

(1) Number of pages 12 24
 (2) Date of repair 23-1-1973
 (3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1567

Press
Mis.

Dated

26-4-1877

187

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 653. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st April 1877, No. 1,833:—

Read the following letter from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 4th April 1877, No. 227.

THE Government have, in their Proceedings, dated 5th October last, No. 2,038, remarked, on information furnished by the Inspector-General of Police, that my complaint regarding the failure of the Police to check and discover the illicit sale of toddy in the Chittoor Taluq was undeserved.

2. The Inspector-General of Police and the District Superintendent, Captain Cox, in their letters embodied in the abovementioned Proceedings, assert that in fifteen out of the twenty-eight cases of unlicensed shops mentioned by me the local Police gave the Taluq Magistrate the required information. On this point I have made the most careful inquiry, and I shall now endeavour to convince the Board and Government that the Police took no action whatever in the matter prior to my becoming aware of the illicit sales through the Taluq Magistrate of Chittoor.

3. I enclose copies of my letters to the Superintendent of Police, dated 11th June 1875 and 10th May 1876, in each of which, as the Board will observe, I earnestly requested assistance in the detection of the illicit trade in toddy. I received no reply to either of those letters from Captain Cox, and not a single case of illicit sale of toddy was reported to me by the Police.

4. Finding at last that I could not obtain the assistance I had asked for, I issued to the late Chittoor Tahsildar, Vencatasubbiah, an order, dated 12th June 1876, No. 256, directing him to take immediate steps in the matter and, if possible, bring the offenders to justice. He set to work on the 13th idem and succeeded in detecting various cases on the dates entered in the sixth column of the statement prepared and submitted by him, and which accompanies this report.

5. This statement also exhibits the dates on which the Superintendent of Police in his second list embodied in the Government Proceedings under reply asserts that information was given by the Police to the Taluq Magistrate, also the dates actually entered by the local Police on the occurrence reports, and those on which the reports were actually received by the Taluq Magistrate. There are divers discrepancies between the dates given by the Superintendent of Police and those entered by the Police on the occurrence reports, which, however, it is not for me now to discuss. I would only here draw attention to the dates given in the columns 4 to 6 of the statement. It is clear from those figures that in cases Nos. 1, 10, 13, and 15 the detection by the taluq officials was prior to the alleged discovery by the Police according to their own showing in their occurrence reports, and that in nearly all of the remaining cases the occurrence reports reached the Taluq Magistrate several days subsequent to the detection of the frauds by him.

6. The Board will thus perceive that the Police authorities neglected a most important duty for a considerable length of time, although their attention had more than once been specially directed to it by me; and that when at last they came to know that the local Magistrate had actually succeeded in tracing out several important cases of fraud, they, anticipating unpleasant results to themselves, hastily prepared and sent in reports setting forth the very facts which the Taluq Magistrate acting under my orders had discovered. About their assistance. If any such occurrence reports had been sent in prior to the inquiry of the Taluq Magistrate, I could not, of course, deny that the Police had exercised the vigilance that I had more than once requested. But it is an undeniable fact that nothing was done as regards the detection of the illicit shops until the Police found that I was taking action myself, and then, when the matter was no longer in their hands, the occurrence reports were sent in rapidly. There was more than a year's interval between the date of my first letter to Captain Cox asking for inquiry as to the illicit shops and the date of the first report of detection sent in by the Police; on the other hand, only four days intervened between the Taluq Magistrate commencing to inquire into the matter and the submission of that first report by the Police, and they did not report the existence of any one shop that the Taluq Magistrate did not discover.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
26th April 1877.*

7. I submit that this shows clearly that my remark that I had not received the assistance at the hands of the Police that I had requested was well founded. I venture to hope that, under these circumstances, the Government will no longer regard my complaint as undeserved.

8. In paragraph 4 of his letter Captain Cox observes that it is impossible for the Police to detect every case of illicit sales of toddy in towns and other such places. I readily admit this, but it is a fact that every one of the illicit shops to which reference is now being made was held in a house in a large village, and had been so held openly and constantly without licenses for months prior to its discovery by the Taluq Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to Captain H. W. H. COX, Superintendent of Police, North Arcot, dated Punganoor, 11th June 1875, No. 655.

From this office letters noted in the margin, and from the list of toddy shops furnished to you with the first of the letters above quoted, you

Letter No. 878, dated 7th October 1874.
" dated 28th January 1875, No. 74.

will see that the number of toddy-shops sanctioned by me for the Chittoor Taluq is 57, and

that I requested that a strict and careful supervision may be exercised by your department, lest the said number may be fraudulently exceeded by the renters.

2. Chittoor Golla Guruvappa Naidu, the future toddy renter of that taluq, has now filed before me a list of 103 toddy-shops, in all of which he alleges that toddy is now being vended in the Chittoor Taluq. A copy of that list is herewith forwarded.

