

(1) Number of pages 16.
 (2) Date of repair 17. 4. 73.
 (3) Initials of the Referencer .

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1828	Press
~~B.P. No.~~		~~Mis.~~
Dated	26. 5. 1872	197.

not to be folded or roughly handled

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 14th June 1875.

Read the following papers:—

From W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 28th May 1875, No. 234.

I HAVE the honor to bring to the notice of the Board a case tried by the 2nd-Class Magistrate of Yernagudem, in this district.

2. It seems that a piece of teak-wood belonging to Bramana Sastrilu was carried down the river in November 1872 and was caught by Garra Ranganaiaku. Bramana Sastrilu proved to the satisfaction of the Taluq Magistrate that the wood in Ranganaiaku's possession belonged to him. On that the Taluq Magistrate issued an order to the Village authorities to the effect that they were to make over the wood to Bramana Sastrilu. The Village Munsif had this order read to Ranganaiaku and asked him to give up the wood, but Ranganaiaku refused to give it up. On this account Ranganaiaku was convicted of obstructing a public servant in the execution of his duty and sentenced to one month's rigorous imprisonment.

3. I think this decision is wrong. There does not appear to me to have been any obstruction, and the order issued to give up the wood was illegal. The order was issued in November 1872, the alleged obstruction took place in the same month. The present Taluq Magistrate took charge of the taluq in July 1874, and he summoned Ranganaiaku to appear and answer the charge in January 1875.

but, supposing it were legal, unnecessarily severe after so long a time had elapsed since the offence had been committed. I cannot believe this to have been only an error of judgment on the part of the Taluq Magistrate. He has only lately been reduced to this taluq, and he seems no more careful to act in a proper manner since his reduction than before it. I must recommend his dismissal.

5. The Board will find their order reducing this Tahsildar in their Proceedings, No. 1,460, dated 15th June 1874.

Telegram from PHANIHARAM VENKATARANGA CHARLU, Tahsildar of the Yernagudem Taluq, Godavery District, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tallapudi, 2nd June 1875.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting to be furnished with the report of the Collector recommending his dismissal and praying to pass orders after taking his defence.

Petition No. 1,393 of 1875, from that individual.

THE Collector will call upon the Tahsildar for any explanation he may have to give.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

To the Collector of the Godavery District,
with Petition No. 1,393 of 1875.

Rd. A. S. Rodgers.

No. 2,173.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 10th August 1874.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 7th July 1874, No. 220:—

REFERRING to the Board's Proceedings, dated 15th ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that I have reduced P. Vencata Rungacharlu to the fifth-class Tahsildarship of Yernagudiem Taluq.

2. As Yeluri Venkayya, the last class Tahsildar of Yernagudiem, is the senior of the two of his position, and, as he has been in a jungly taluq for upwards of four years, I have appointed him to be Tahsildar of Rajahmundry in succession to Rungacharlu. I request that the Board will approve of this.

APPROVED.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Secretary.

To the Acting Collector of the Godavery District.
Copy to the Accountant-General.

Ed. W. H. French.

1875.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 14TH JUNE 1876, No. 1,613.

Encl.

Received

4721/5

JUNE,
No. 1,613.

Venkataranga Charlu, P., 2nd-Class Magistrate of Yernagudem Taluq, in Godavery District, who has been recommended by Collector to be dismissed from service for having improperly convicted one Ranganatha of obstructing a public servant in the execution of his duty and sentenced him to rigorous imprisonment.—Collector directed to call upon — for any explanation which he may have to give in connection with charge.

Received May 1st 1876

10/1/2

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 15th June 1874.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 13th May 1874, No. 139 :—

I HAVE the honour to forward copies of two letters* and their enclosures from the Sub-Collector and Joint Magistrate, Mr. Horsfall, relating to the conduct of the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry.

2. The first, No. 93, refers to his acquisition of a piece of land adjoining his house by means of false representations made to Mr. Pearse, who was for a short time in charge of the Sub-Collector's office.

3. When the Innespetta of Rajahmundry was laid out Mr. Linton was stationed there as Head Assistant Collector, and Mr. Horsfall was there as Assistant, so that the latter is well able to speak to what Mr. Linton's intentions were. His intention was to allow the people an avenue walk by the side of the road and off the road. By the appropriation of this piece of ground by the Tahsildar this intention has been frustrated.

4. The Tahsildar applied to Mr. Pearce for permission to build a wall along a drainage channel by the side of the road, and to enclose the space between this wall and his house, and to make this into a flower garden. He said that Mr. Linton had given him this piece of ground.

5. Mr. Pearce, knowing of no reason for doubting the Tahsildar's word that the land has been given to him, gave him permission to enclose the ground as requested. After that the man who lives next to the Tahsildar applied for and obtained a similar piece of ground between his house and the road.

6. When Mr. Horsfall returned to the district he noticed that the plan that had originally been adopted had been departed from and he looked into the matter, and he has "no hesitation in declaring that the representation made by the Tahsildar that the land was given to him by the reg. was not correct."

7. The patta of Innaspetta shows that this land was not intended to be given to any private person, and it was not included in the patta which was given long subsequently.

8. It is not likely that Mr. Linton would have deviated from the plan in favour of the Tahsildar without leaving something on record about it, without giving more than a verbal order.

