

(1) Number of pages 26
(2) Date of repair 28-11-72
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1340
B.P. No. _____

Press
Mis. _____

Dated 5-4-1877 197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 131. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd March 1877, Miscellaneous No. 4,300 :—

Read the following letter from W. McQUHAE, Esq., Collector of Madura, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Dindigul, 7th March 1877.

I HAVE the honor to submit the explanation procured from Mr. Nicholson as directed in paragraph 3 of G.O., dated 9th February 1877, No. 572, Revenue Department.

2. The petitioner did not complain to me. I did not advise Mr. Nicholson to compromise the matter. Mr. Nicholson did not disregard any suggestion of mine. These are answers to the questions put; but as Government appear to have been, in some degree, misled by the artful mendacity of the petitioner, a few words may perhaps be added with advantage. I find on reference to the only person who spoke to me on this subject that his communication was confidential, and was merely what he would have said to Mr. Nicholson had he been within reach. I had no communication with Mr. Nicholson till after he had settled Venkata Row's case, and the advice to "take no further notice of the matter but to return to his duty at Ramnad" was, I believe, given by a responsible and independent pleader whom Venkata Row wished to employ to prepare the petition to Government.

3. I know nothing of the petitioner, but in consequence of this complaint I have looked into the Municipal records, and they contain abundant evidence that Venkata Row is a man of doubtful character and capable of the most unparalleled insolence. His connection with Municipality ended in a criminal conviction which was afterwards quashed on a legal technicality, leaving the facts untouched.

4. The description of the petitioner, as agent and vakil of the Rani of the Shivagunga Zemindari, is calculated, I think, to mislead. He has held a Vakalat for Shivagunga rent suits in the Revenue Courts, but this does not imply any position of special confidence and responsibility. He claims to have done business also for Ramnad, and if so, he might equally style himself the agent and vakil of the Court of Wards. In these rent suits before travelling Courts, we can only employ the people who follow such Courts about the country.

5. I am not asked for any opinion regarding the complaint itself, but these observations seem called for by the terms of the order of Government upon it.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From F. A. NICHOLSON, Esq., Head Assistant Collector, to W. McQUHAE, Esq., Collector of Madura, dated Ramnad, 5th March 1877.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the petition addressed by Venkata Row to Government, and forwarded to me for explanation. I will endeavour to be as brief as possible, merely asking that if I leave any allegation unanswered I may not be understood to admit it.

2. The petitioner expresses himself as confident that I will, in the main, admit the facts. On the contrary, the allegations are either gross misrepresentations or absolute falsehoods. The petitioner is a mere unpassed private vakil, allowed to appear in my Court on sufferance, and the real foundation of his complaint he has studiously kept out of sight, or rather has grossly misrepresented. His real grievance is that I have been compelled to suspend him from practice as a vakil in my Court for three months. I presume I need not explain at length the ground for suspending him, since that is not what he has complained about: suffice it to say that on the 30th December,