3. I have the honor to request, therefore, that you will be so good as to ascertain at once, through the several station officers, the exact number of toddy-shops now existing in the Chittoor Taluq, and furnish me with a statement showing the names of the villages in which the shops are held, so that I may, if necessary, prosecute the renters for fraudulently opening shops. As it would be next to impossible to find out the exact state of things after the close of this month, when the farm passes away from the late renters to new hands, I particularly request that no time may be lost in pushing on the inquiry as vigorously as you can.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to Captain H. W. H. COX, Superintendent of Police, North Arcot, dated Palmanair, 10th May 1876, No. 451.

In my letter of the 11th June 1875, No. 655, I brought to your notice that there was reason to believe that a large number of unlicensed toddy-shops were then in existence, and requested that you would ascertain at once, through the several station officers, the exact number of such shops and furnish me with a list thereof to enable me, if necessary, to prosecute the renters for fraudulently opening the shops. I particularly requested that as it would be next to impossible to find out the exact state of things after the close of this month, when the farm would pass away from the late renters to new hands, no time might be lost in pushing on the inquiry as vigorously as possible. No reply having been received to my letter (and which still remains unanswered), and as time was precious, I determined to depute Vencatasubbiah, then Tahsildar of Chittoor, to obtain for me the information I had in vain sought from the Police. He speedily succeeded in discovering, without any assistance from the Police, that no less than 28 unlicensed shops had been fraudulently opened in the taluq of Chittoor alone by the sub-renter Arnachella Mudali, and liquor sold therein for a length of time. Arnachella Mudali was then prosecuted before me by Vencatasubbiah, and I convicted and fined him in the sum of 2,000 Rupees on that charge. He paid the fine and never appealed against my sentence.

2. I have no doubt that you issued the necessary orders on receipt of my letter, and I am sure if the information called for had been furnished to you by the several local Police officers in the taluq, they would at once have communicated it to me. This leads me strongly to suspect that

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
26th April 1877.*

of the several unlicensed toddy-shops by Arnachella Mudali, for if they were zealously doing their duty, the briefest inquiry would have resulted in the discovery that the 28 shops I have mentioned above were not protected by any license.

3. This circumstance, coupled with the fact that it was the arrack renters and not the Police who discovered the two instances of illicit distillation of arrack successfully prosecuted by them before me, lead me to believe that the Police are not exerting themselves as they ought to check irregularities on the part of the toddy renters; and I request that you will now warn the Police Inspector who, from his lengthened residence in the Chittoor Taluq, ought by this time to be thoroughly conversant with its affairs, that in future severe notice will be taken of failure on his part to detect and bring to light frauds of this description.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

COMPARATIVE statement showing the dates on which the existence of unlicensed Toddy-shops in the Chittoor Taluq was discovered by the Police and by the Taluq Magistrate.

Number.	Locality.	DATES				Remarks.
		On which the Police say they reported to the Magistrate.	On the Occurrence Reports.	Of receipt by the Taluq Magistrate.	On which Taluq Officials discovered the existence of illicit Shops.	
1	Sannasipallay	18-6-75	19-6-75	24-6-75	17-6-75	The order of the Collector of the 12th June 1875, No. 256, directing the checking of the shops, was received on the 15th idem. At once on the very same day the whole staff of the taluq officials set out to work so as to have all shops suddenly and simultaneously examined. The taluq, including the Bangari, Thoomba, Goodipati, and Naragantipolliems, were said to have 103 shops which had to be inspected. It will be apparent from this statement that the Police followed the taluq officials in their track of detecting the fraudulently kept up shops. Their first report is dated 19th June 1876, whereas they say that their first information to the Magistrate of these illicit shops was given on the 18th idem. This is certainly impossible.
2	Kalanagunta	18-6-75	19-6-75	28-6-75	23-6-75	
3	Rangumpett	19-6-75	19-6-75	28-6-75	23-6-75	
4	Kanipakum	25-6-75	26-6-75	1-7-75	27-6-75	
5	Aroogonda	24-6-75	24-6-75	28-6-75	25-6-75	
6	Gajulapallay	24-6-75	24-6-75	30-6-75	25-6-75	
7	Hooppam	25-6-75	25-6-75	7-7-75	5-7-75	
8	Nallangadu	25-6-75	25-6-75	7-7-75	5-7-75	
9	Puthoor	21-6-75	21-6-75	24-6-75	27-6-75	
10	Thavanampallay	28-6-75	29-6-75	30-6-75	26-6-75	
11	Varigapallay	29-6-75	29-6-75	30-6-75	Date omitted by oversight.	
12	Kammapallay	6-7-75	6-7-75	8-7-75	8-7-75	
13	Veppalay	6-7-75	6-7-75	8-7-75	5-7-75	
14	Narasingarayanipett	7-7-75	7-7-75	8-7-75	8-7-75	
15	Cooppagampally	10-7-75	10-7-75	16-7-75	28-6-75	

13th November 1876.