9. I must also remark on the Tahsildar's proposal to make a flower garden. It would seem that this was made, because the officer might be induced to give this piece of ground, as a flower garden would be an ornament to the town; but instead of making a flower garden he uses the ground as a place in which to keep his bullocks.

10. As to the danger to the people from the drainage channel, if it had existed to such an extent as the Tahsildar says, it was his duty as a Municipal Commissioner to have asked the Municipality to put up some fence. They would have done it at once on his representation.

11. I have come to the conclusion that the Tahsildar's statement, that this land was given to him by Mr. Linton, is false.

12. According to Mr. Horsfall's recommendation in paragraph 7 of his letter I asked the Tahsildar if he would consent to take down the wall, retire from the land, and pay the expenses incurred by the other man, Sriramulu, in removing from the land he has taken, and whether Sriramulu would retire. The Tahsildar says he will remove from the land, and pay the expenses, but he says that Sriramulu will not. I know that the Tahsildar has sufficient influence with this man to induce him to withdraw if the Tahsildar wished him to do so. As the Tahsildar does not choose to try to get matters right, and as the proposed arrangements have been upset by the Tahsildar's representations which he knew to be false, I have no other course to adopt but to recommend his dismissal.

1874.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 10TH AUGUST 1874, No. 2,173

Records

AUGUST.
No. 2,173.

Tahsildar of Rajamundry.—Letter from Collector of Godavary, reporting that he has appointed Y. Venkaya, fifth-class Tahsildar of Yennagudem, as — and reduced P. Venkata Rungacharla Tahsildar of former place to latter, approved.

Musci: Aug 11 & 1904

13. With his letter, No. 69, the Joint Magistrate sends the records of two cases in the (Tahsildar) 2nd Class Magistrate's Court.

14. In a Revenue case before the Sub-Collector the witnesses proved that certain ryots refused to receive puttas and give muchilkas; that they were summoned to appear before the 2nd Class Magistrate; that they were kept at his Court for some days; and that they were allowed to go when they consented to give muchilkas. The summonses and warrants which he issued are not included in the records sent by the 2nd Class Magistrate, an omission deserving most serious notice, when it appears that the charge was made really to induce these ryots to execute muchilkas.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Sub-Collector, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavary District, dated Rajahmundry, 30th March 1874, No. 93.

I HAVE the honour to bring to your notice the fact of the Rajahmundry Tahsildar having obtained and enclosed with a wall a piece of land in front of his house at Innespetta, which had been set apart for public purposes, and was never intended to be, and ought never to have been allowed to become private property.

2. This plot of ground was applied for by the Tahsildar during the short period that Mr. Pearce was in charge of the division, and I have no hesitation in declaring that the representation made by the Tahsildar, that this land was given to him by the late Mr. Linton, is false, and that the Tahsildar knew it to be so.

3. That this is the case I know from my own personal knowledge of Mr. Linton's proceedings with regard to the formation of Innespetta; it is borne out by the original plan of Innespetta, and by the fact that, though the putta for his land was issued long subsequently, the plot in question was not included.

4. The appropriation by the Tahsildar with Mr. Pearce's sanction has completely destroyed the original intention of the plan, which was to allow the people an avenue walk by the side of the river. This is now impossible.

5. The other reasons assigned by the Tahsildar in his application have no more foundation, I believe, than his statement as to the gift made verbally by Mr. Linton. As Municipal Commissioner he might easily have moved to have the drain referred to properly guarded, and if, as stated by him, it was dangerous it was his bounden duty to have done so. The flower garden that he speaks of is at present used as a place where his cows are kept standing, as I have more than once noticed.

6. The Tahsildar having obtained and enclosed this piece of ground his neighbour, Joovada Sriramulu, applied for and obtained from Mr. Snaith the adjoining ground, and has enclosed it also with a substantial wall; Mr. Snaith seeing no objection since the Tahsildar had already obtained one plot.

7. I consider that both these grants ought to be cancelled, and the walls removed. The land being reserved for the purpose originally intended, and the least punishment that I can recommend for the Tahsildar is that he be made to pay all loss caused to J. Sriramulu by the proposed removal. This will be to some extent a meet, but perhaps not an adequate punishment.

8. I have already recommended the removal from the list of Municipal Commissioners these two individuals.

9. The papers connected with the case are herewith submitted.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. FOSTER,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Joint Magistrate, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Magistrate of the Godavary District, dated Rajahmundry, 30th March 1874, No. 69.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith the record of Summary Suit, No. 3 of 1874, on my file, together with the records of Calendar Cases, Nos. 240 and 263 of 1872, on the file of the Sub-Magistrate of Rajahmundry.

2. There is every reason to believe that the Sub-Magistrate acted most improperly in this matter, and I request that you will take such notice of his conduct as you may deem fit.

3. You will observe that he has failed to include in his records the summonses and warrants issued by him in the above cases, and I can only presume that he has done this as they would not support the statement which is herewith submitted.

4. I request that when done with you will return the records to this office.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. FOSTER,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—List of Papers.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 4 to 7.—Records.

P. Vencatarangu Charlu, Tahsildar of Rajahmundry, is proved to have encroached on land which he knew had been assigned by his superiors for public purposes. He effected the encroachment through a falsehood, taking advantage of an officer who came to the place after the assignment was made, and knew nothing about it. He subsequently defended his conduct disingenuously, and the encroachment was of such a nature as to make it impossible to use the land as had been proposed. Moreover, this encroachment was the immediate cause of, and rendered possible another encroachment by Joovada Sriramulu.

