw him. If he had expressed his doubts then, the memorialist would have submitted a certificate from the nearest Surgeon. But he was not asked to do this.

That the memorialist will leave it to your Grace to consider whether there has been any moral turpitude or abuse of position by the memorialist. Memorialist was all along considered to have been faithful in the discharge of his duties, even by the very Deputy-Collector who now condemns him. This officer only two years ago recommended him for promotion, and on one occasion persuaded him to decline promotion when he was raised to a higher grade beyond the Deputy-Collector's division, with the assurance that a similar, if not better, promotion would be given in the Deputy-Collector's own division shortly.

Vide Extract from Diary enclosed.

That the memorialist would not have taken this much to heart if his diaries were, as a rule, obnoxious to such unpleasant remarks; on the contrary, his diaries were approved by the Deputy-Collector for the past eight years without remark, yet it is strange that the Deputy-Collector should take the diaries of three latest months in consecutive order, and review them in the manner he has done. And what has he found in the diaries? Nothing that can throw mire on his character; and what is stranger still is, that the memorialist's explanation and that of others whose evidence was pertinent to a right conclusion were not taken. The copies of records also which would strengthen the memorialist's case have also been most ungenerously, if not unreasonably, withheld from him. The memorialist, therefore, prays that your Grace will be pleased to call for all the records referred to in his memorial before disposing of it.

The chief cause of the memorialist's aim is, not that the memorialist was negligent or culpable in the discharge of his duties, but that he ventured to have searched by the Police the lodgings of certain people who were the relatives of a woman in the keeping of the Deputy-Collector, and who were strongly suspected of being implicated in the matter.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
9th January 1875.

That the memorialist finally prays that your Grace will be pleased to give a just, indulgent, and patient consideration to his prayer for restoration to his former appointment.

For which act of kindness, the memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

No. 75. ORDER THEREON, 9th January 1875, No. 34.

Miscellaneous.

PETITIONER is informed that his memorial has been received and will be forwarded to the Secretary of State.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Petition Department.

Exd. F. E. Bantleman.

Govt. of 1875 Order

REVENUE.

To

THE PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Dated January 8th.

Recd Recd

G. O., 9th January 1875, No. 81.

JANUARY

Nos. 74-75.

K. Kistna Row, late Revenue Inspector of Ramalakota, Kurnool District—Informing that his memorial praying for restoration to his former post will be forwarded to the Secretary of State.

3108
24 Encl.
2/12/74

To.

The Right Honorable the Governor
in Council
Fort Saint George

The humble Petition of Kulbur Kistna Row late Inspector of the Ramalakota

Respectfully Sheweth.

That he is so convinced of his innocence that he has ventured to draw out a Memorial to the Secretary of State of India which he begs to submit in duplicate and prays that the Government will be pleased to send it on with their kind recommendation.

For this act of kindness the Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

2d December 1874.

The True Copy

To

The Right Honorable the Secretary
of State for India

The humble memorial of Kubbur
Khristna Row late Revenue Inspector of
the Peapully Taluq Kurnool District

Respectfully sheweth

That he was unjustly reduced by the Collector from the Revenue Inspectorship to a Gumastah's place in the Pamallakota Taluq on the gross misrepresentation of the Deputy Collector who was actuated by ill feelings towards the Memorialist as will be explained presently.

That the Collector who reduced the Memorialist on the ground that he had written + false diaries for the months of March, April and May —

Vide extract Collectors order.

Ind No 2105 of 76

last without performing his duty properly observes that the Memorialists statements were false in the following respects

1. That the Memorialist was in attendance upon the Police without engaged in the detection of a theft that had been committed in his house

2. That the Memorialist's statement that he was attending the sub Magistrates Court from 14th to 17th May in connection with a complaint made upon him by a person whose property was examined in view to the detection of stolen property could not be true as it appeared from the sub Magestrate's diary that the case which had been gone on to some extent on the 14th was adjourned for enquiry on the 21st idem —

3 That his statement in the

3 Your diary that he was engaged for 16 days in hastening the collections in Peapully Village and eight days in Gudipan Village could not be true as the Reddy

an

and the Kurnum of the Villages deposed that there was no necessity for any interference in the matter —

4. That the statement in the diary that he was engaged in giving information regarding salt madas in his range from from 3d to 8th March could not be true as there were not many of that Kind in his range —

5. That the jamabundy of the Peapully Taluq having been completed on 11th April there was no necessity for the Memorialist staying at the station on 12th. —

6. That the Memorialist did not attend to his duty from 28th April to to 18th May on the false ground of illness.

That ~~adverting~~ adverting to the first point that a considerable part of memorialist's wife's property given her by her father a wealthy gentleman having been stolen the Memorialist personally waited upon the Deputy Collector

Collector with a request for leave to hunt up the offender but that officers reply was that as the detection of crime was of a public matter no ~~of~~ separate leave was necessary had the Memorialist known that the Deputy Collector would ~~turn round~~ thus turn round and deny the grant of the leave he woul have submitted a written application for leave. He was on the contrary so confident of the sincerity of the permission that he had no hesitation in regarding the circumstance in hi diary—

This was not the first time that verbal leave was granted to the memorialist by the Deputy Collector. For instance when the Deputy Collector asked the memorialist to go to Sreerungam with his family 1871 an the Memorialist asked for leave he was told that no leave was necessary. The fact wil be found recorded in the diary of that year in explanation of an absence of 12 days on that occasion. Then again when there was marria in the Deputy Collector's house in 1872 and he asked the memorialist to go along with him to Bellary for six days only verbal leave was granted by the Deputy Collector as may be seen from the diary in which the memorialist wrote it down. As oral leave had been granted on these and many other previous occasions the Memorialist was satisfied with a similar leave in the present unfortunate case.