(Signed) C. VENCATASUBBIAH,
Tahsildar.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
26th April 1877.*

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G.O., dated 21st October 1876, No. 2,441.

2. The statement forwarded by the Collector shows that the dates of detection or of occurrence report by the Police were generally prior to those of detection by the Tahsildar, though the dates of receipt of the reports were not. Hence it would appear that the Police preceded not followed the Tahsildar. It is clear, that in all cases the reports took many days to reach the Tahsildar, and that if the Police disturbed the sellers on the dates they reported the existence of the shops, the Tahsildar should have found the shops open a few days after; and these facts look as if the reports were antedated. It is clear at any rate that the Police took no action until the Collector moved in the matter on information drawn from the new renter.

3. The date of the Collector's order to the Tahsildar is wrongly quoted in paragraph 4 of his letter. The correct date is 12th June 1875.

(True Copies and Extract.)
(Signed)

H. E. STOKES,
Secretary.

No. 654.

ORDER THEREON 26th April 1877, No. 1,567.

Separate Revenue, No. 20.

Abkari.

COMMUNICATED to the Inspector-
General of Police for his remarks.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Offg. Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Police.
„ the Board of Revenue.
„ the Judicial Department.

15/4

10

7. p. 227

So.

Si.

2 Inc

100

2. The Inspector General of Police
and the District Superintendent of Police
in their letters embodied in the
above mentioned Proceedings, state
that in 15 out of the 28 cases
of unlicensed ships mentioned by me,
the Local Police gave the Taluk Inspector
the required information. On this
point I have made the most careful
enquiry, and I shall now endeavour
to convince the Board of Government
that the Police took no action what-
ever in the matter prior to my becoming
aware of the illicit sales through the
Taluk Inspector of Chittoor.

3. I enclose copies of my letters
to the Superintendent of Police dated 11th
June 1875 and 10th May 1876 in each
of which as the Board will observe,
I earnestly requested assistance in the

detection

detection of the illicit trade in opium.
I received no reply to either of these
letters from Captain Fox and not a
single case of illicit sale of opium
was reported to me by the District

Inspector at last that I
could not obtain the assistance I
had asked for, I issued to the late
Taluk Inspector the following order
dated 12th June 1876, No 25
directing him to take immediate
steps in the matter and if possible
bring the offenders to justice. He
set to work on the 15th Idem
and succeeded in detecting various cases
on the dates entered in the 16th Column
of the Statement prepared and sub-
mitted by him and which accompanied
this report.

6. This Statement also exhibits
the dates on which the Superintendent
of Police in his second list
embodied

submitted in the Government
Proceedings under ref. adds that
information was given by the Police
to the Taluk Magistrate also the
facts actually entered by the local
Police in the occurrence Reports and
those in which the reports were
actually received by the Taluk
Magistrate. There are diverse
discrepancies between the data given
by the Superintendent of Police and
those entered by the Police on the
occurrence Reports, which however,
it is not for me now to discuss.
I would only here draw attention
to the data given in the Columns
4 to 6 of the Statement. It is
clear from those figures that
in cases Nos. 1, 10, 13 and
15 the detection by the Taluk
Officials was prior to the
actual discovery by the Police.

According

According to their own statements
in their Occurrence Reports and
that we read all of the same in
my cases the Occurrence Reports
reached the Taluk Magistrate.
Several days subsequent to the detection
of the frauds by him.
b. The Board will find
that the Police authorities
reflected a most important duty
for a considerable length of time.
Although their attention had more
than once been specially directed
to it by me and that when at
last they came to know that the
local Magistrate had actually
succeeded in tracing out several
important cases of fraud, they
anticipating unpleasant results
to themselves, hastily prepared
and sent in Reports setting
forth the very facts which the Taluk
Magistrate

Letter Captain for Service that
it is impossible for the Police to
detect every case of illicit sale
of Taddy in shops and other such
places. I readily admit this, but it
is a fact that very one of the
illicit shops to which reference is
now made was held in a
house in a large village and had
been so held openly and constantly
without license for many years prior to
its discovery by the Taddy Inspectors.

I have the
honble Secy W. S. Whiteside
Collector
North West
Collector's Office
Cuttack
1877

Enclosure 1.

From W. S. Whiteside Esquire
Collector of North West

To Captain A. W. A. Cox
Superintendent of Police
North West.