2. The Collector recommends that P. Vencatarangu Charlu should be dismissed. The Board have no doubt that he must be punished, but they consider it will be sufficient if he is reduced to the next grade of Tahsildars, that is to the lowest. Sriramulu's land should be acquired under the Act, and P. Vencatarangu Charlu required to pay all the expenditure incurred in doing so.

3. With regard to the charge that P. Vencatarangu Charlu used his influence as a Magistrate unfairly in the cases referred to in paragraph 14 of the Collector's letter the Board are unable to come to any conclusion on the papers before them. The missing summonses and warrants should be obtained and P. Vencatarangu Charlu's explanation taken, and the Collector may then address the Board again if he thinks proper.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Secretary.

To the Collector of the Godavary District, with Records returned.

Copy to the Accountant-General.

Exd. J. Tallooh.

concerned, to have the piece made
over to that person by the man,
in possession, report to guide it up.

On finding a paper pending,
filed the case and punished the
one who refused under section
180 of the Code. The Collector calls it
a wrong section, if so, it may be
either 400 or 401. Such defects ge-
nerally occur and are subject to
amendment by the High Court.

The Collector in his letter
of 13th June 1875 recommended my
promotion to the grade of Tahsildar. The
Collector was not satisfied with the
result. He now writes again the same.

I have completed 30 years service,
of which 28 years as a Magistrate.
In conclusion, I beg
to say that I am highly
pleased to supply material
of the Collector's letter and allow
my defence before the High Court.

final order. To this effect, I gave
a telegram yesterday.

I beg to remain
Sir,


4th June 1875 } Your most obedient
and humble servant
Tallapudi. } ~~Devi Prasad~~
Tahsildar
Guntur District.

that result unsuited
again the same.

Continues that he
has completed 23 yrs
service of which 18 yrs
as a lawyer.

Ways for a copy of the
Collis letter and prob.
taining his for paper
after the final over after
obtaining his defense.
and that to this effect
he telegraphed yesterday.

2578
3/11/75



1191
14

To

THE HONORABLE THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

The humble Petition of PANIHARAM VENKATA
RANGA CHARYULU, Tahsildar of Yerna-
goodem Taluk, Godavari District.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

1. That the Petitioner respectfully begs to offer his explanation of the charge for his concern in which he is informed that his dismissal has been recommended, and of which he has been convicted by the Sessions Judge of Rajahmundry, differing from the intelligent assessors who were appointed to try the case and who pronounced the Petitioner thoroughly innocent on a consideration of the evidence before them, and the respectability, character, &c., of the Petitioner.
2. Though in the absence of other explanations decisions of Civil Courts may serve as guides to your Honorable Board, the Petitioner begs to submit that they are not binding upon the Board and their effect may be relaxed when there is cause for it, and, in this view of the case, the Petitioner begs respectfully to offer the following remarks which must serve as convincing proofs of his innocence and his deservingness to be retained in service as Tahsildar.
3. The charge on which the Petitioner stands convicted, is having sold European liquor without a license under Act III of 1864.
4. In the absence of the most unequivocal documentary evidence which certainly does not exist in this case, the simple circumstance, whether the Petitioner, a public servant of 23 years' service, and one who has filled the honorable place of Tahsildar for 18 years on the receipt of a handsome salary and registration fees coming up to about 250 Rupees a month; would be fool enough to engage himself in a concern which could but yield the most paltry kind of income perhaps Rupees 20 a month, attended with the most dangerous consequences, inclusive of entailing the loss of his place, is enough to produce in the minds of unprejudiced Judges a conviction of the Petitioner's innocence.
5. Entreating your Honorable Board to bear this in mind while judging of him, the Petitioner would now go on to review the whole proceedings in his case and the evidence and circumstances pro and con.
6. The complainant in the case is a discontented cousin of the Petitioner's whom the Petitioner reared up from his infancy as his own son, who managed all his private affairs, and in whom he placed the most implicit confidence, so much so that except in his official capacity, he used to act entirely upon his representations and even to sign papers whose contents were only reported to the Petitioner by the said cousin. It is this cousin, encouraged

of the late 3rd class Magistrate
to his last post, upon
which he issued a Subd
to the Village Revenue
house the price was 00
over & that person, but
the man
That Petitioner furnished
the man who refused
under Sec 186 of the I.P.C.
which (Section) which
the Collector's wrong & if so
it may be either Sec 403
or 406, but that such
defects are subject to
amendment by the
High Court.
Also that the Collector
in his letter No 139 of 75
recommended Petitioner
dismissal, but the
Bt then advised him
& this (Council) made
of Tahsildar, but
the Collector being having
been disatisfied with
that

No 1393 of 75
From the 22nd Aug 1875
To the Tahsildar of
Yerna-goodem Taluk
Godavari District
That the Collector
has recommended
Petitioner's dismissal, making
his sentence in a Calcutta
Case No 11 of 75, illegal.
That a piece of paper
which was handed over by
the friends of the Petitioner
was in the possession of
G. Rangamayyaiah
who refused to give it up
& a certain person who
promised to the Collector's father
that

by the ill-feeling exhibited towards the Petitioner most unfortunately, by his official superior, and assisted by the Petitioner's personal enemies, that has brought this charge against the Petitioner, concocted some evidence and used other evidence of a most equivocal nature, and perfectly susceptible of a most favourable interpretation, against the Petitioner, by laying it before officials who either mediately or immediately were prejudiced against him.