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th April 1877.*

at Kamoody, he so misconducted a case that, as I had often before warned him, I was obliged to suspend him, and that I did so at the actual hearing of the suit and in his presence, and refused to cancel it in spite of his entreaties. The order was merely a verbal one, and I may have used some hasty and intemperate language, intimating that his mode of conducting the case was excessively foolish, if, indeed, it was not purposely adopted to mislead the Court. But I most distinctly deny that I called him a "damned soor." His statement that I thus abused him, and that in consequence he withdrew to seek redress, and that I suspended him on hearing that he had gone to complain is a gross falsehood. He seeks revenge for his suspension, not redress for any hasty language I may have used in sentencing him. On the 8th January he put in an application for leave for six months, saying that he felt the suspension a great disgrace, and wished to go to Benares. This application I send up as it really forms the only record of what has occurred in the matter of Venkata Row's suspension, and explains my two endorsements. I endorsed on it "sanctioned" and added verbally that he was not to understand that this cancelled the suspension. He then said "I have mentioned to Mr. Fischer that your Honor abused me at Kamoody, and he has put the matter officially into Mr. Scott's hands, if your Honor gets a letter from those gentlemen to effect a 'raze', I hope you will give a favorable 'order.' This was as much as telling me with all "humility" that if I did not cancel the suspension, he would make the most of any hasty language into which I might have been drawn. Such gross impertinence provoked me extremely, and would have justified the *harsh* language. But I entirely deny the abusive language attributed to me, and any abuse whatever of Brahmans in general or of the Rani. I said "I won't cancel your suspension, as a gentleman I cannot (meaning that I would not through fear of being punished do what I thought wrong); you may appeal to Government or the District Magistrate, but at present you must leave my cutcherry." He then became very violent and commenced speaking and acting in the most excited way, so that at last I was constrained to call up the orderly and threaten to use force if he did not take himself off. Upon this he left, and I at once wrote on the petition what had occurred, and instead of granting him leave finally dismissed him. Two days later, feeling that the vakil's violence and insolence, extreme as it was, might possibly be due to irritation at his suspension, and that he was off his head at the time, I thought it sufficient to leave the original suspension intact, revoked the order of dismissal, and granted him his leave. Venkata Row has carefully abstained from setting out my "recorded reasons," though he duly obtained a copy.

3. In conclusion, I shall merely add that Venkata Row has given a very exaggerated account of his own respectability, and that, when suspending him as vakil, I expressly exempted cases in which he had already been retained, or in which he appeared as agent for the Rani.

4. The character of the petitioner has already been before Government in connection with the Madura Municipality (G.O., No. 140, of 2nd February 1869, Public Department, and No. 1,044 of 27th July 1869).

5. So much of the main charges: Venkata Row then mentions three other instances of misbehaviour towards himself. In the first case, I may have somewhat ridiculed his plea to my jurisdiction, as I believed the plea to be wholly untenable: I have not the slightest recollection of calling "fool."

6. The second allegation is pure falsehood, for I heard Venkata Row at length and duly docketed my rejection of the complaint upon it, and a few days after, on receiving an amended complaint, I read it and stated that it did not alter the case. No appeal has yet been made against my rejection of the complaint.

7. The third allegation is also untrue, though a peon is always stationed near a witness to keep him in his place, and remove him when his examination is over.

8. I deem it unnecessary to notice the instances of alleged misbehaviour to others since they have not come forward to complain, and Venkata Row does not pretend to speak from his personal knowledge.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. McQUHAE,
Collector.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th April 1877.*

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to the order quoted.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Sub-Secretary.

No. 132.

ORDER THEREON, 5th April 1877, No. 1,340.

Miscellaneous.

The Government are satisfied that the complaint is grossly exaggerated; that the complainant's antecedents discredit his description of his own conduct and demeanour; and that Mr. Nicholson had much reason for his action.

2. The Government trust, however, that Mr. Nicholson will not allow himself to be hurried into hasty expressions by any similar provocation, but will maintain the dignity of his Court without undue warmth of language.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 1892

$$\begin{array}{r} 1340 \\ \hline 3 \end{array}$$

From

Progr. of the B² of Rev.

Dated

22nd March

1877

FOR ORDERS.

Loose cord with re-
marks that the Gov. Trust
that Mr. N. will avoid main-
tain his temperate and moderate
proposition on crowd to
the effect

no. 1. 4085-4-27

did not disregard any suggestion of

The complainant's
antecedents discredit
his description of his
own conduct & disavow
that Mr. H. ^{had} ~~intended~~
much violence for his
actions. adding that
the Gov. met ^{him} ~~the~~ with
whom he himself
was hurried into
hasty expressions
of any ^{unpleasant} ~~unpleasant~~ manner
but will maintain

against any suggestion of
mine

Submitting explanation
from Mr. Nicholson by
the order of the Board
FOR ORDERS.