Secondly. That when the memorialist attended the Sub Magistrates Court on 14th May in obedience to a summons which had been issued to him the Case was gone on to some extent that day and adjourned indefinitely it was not until the 17th idem that the Memorialist was informed of the adjournment up to 21st Recognizance having been taken that the Memorialist should not leave the Court without permission how could the memorialist leave the station when the date of the adjournment was not announced? If the submagistrate had been asked either by the Deputy Collector or the Collector on this matter this order would not have been passed. A diary being an abstract of the proceedings cannot give all the information in detail.

Thirdly

Thirdly. The ryots of the Peapully and Gudipaud villages have always been notorious for dilatoriness in the payment of Circar dues and the Village servants so notoriously apathetic in the matter that for the last two years the Memorialist was specially asked to go to the villages and hurry the collections. The Thasildar's order directing him to proceed to the Village is enclosed. At the time that Memorialist was deputed on this duty there was an arrear of Rs 4000 to be collected in the two villages the collections during the time he spent in the villages amounted to Rs 2500

M. B.
date
17th April
1873.

This the village servants admit and though they concede that the Memorialist was at them and with them every day still they say that they made the collections by themselves and the Collector and deputy believe it all to be true that he ~~h~~ did not take part in the collections is a contradiction in terms under the circumstances. Directly the Memorialist turned his back upon the villages there was again a paucity in the collections and the Memorialist is aware that the village servants were seriously punished for their dilatoriness. That the village

Copy

servents never could do and never did their duty is abundantly clear from the necessity of the punishment which had to be inflicted upon them and the special order that had to be given to the Memorialist for expediting the collections in these villages. The fact is that they were coerced into making these statements by the Deputy Collector who felt his vantage safe with such timid and echoing chaps.—

Fourthly. That the Memorialist who was directed to collect information regarding salt Madas in his range against the expected arrival of Mr Thornhill Member of Board of Revenue nominated to the special duty was kept waiting by the Thasildar until it was known that Mr Thornhill was not coming in that direction. It was not therefore merely in the (3) [illegible] collection of information that the period intervening from 3rd to 8th March was spent. If the Thasildar had been asked on the matter

matter or the Memorialists explanation cane the order which now find fault with him for having discharged his duty would not have been passed. –

Fifthly. – That the Collector in observing that the jemabundy of the Peapully Taluq was completed on the afternoon of 11th April and that the Deputy Collector left the station on the following morning forgets that the Thasildar was still at the station winding up work that day and the Memorialist was waiting upon him examining the accounts and seeing that orders &c were passed upon all cases and puttahs distributed.

The Thasildar left the station on the night of the 12th as may be seen from the diary and Memorialist went about on his duties early on the 13th on this point also no explanation was taken either from the Thasildar or the Memorialist nor was the Thasildars diary referred to. –

Copy

Sixthly and lastly adverting to the remark that the Memorialists excuse that he had been laid up from 28th April to 18th May last is not true and that he did not look looked as if he were sick when seen by the Deputy Collector the Memorialist begs leave to observe that when the Dep. [illegible] Collector who was only living a b[illegible] on his house was applied to for [illegible] he gave it verbally. He now denies this and says that the Memorialist did not look as if he were sick. But he does not say what he said to the Memorialist at the time he saw him. If he had expressed his ~~the~~ doubts then the Memorialist would have submitted a Certificate from the nearest surgeon But he was not asked to do this.

That the Memorialist will leave it to your grace to consider wether there has been any Moral turpitude or abuse of position by the Memorialist Memorialist was all along considered to have been faithful in the discharge of his duties even by the very Deputy Collector

[illegible] who now condemns him. This officer only 2 years ago recommended him for promotion and on one occasion persuaded him to decline

Vide extract from diary enclosed

decline promotion when he was raised to a higher grade beyond the Deputy Collector's Division with the assurance that a similar if not better promotion would be given in the Deputy Collector's own Division shortly.—

That the Memorialist would not have taken this much to heart if his diaries were as a rule obnoxious to such unpleasant remarks on the contrary his diaries were approved by the Deputy Collector for the past 8 years without remark yet it is strange that the Deputy Collector should take the diaries of 5 latest months in consecutive order and review them in the manner he has done. And what, has he found in the diaries? nothing that Can throw mire on his character and what is stranger still is that the Memorialist's explanation and that of others whose evidence was pertinent to a right conclusion were not taken. The copies of records also which would strengthen the Memorialist's Case have also been most ungenerously if not unreasonably withheld from him. The Memorialist therefore prays that your grace will be pleased to call for all the records referred to in his memorial before disposing of it not that the Memorialist was negligent or culpabable in the discharge of his duties but that he ventured to have searched by the police the lodgings of certain people who were the relatives of a woman in the keeping of the Deputy Collector and who were strongly suspected of being implicated in the matter:—

That the Memorialist finally prays that your grace will be pleased to give a just indulgent and patient consideration to his prayer for restoration to his former appointment.

For which act of kindness the Memorialist as in duty bound shall ever pray.—

True Copy

2nd December 1874.

Ind. 2105/72.
23
Rev 4346/74.

No. 4346
Revenue 1874 Departt.
Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 3105 of 1874.

From K. Kristna Rao

Occupation. late Revenue Inspector of

Village.
Talook. Ramalkota
District. Kurnool

Dated 2d Dec: 1874
Received 3d
Do 34. 9 January 1875 Enclosures. 24

ABSTRACT.

Submits, for transmission, a Memorial to the Secretary of State for India praying for restoration to his former post

With Order

No. 34

Petitioner is informed that his Memorial has been received, and will be forwarded to the Secretary of State.

1 To the Petitioner. Despd 11 Jany

9th January 1875