7. The evidence on which the charge against the Petitioner is made to stand is as follows: (and he leaves it to your Honorable Board to judge whether or no, the explanation he is giving to all this is susceptible of being interpreted in his favor.)

- A. Copy of a letter alleged to have been signed by the Petitioner and addressed to one Pardasaradhy Nayadu of Madras, ordering among other articles, 18 (eighteen) cases of brandy.
- B. An original letter, purporting to have been written to the Petitioner by Pardasaradhy Nayadu.
- C. A letter from the consignee at Cocanada to the Petitioner's brother, advising him of the receipt of brandy.
- D. A permit signed by the Petitioner for 18 (eighteen) cases of brandy being taken to Sironcha.
- F.. An account signed by one Kassim Sahib, acknowledging the purchase of a few bottles of brandy.
- G. A paper in the Petitioner's hand, containing certain accounts of sales of 18 (eighteen) cases of brandy.

As regards A.—The conviction is made to stand on the assumption that the Petitioner admitted this letter, which, he never did. Referring to this letter, the Petitioner stated in defence that he merely ordered uttar (scent) from Madras for his own use, and that he might have signed any letters represented to him to have been written for the purpose of getting that commodity from Madras, and by this the Petitioner never meant to admit A, but, on the contrary, meant to deny it; and this being the most important and starting link in this chain of evidence, in the absence of its proof beyond doubt (which is not the case here) the conviction must be held to fail. The Petitioner further begs to point out that this letter is most funnily and suspiciously worded, and is on the face of it a most unlikely one. In the 1st paragraph of it, it sets forth that some uttar and other scents are required for the Petitioner; just in the next paragraph, it gives a list of articles to be sent from Madras, and in this list the 18 (eighteen) dozens of brandy come, and there is no mention made of uttar which the Petitioner wanted. The Petitioner begs to urge that this is a most unlikely, not to say ignorant and stupid form of writing a letter for articles wanted, and that it is very probable that the 18 (eighteen) cases of brandy written in English (which language the Petitioner does not at all know) is either an unauthorized postscript, or an addition in the letter. All these suggestions the Petitioner puts forward

without for a moment admitting the letter, and if admitting it subject to the qualification that he might have signed it on the representation by the complainant that it was a letter for uttar.

As regards B.—This is a letter purporting to have been written by Pardasaradhy Nayadu of Madras to the Petitioner, advising him of certain things sent to him by steamer. The Petitioner never received this letter; the letter itself was not proved by the examination of the party who is alleged to have written it; it is just possible that it is a daring forgery, and that it is a link in a long contemplated plot by the complainant against the Petitioner, and even assuming for argument's sake that the letter was written by Pardasaradhy Nayadu, is it not possible that the complainant who was so much in the Petitioner's confidence, and who was authorised to open his letters would have opened this letter and kept it aside to serve his own purposes, or lest its being shewn to the Petitioner might end in the disclosure of the brandy-trade in which he had a part. The Petitioner, therefore, begs to submit that this letter ought not to have at all been received in evidence without the examination of the writer who is alive (Section 32 of the Indian Evidence Act), and that it is at the same time capable of being interpreted, as pointed out above, in the Petitioner's favor.

C—is a letter addressed to the Petitioner's brother, and unless knowledge of the same is brought home to the Petitioner, he cannot be held responsible for it.

On the back of D, is a permit signed by the Petitioner to pass 18 (eighteen) dozens of brandy to Sironcha. How on earth, this circumstance can be taken against the Petitioner, he does not see. A Tahsildar granting a pass for brandy is the most ordinary part of his duty, and if at all this pass on the back of D is any evidence, it must be taken in the Petitioner's favor, inasmuch as if any knowledge of these brandy transactions by his nephew could be brought home to him, there is this pass to shew that these bottles were to pass away from his nephew's hands and were not to be used by him. The Sessions Judge seems to attach great weight to D as contradicting the statement of the 3rd witness that the brandy bottles were brought into Rajahmundry by mistake, but, the Petitioner submits that even if the bottles were brought into Rajahmundry intentionally, it could not in any way affect him.

F—is an account signed by one Kassim Saib acknowledging the purchase of a few bottles of brandy at the Petitioner's house. Assuming the purchase to have been made in the place where it is said to have been made, the Petitioner must say that it does not in the least concern him. There is no proof whatever that the Petitioner had any hand in, or knowledge, of, the sale; the circumstances under which the purchase is said to have been made are quite consistent with the Petitioner's information as to these transactions that there was some joint dealing in brandy by Ragava Charyulu, the licensed shop-keeper at Dowlaswaram, the complainant and the Petitioner's brother. It is in evidence that the said shop-keeper was there at the time of sale, and it is most likely that he was there to take the brandy to his licensed place of vend, and having found a paying cus-

tomor just then and there, sold a portion to him and took the remainder to his licensed place of vend. If, on the other hand, this licensed dealer was a mere purchaser like the Abkarry contractor, why is not there in evidence a similar acknowledgment signed by him; does the complainant mean to say that he who took so much care to preserve every other particle of evidence did not think it fit to secure this. Thus the story of the partnership is most probable, and, even assuming otherwise for argument's sake, the Petitioner is not to blame for the transactions evidenced by F unless it is shewn that he had any direct or indirect hand in them.