131-32

C. 24 March 77. B. 3-477 -

1340
5

Revenue Department

Miscellaneous No. 4300

There seems to
be a very slight
substantiation of truth
in his generally
false accounts from
Mr. D. owing to haste
conveyed to his
to him.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 22^d March 77

Read the following

From
Mr. M. D. Esquire

Collector of Madras

To
J. E. Stokes Esquire

Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir

I have the honor to submit
the explanation procured from Mr. Nicholson
as directed in para 3 of G.O. dated 7th
February 1877 No 72 R.D.

2 The petitioner did not complain
to me. I did not advise Mr. Nicholson
to compromise the matter - Mr. Nicholson
did not disregard any suggestion of
mine

mine. These are answers to the questions put, but as Government appear to have been in some degree misled by the artful mendacity of the petition a few words may perhaps be added with advantage. I find on reference to the only person who spoke to me on this subject that his communication was confidential and was merely what he would have said to Mr. Nicholson had he been within reach. I had no communication with Mr. Nicholson till after he had settled Venkata Rao's case and the advice to "take no further notice of the matter but to return to his duty at Ramnad" was, I believe, given by a responsible & independent pleader

1340

V

pleader whom Venkata Rao wished to employ to prepare the petition to Government.

3 I know nothing of the Petitioner, but in consequence of this complaint I have looked into the Municipal records and they contain abundant evidence that Venkata Rao is a man of doubtful character and capable of the most unparalleled insolence. His connection with the municipality ended in a criminal conviction which was afterwards quashed on a legal technicality leaving the facts untouched.

4 The description of the petitioner as agent and Vakil of the Rao of the Shevayungah

Shevagaingal & minority is calculated
I think to mislead. He has held
a Vakalat for Shevagaingal rent suits
in the Revenue Courts but this does
not imply any position of special
Confidence and responsibility. He
claims to have done business also
for Ramnad and if so he might
equally style himself the agent and
Vakil of the Court of Wards. In these
rent suits before travelling courts we
can only employ the people who
follow such courts about the country.

5 I am not asked for any
opinion regarding the complaint
itself, but these observations seem
called for by the terms of the order
of

of Government upon it. 1340

Madura Colls Office } I have to
Camp Dindigul } Sd/- W. McDuffie
7th March 1877 } Collector

From
J. A. Nicholson Esquire
Head Assistant Collector

To
W. McDuffie Esquire
Collector of Madura

Sir

I have the honor to acknow-
ledge the receipt of the petition addressed
by Venkata Rao to Government and
forwarded to me for explanation.
I will endeavour to be as brief as
possible merely asking that if I leave
any allegation unanswered I may not
be understood to admit it.

2 The Petitioner expresses himself
as confident that I will in the main
admit

admit the facts. On the contrary the
allegations are either gross misrepresent-
-ations or absolute falsehoods. The
petitioner is a mere unpassed private
Vakil, allowed to appear in my court
on sufferance and the real foundation
of his complaint he has studiously
kept out of right or rather has grossly
misrepresented. His real grievance
is that I have been compelled to
suspend him from practice as a
Vakil in my Court for three months.
I presume I need not explain at
length the ground for suspending
him, since that is not what he
has complained about. suffice it to
say

say that on the 30th December at
Hamoody he so misconducted a case
that, as I had often before warned him,
I was obliged to suspend him: and
that I did so at the actual hearing of
the suit and in his presence, & refused
to cancel it in spite of his entreaties.
The order was merely a verbal one and
I may have used some hasty and
intemperate language intimating that
his mode of conducting the suits was
excessively foolish, if indeed it was
not purposely adopted to mislead
the Court. But I most distinctly
deny that I called him a "damned
soor". His statement that I thus
abused him, and that in consequence
he withdrew to seek redress, and that
I