Sir, I am this Office letter noted Letter No 278 dated
in the margin and from the list 7th October 1874
of Taddy shops furnished to you Letter dated
with the first of the letters above January 1875
No 74
quoted

quoted you will see that the number
of Taddy shops sanctioned to you
for the Cuttack Taluk is 7, and
that I requested that a strict
and careful supervision may be
exercised by your Department that the
said number may be scrupulously
observed by the Taddy Inspectors.

2. I enclose herewith a list of
the Taddy shops in that Taluk
which has now been filed before me a list
of 103 Taddy shops in all of which
the Taddy shops are now being
being ordered in the Cuttack Taluk.
A copy of that list is being
forwarded.

3. I have the honor to request
therefore that you will be so good
as to ascertain at once through the
several Station Officers the exact
number of Taddy shops now existing
in the Cuttack Taluk and furnish
me with a statement showing
the names of the villages in
which the shops are held so
that

I may, if necessary, prosecute
 the Renters for fraudulently opening
 ships. As it would be next to
 impossible to find out the exact
 date of ship after the close of
 this month, when the form passes
 away from the late Renters to new
 hands, I particularly request that
 you may be best in pushing on
 the inquiry as vigorously as you can.
 I have the honor to be, Sir,
 Yours faithfully,
 J. W. Whitcombe
 Collector

Enclosed 2.
 No. 457.
 Hon. W. S. Whitcombe Esquire
 Collector of
 North Coast
 J. A. H. M. A. Cox
 Superintendent of Police
 North Coast.

Sir,
 In my letter of the 11th
 June 1875 No. 655 I brought to your
 notice that there was reason
 to believe that a large number
 of

of unlicensed ships were
 then in service and request
 that you would ascertain at once
 through the several Station Officers
 the exact number of such ships
 and furnish me with a list of
 of to enable me if necessary to
 prosecute the renters for fraudulently
 opening the ships. I particularly request
 that as it would be next to
 impossible to find out the exact
 date of ship after the close of
 this month when the form would
 pass away from the late Renters to
 new hands, you may be best in
 pushing on the inquiry
 as vigorously as possible. No reply
 having been received to my letter
 (and which still remains unanswered),
 and as time was precious, I determined
 to depute Subkara Subbiah Men Sah.
 Seldar of Chittoor to obtain for
 me the information. I had in
 vain sought from the Police. He
 succeeded in discovering
 without any assistance from the
 Police

Police that at less than 28 in.
licensed shops had been fraudulently
opened in the Taluq of Chittoor
alone by the Sub Renter Annachella
Dudali, and liquor sold therein
for a length of time. Annachella
Dudali was then prosecuted before
me by Venkatasubbia, and I convicted
and fined him in the sum of
2000 Rs in that charge. He paid
the fine, and never appeared
against my sentence.

I have no doubt that
you issued the necessary orders
on receipt of my letter, and I
am glad, if the information called
for had been furnished to you
by the several local Police Officers
in the Taluq, you would at once
have communicated it to me. This
leads me strongly to suspect that these
Police Officers were acting in collusion
with the late Renter and connived
at the opening of the several
unlicensed Taddy Shops by Annachella
Dudali; for if they were zealously
doing their duty, the briefest enquiry
would have resulted in the discovery
that

that the 28 shops have continued
above where no steps by any
license. This circumstance connects
with the facts that it was the attack
Renters, and not the Police who do.
covered the two instances of illicit
distillation of arrack successfully from
secreted by them before me, and me
to believe that the Police are not
exercising themselves as they ought to
check irregularities on the part of
the Taddy Renters. And I request that
you will now warn the Police Inspector,
who from his long term residence in
the Chittoor Taluq, ought by this
time to be thoroughly conversant
with its affairs, that in future
severe notice will be taken of failure
on his part to detect and bring
to light Frauds of this descrip-
-tion.

I have &c
North Andhra Office Sd/- W.S. Whiteside
Camp Palamancin 10 May '76 Collector.

[Enc. 1/3]

Sd/- W.S. Whiteside
Collector.

Submitted to Government with refer.
G.O. 214 dated 1876 No 244.
The statement forwarded by the
Collector Shins that the dates of detention, or
of occurrence, report by the Police were invariably
prior to those of detention by the Tahsildar,
though the dates of receipt of the reports were
not. Hence it would appear that the Police
presented no. followed the Tahsildar. It is odd
however that in all cases the reports took many
days to reach the Tahsildar and that if the
Police disturbed the Sellers on the dates they
reported the existence of the shops, the Tahsildar
should have found the shops open a few days
after; and these facts look as if the reports were antedated. It is clear
at any rate that the Police took no action until
the Collector moved in the matter, on information
drawn from the new writer.

3. The date of the Collector's order to the
Tahsildar is wrongly quoted in para 4 of his
letter. The correct date is 12th June 1875.

1 June Espin & Traut

W. R. R.

To the Secretary to Government, Rev. Dip.

E. H. C.