Coming to G—the last piece of evidence against the Petitioner, he must, in justice to himself, begin by saying that the effect and nature of this document have been most grossly misunderstood by the Sessions Judge, and that the Judge did not give a moment's consideration to the form in which the original was produced by the complainant. Para. 12 of the Judgment contains the Judge's account of G. It is said that this contains an account of the sales of 18 dozens of brandy, and being in the Petitioner's hand is conclusive evidence of his guilt. But let the contents of the document and the form in which it was produced be fully considered; it will then be seen what it will resolve itself into. It is no doubt an account of the sale of brandy, but is it not one conclusive account of the sale written for the purpose of striking the profit; it will be seen on the face of the document that there are two different accounts given of the sales of the same quantities of brandy and are given in two different columns. In the 1st line of the 1st column, 8 Rupees is put down as profit on the sale of a certain species of brandy, and in the same line in the 2nd column, 5 Rupees is put down as profit, and the same is found with reference to the 6 items in both the columns. This then is not the way of striking profit in any concern, but certainly is an account made out on the dictation of two different individuals. The truth of the matter is that a certain dispute having arisen between the Petitioner's brother and the complainant, both of them came to the Petitioner for a settlement of their disputes and gave the two different accounts to be found in G. The Petitioner thereupon settled their dispute and wrote a decision underneath, and that being the first time that their concern in any brandy-trade with the licensed vendor was brought to the Petitioner's knowledge, he immediately gave orders for discontinuing their connection with brandy-trade of any kind. This is how the affair stands, but how is it represented and understood? the whole of the account is not produced by the complainant, he tears off a portion of it, and that is the portion containing the Petitioner's settlement of the dispute, and the paper is produced in this form simply to produce an impression that the account was written for purposes other than the settlement of the said dispute. In this part of the case, the Petitioner begs to request that your Honorable Board will be pleased to send for the original which will be a convincing proof of the truth of the Petitioner's statements. The fact of the dispute is evidenced by the deposition of the two witnesses for the defence, and, though the Sessions Judge did not choose to believe them, the Petitioner ventures to submit that their story must be accepted as true, seeing that it is so well borne out by the circum-

stance pointed out above. Regarding the words "my own things" mentioned in the Judgment as being found in G, the Petitioner while denying all knowledge of his having written any such thing, begs to submit that he cannot say more about it as he does not find these words in the certified copy of G given by the Court.

8. The Sessions Judge in finding the Petitioner guilty seems to lay very great stress on the fact of the complainant and the Petitioner's brother being penniless, and having got their money from the Petitioner's funds. The simple answer to this is that all the private money of the Petitioner was in their hands, and if they had used a few hundred Rupees in purchasing brandy for sale, the Petitioner could have no opportunity of knowing it. It is just possible also that these persons having resided with the Petitioner a Tahsildar might have managed to borrow some money on credit for this purchase, and it is equally possible in the absence on record of proof to the contrary, that the brandy might have been bought by them on credit and the sale proceeds sent to Madras for payment of their price to the consignor from Madras. The moment the affair comes to the Petitioner's knowledge, he checks it, and the prosecution has not shewn any private concern in brandy-trade by the Petitioner's brother, subsequent to the dispute evidenced by G.

9. Taking all in all, the Petitioner begs to submit that the facts as proved and as above explained, however much they may go against the Petitioner's brother, are not enough to impute such a base act to a person of the Petitioner's position or respectability, nor do they prove any direct or indirect encouragement by the Petitioner of the acts of his brother.

10. It may not be out of place here to say a few words as to the prejudice most unfortunately entertained against the Petitioner by some of the presiding officials of the District. A perusal of the correspondence noted in the margin will show to your Honorable Board how little things

Proceedings of Board of Revenue, dated 15th June 1874, No. 1460.

are made mountains of by the District officials. The concluding extra judicial remarks of the Sessions Judge in his judgment wherein he says, "I presume the conviction will carry with it his dismissal from the Government service and loss of pension" are certainly enough to show how unfortunate the Petitioner has been in subjecting himself to the *personal* ill-will of the Judge, prejudiced by his official superiors. Whether when the tide of feeling is so much against the Petitioner, it is not likely that his enemies will take an opportunity of ruining him by bringing such false charges, he leaves it to your Honorable Board to judge, and this fact he entreats your Honorable Board to bear in mind when judging of the truth or falsity of the charge under reference. The Petitioner is prepared also to appeal to the High Court against the conviction.

11. In these circumstances, the Petitioner begs that in consideration of his 23 years' standing in service and of his having discharged satisfactorily the duties of Tahsildar for a period of 18 (eighteen) years, except that he was misreported of late by officials prejudiced against him, and in consideration of the facts noticed above, which are certainly to be construed in his favor, your Honorable Board will be pleased to retain him in his place as Tahsildar.

For which act of kindness the Petitioner as in duty bound,

SHALL EVER PRAY.