I suspended him on hearing that
he had gone to complain is a gross
falsehood. He seeks revenge for his
suspension not redress for any
hasty language I may have used
in sentencing him - On the 8th January
he put in an application for leave
for 6 months saying that he felt the
suspension a great disgrace and wished
to go to Benares. This application
I send up as it really forms the
only record of what has occurred
in the matter of Venkata Rao's
suspension and explains my two
endorsements - I endorsed on it
"sanctioned" and added verbally that
he

121
1340
he wanted to understand that this
cancelled the suspension - He then
said "I have mentioned to Mr. Fischer
that your honor abused me at Kamrody
and he has put the matter officially
into Mr. Scott's hands: if your honor
gets a letter from those gentlemen to
effect a "rajee" I hope you will give
a favourable "order". This was as much
as telling me with all "humility" that
if I did not cancel the suspension
he would make the most of any hasty
language into which I might have
been drawn. Such gross impertinence
provoked me extremely and would have
justified the harshest language.
But I entirely deny the abusive language
attributed to me and any abuse whatever
of

of Brahmins in general or of the Rance.
I said "I want cancel your suspension
as a gentleman I cannot (meaning
that I would not through fear of
being punished do what I thought
wrong). You may appeal to Government
or the District Magistrate, but at
present you must leave my cutcherry.
He then became very violent and
commenced speaking and acting in
the most excited way so that at last
I was constrained to call up the
orderly and threaten to use force if
he did not take himself off. Upon
this he left and I at once wrote on
the petition what had occurred
and instead of granting him leave
finally

6 $\frac{1340}{10}$
finally dismissed him. Two days later
feeling that the Vakil's violence and
insolence extreme as it was, might
possibly be due to irritation at his
suspension and that he was off his
head at the time, I thought it suffi-
-cient to leave the original suspension
intact revoked the order of dismissal
and granted him his leave Venkata
Row has carefully abstained from
setting out my "recorded reasons" though
he duly obtained a copy.

3 In conclusion I shall merely
add that Venkata Row has given a
very exaggerated account of his own
respectability and that when suspending
him as a Vakil I expressly exempted
cases

cases in which he had already been retained or in which he appeared as agent for the Rance.

4 The Character of the Petitioner has already been before Government in connection with the Madras Municipality (G.O. No. 140 of 2^d February 1869 Public Department and No. 1044 of 27th July 1869).

5 So much of the main charges. Venkata Rao then mentions three other instances of misbehaviour towards himself. In the first case I may have somewhat ridiculed his plea to my jurisdiction as I believed the plea to be wholly untenable: I have not the slightest recollection of calling "fool".

The

1360
6 The second allegation is pure falsehood for I heard Venkata Rao at length and duly docketed my rejection of the complaint upon it, and a few days after on receiving an amended complaint I read it and stated that it did not alter the case. No appeal has yet been made against my rejection of the complaint.

7 The 3^d allegation is also untrue, though a peon is always stationed near a witness to keep him in his place and remove him when his examination is over.

8 I deem it unnecessary to notice the instances of alleged misbehaviour to others since they have not come forward to complain and
Venkata

Neukata Rao does not pretend to speak
from his personal knowledge

Rammad } I have &c
5th March 1877 } By J. S. Nicholson
Ad Asst Collector

(True copy)

By W. McQuhae
Collector

Submitted to Government with
reference to the order quoted.

(True Copies & Extracts)

G. L. L. L.
Sub Secretary

To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with 2 enclosures to be returned

[Signature]

1340
12

1340
13.

Memorandum 1874
No 1892

Proceedings of the

Board of Museum

and 22d March 1874

1874
1874
1874

Submitting to you

letter from the Boston

of the American Academy

of the American Academy

from the American Academy

as directed in the

of the American Academy

February 1874 No 592188

1874 No 592188

1874 No 592188

Enclosure .!

In letter

From

The collector of
Madura

To

The Secretary to the
Board of Land
Madura

Dated 7th March 1877

P.O. 4-77 No. 1340.

Petition from R.
Venkata Rao to govern-
ment

Sub No. 2506/77

2

R.N. 1892 of 1877