2^d November 1875

Madras

[Signature]

[Signature]

Pray under these cir-
cumstances for
order & retain him
in his place of labor.

two brother 2nd Defendant No 20
 a month for his assistance in
 future, and there were an end
 of the hearing
 5. Of no evidence that
 the nephew, the 1st witness has
 been keeping a shop for the sale
 of European liquors in the town
 in his own account since 1873.
 it is almost certain that had
 it not been for a quarrel between
 the uncle or uncle and their
 nephew the change would
 never have come to light. The
 latter says that he made the
 2nd piece brought a book
 put against him after he
 had separated from him and
 his brother and got all the
 property attached and sold.
 the writing piece was turned
 inside out and taken away

who was brought up by
 Oath was the complainant
 and evidence
 against him was considerable
 and that his official
 duties he believed and all-
 feeling towards him,
 without showing any
 consideration for his
 long service of 23 years
 and that the Sepsan
 Judge unjustly carried
 at him the whole
 allegation before who
 tried the case pronounced
 him innocent and
 that he is prepared
 to appear to the High
 Court.
 Refused at length
 within the charge
 agt. him and states
 that the Dist. Offr.
 made little things known
 (vide P.D. No. 15 June
 1877 to 1460)

No 25/18/1875
 From Mr. Thos. 22nd May 1875
 P. Vankata Ranga
 Charyulu Tadar of
 Mysore
 Dated 2nd May 1875
 Recd 3rd November 1875
 On a 1/- stamp of 2 Rs
 Rs 472/75 English
 Referring to the
 Collector's recommendation
 for the discharge
 after Oath from the
 Justice of Peace stating
 that the charge on
 which he stands
 connected is, having
 sold European liquors
 without a license under
 Act III of 1864.
 I beg to say that his own cousin
 who

in speaking for the pleasure which
 might well have been derived in
 this extremely simple case.
 3. The 1st witness is a partner
 of the two accused: he was, if
 not legally assisted by a clerk,
 freed from his infirmities,
 can assist now, by the doctor,
 plan the 1st accused: he had
 no property of his own in the
 world: he wrote letters for his
 uncle, and generally assisted
 in looking after such business
 as the 2nd accused was en-
 trusted with by his brother
 the 1st accused. The 2nd accused
 admits that he was living
 entirely on the bounty of the
 1st accused then & he declares
 of this fact, in one and the
 same house: they are in-
 scribed brother.
 4. This being the state of
 things

things it is the case for the pleasure
 that the 2nd Prisoner and the 1st
 witness and one William D. R.
 (now deceased) were
 engaged in trading in Birmingham
 agents on a considerable scale,
 without any license that at
 some time date and years
 not given these two had a plan
 made about their shares in
 the profits when the plan
 was referred to. The
 wrote down the accounts as
 stated by the two, compared
 them and settled the plan: their
 nothing whatever about the
 trading before, not the first
 letters for carrying on such
 a business, and no more

194/24

4. Charges and defenses (continued)

The Court is forming from

the jurors, find you Guilty of

Sanitation and you

guilty of the offense with which

you are charged, namely, killing

yourself, without a

license or offense punishable

under section 21 of the Act of 1864, and

Sanitation and you

a fine of \$250 and you

Sanitation and you

a fine of \$250.

(Signed) J. D. Grout

Acting District Judge

Sanitation and you

Judgment.

1194

I introduced the former

that it was not in my opinion

that if the evidence proves

that the large quantity of evidence

was not admitted

ordered up from the records to

examination and proposed

of by the brother (the 2nd one)

son) and in view of the

Sanitation (the 1st one)

who were then living in the

Sanitation house, were in

fact ordered, had for, and

the profits thereon to them, and

adjusted in by the then Sanitation

plan that will provide all

Sanitation under the section and the

are charged.

of great deal of time

have been taken up both in

Sanitation of Sanitation

~~nbw~~

10

Legna

700

100

2020/48

20

[Handwritten signature]



1000

2	1
3	4

8 June

141

80067

Abraham Lincoln

1726

Dec 15 1892

Exposition of 20th Dec.

in which case

under the influence of

...of ...

... and ...

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

The authorities, against that reported,

had not anything more to say in proof

of their statements, and this fact the petitioners

mention, here, to show the ill will

which to his misfortune he is subjected

to, and he begs also to say that the

present case is one of the kind.

(7) The petitioners, therefore, pray that His Majesty

may be good to him, for a full exoneration

of his case, and the petitioners again mention

to assert that at the end of this period he

stands to show the great discrepancy

that exists between the facts as they

stand, and as they are represented.

(6) The petitioners has no doubt, that the investigation

is he reported rather unfavorably to you

before the Board, but the petitioners begs

in private to mention, to state that, though

possibly he was dealt with rather harshly once, or

the other occasions, the reports against

him were not considered worthy of notice

1194/1
The change in which
the petitioners pray that he be entitled
considered his misfortune for carrying out his
business in his power and his efforts to maintain
the same and his by
means he is to be entitled to a return of 4 of his
balance the unpayable to him for the price
unpayable that away the petitioners that with
bonded in his hands between the petitioners
the petitioners pray that they should not be
and that he will be an representative.

1194/2
Pray the petitioners
that he is a full statement
of his case, mentioning the fact that he always has been
that he is a full statement
all blame is to be given him to contribute a
was will let the petitioners full satisfaction
when he is quoted by the
1194/3
The petitioners

(3)

The petitioner has feared that the
surprise fines, on every the question,

that it does not represent the whole
matter in a fair light, that it
misleads upon material evidence,

and that it is more like a statement
of facts, made by an ignorant

as against the petitioner, than one who would
have heard and weighed both sides

of the question.

(4)

The fact that the answers required

the petitioner of the charge in which the

several just convicted him is prima

facie in his favor and must be

taken if counterbalanced the unfavorable

impression which may be formed in your

minds, and the petitioner begs confidently

to assert that he will, on being, by a full

(3)

statement of his case, convince your honorable
Board that he is free from all blame
in the affair, and will get the sentence
upon him granted by the High Court.

With a view to do this, the petitioner
has applied for copies of all the papers
connected with his case and hopes by

will submit such an explanation as will show
that he has been thoroughly innocent, and
very hardly dealt with, and that his
only fault, if any, lies in his having
been duped by persons who were undoubtedly
in his confidence.

25th September 1875. For which act of kindness,
your petition, respectfully begs,
Yours very truly,
James Mayhew

1194/20

1894/5

and out of it were turned
all his papers including those
now produced before the Court.
it was then the 1st witness
Prosecution
saw his chance and determined
to "split" upon his uncles.

6. A is a small Book
purporting to contain copies
of letters despatched in 1871
by the 1st and 2nd accused:
those letters are admitted by
the 2nd accused, that is those
purporting to be signed by him
viz A. 2-3. et seq:

Objection was raised by the
1st accused's counsel to the
recaption of these in evidence
as being only copies: the ob-
jection was allowed as re-
corded A. 1. purporting to be
signed by him: but in his


Since seeing his telegram, the petitioner
applied for a copy of the judgment of the
Sessions Court in his case, under the impression
that it contained an accurate statement
of the facts of his case, together with
his defence, and that his explanation
could with a copy of the said judgment
alone would suffice to convince
your Honorable Board of the
innocence of the petitioner

(2) With reference to the petitioner's telegram of the
20th Sept/75, he begs respectfully to say the
following facts for your Honorable
Board favorable consideration.

(1) It is respectfully shown that
The Honble Justice of P. Nungachari,
Judge of Ennissey, Ennissey District.

Board of Revenue.
The Honorable the members of the

1194/19
2303
4/10/75
4/10/75



defence statement the 1st ac-
cused voluntarily, though clearly
warned that he could not
use A.1. in his own favor, and
then demand that it should
not be used against him.
admitted that such a letter
was signed by him.

B.1 to 7 are original
letters written by one B. Par-
thasaradi Naidu a merchant
at Madras most of which
viz 1. 2. 3. 7 are addressed to
the 1st accused, the others
to his brother 2nd accused.
they are beyond doubt answers
to the letters A.1. &c. the dates,
figures and every thing cor-
respond in a most business
like manner: and the 1st witness
swears the originals of A.1. were
written by him, signed by the

102/20
1st and 2nd accused indifferently,
and the replies received in due
course.

7. This correspondence
proves that a very considerable
wholesale trade in European
spirits and wines was going
on, the Tahildar of this Taluk
the 1st accused and his brother
2nd accused or one of them,
ordering and receiving con-
signments from the Madras
Merchant: they are the letters
of two traders and it would
appear that it was contem-
plated to extend operations to Gijn,
Jannica Run and Colombo
arrack; there are several
consignments spoken of but
it will be sufficient to fol-
low one.

8. In A.1 (admitted letter)

the 1st accused signs in order
for 18 cases of spirits the dif-
ferent kinds of which are spe-
cified with the greatest care.
the manner in which they are
to be paid for in Madras, shipped
to Cocanada and a hundi
drawing is given at length. they
are to be consigned "as usual"
to one Vittalachari at Coca-
nada. B.1. addressed to the
1st accused acknowledges
the letter, and advises despatch
of the liquors. A.1. is dated 16th
January 1871, and B.1. is dated
28 idem. Then in C.1. the con-
signee at Cocanada advises
the 2nd accused of the receipt
and landing on the 30th idem
and despatch of the same
by boat to Rajahmundry
on the 3rd February 1871. is advised

19/2
to 2nd Prisoner in C. III.

9. D is a pass from the Col-
-lector's Department at Coca-
-nada dated 3rd February 1871
for 18 cases of Brandy to be taken
by one Abbayi to the godown
of Vdala Rengachari in
Rajahmundry within 2 days.

10. Vdala Rengachari is
the 3rd witness ^{prosecution} he is a relative
of the accused: he says he
brought these 18 cases of Brandy
in his name to Rajahmundry.
at first he said he delivered
it to the 2nd accused, the 1st
witness ^{prosecution} and himself (who
were sharers in the trade)
and that Killambi Ragh-
-nathachari a licensed shop-
-keeper at Dowlaissuram

came and took it away at once,
he bring the fourth partner in the
concern that none of the liquor
was ever stored here at all,
nor sold, that it came by
mistake to this place?

11. On the back of Diap
permit admittedly written by
the 1st witness and signed
by the ^{Prosecution} 1st accused as Subordinate
Magistrate allowing these 18
casks to be taken up to Sironeha
in the Central Provinces within
two months. It is admitted
they were not so taken they
were then either at Rajahmundry
or Dowlaismaram. I may
say at once that the story
of their being brought by
mistake here is contradicted
by the P.O.'s D and that there
is no proof whatever except

1194/3
the statement of the 3rd witness
^{Prosecution} that they were at once taken
away to Dowlaismaram. That
this was not so is proved beyond
doubt by the evidence of the
2nd witness ^{Prosecution} corroborated as
it is by the accounts F.I. and
G.I. II. and III.

12. This 2nd witness is and
^{Prosecution} then was a Kavy Contractor
for this Taluk: he said he was
informed by the 1st witness
^{Prosecution} that there were European spirits
for sale at their house i.e. the
Tahsildar's house: that he
went and purchased spirits
accordingly but as it was
so long ago he cannot recollect
how much but he purchased
it in a room or go down in
the enclosure attached to the

Tahsildar's house the 1st witness
and the 2nd Prisoner ^{Prosecution} delivering
the cases to him. He gave them
a receipt; and F.I. bears his
own signature at the time
when he purchased Killaiki.
Raghavachari the Daulaiswarani
shopkeeper was present: asked
by the Court why he purchased
here he says naturally because
this was the only place in Ra-
jahmundry where European
liquors were sold wholesale?
F.I. which is not disputed
shows that some of each sort
of the spirits and wines des-
cribed in A.I. in B.I. and in
the Pass D were purchased
by 2nd witness on a date not
^{Prosecution} given and that he was also

debited with steamer charges &
freight ^{see} the date is supplied
by two payments endorsed
on this receipt one for Rs 150
on 26th February 1871, another
in the following march. If
any thing else were wanted
it is found in the fact that
this bill or receipt contains
nothing to show by whom these
liquors were sold. Then Q.I.
admitted by the 1st accused
to be in his handwriting shows
18 dozens (of something): so
much thereof sold to 2nd wit.
^{Prosecution} and to the Daulaiswa-
rani so much: prime cost:
^{sold at} profit: cost of "my own things"
and soon - with profit so
much.

" His own things clearly
and admittedly refers to a box
of miscellaneous articles making
the 19th case suit as advised
in B.I. but not requiring a
permit.

13. Evidence can go no
further: in one of the letters
B the merchant at Madras
speaks of having supplied you -
the letter is addressed to 2nd accused
with liquors to the extent of
1000 Rupees & more: there is no
mention of hundis for Rupees 400
and other like sums.

The 2nd accused admits
he has not a penny of his own -
and that he managed every
thing for his brother not im-
mediately connected with
public business.

Let us see the defence,

197/30
it is certainly ingenious: the 2nd
accused admits he traded
in liquor and that 1st witness
prosecution and the Dowlaiswaram
shopkeeper were in some way
concerned in that business:
the 3rd witness said he and
prosecution these three were partners: from
the statement of the 2nd accused
I understand him to say that
he thought he could make
some money on his own ac-
count by ordering liquors
from Madras for the Dowlaisw-
aram shopkeeper, but all he
did was to order the liquors
and pay for them. If he did not
find the money why should not
the licensed shopkeeper order
his own liquors: if he did find
the

the money why did he not pro-
-fit by it? and where did the
money come from?

14. The defence of the two
accused is given in para 4 & 13
of this judgment there is no proof
that the calculations on G. were
made for the purpose there stated
except the evidence of the 1st
& 2nd defence witnesses which
I say is worthless when opposed
to the documentary and oral
evidence for the prosecution
and to the admitted facts. If
the 2nd accused and the 1st wit-
-ness ^{prosecu-} and the Dowlaiishwaram
shopkeeper, and the 3rd witness
were partners then the calcu-
-lations show that the ac-
-counts could not refer to
a settlement of disputed
profits between the 2nd accused

and his nephew alone. It
is no proof of any partnership
between these two: they had no
money to trade with: the 1st
accused is the only man
who had command of no
money.

15. A clearer case I have
never seen: I cannot under-
-stand how the Assessors
could, without a minutes
consideration, after hearing
from me an explanation
of the facts & comment on
the speeches for the defence,
find the accused not guilty -
and that without giving a
single reason.

I have not the slightest
hesitation in finding them both
guilty - nothing could show
more plainly that the late

Tahsildar had in the most
flagrant manner broken the
very rules which it was his
duty to see enforced, and the
penalty inflicted in his case
is adequate only because it
must, I presume, carry with
it, his dismissal from the
Government service and
loss of pension. The fines were
paid.

J. Brandt
Acting Session Judge.

(True copy)

J. Brandt
Acting Session Judge.

To
The Magistrate of the Godavery
District, with reference to his letter
dated 18th October 1875, No. 231
Comp. G. B.

Received
11/10/75
10

7/5/75

7/5/75

1196
32

No. 1,618.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 14th June 1875.

Read the following letter from J. KELSALL, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector in charge,
Godavery District, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the
Board of Revenue, dated Rajahmundry, 3rd June 1875, No. 251:—

I HAVE the honor to inform you that to-day a complaint has been made to me
by Ramanuja Chari against P. Venkataranga Chari, the Tahsildar of Yernagudem,
and P. Venkataraghava Chari under Section 21 of the Abkari Act.

2. From the sworn deposition of the complainant supported by a mass of
correspondence and accounts (some of which are in the handwriting of the
Tahsildar), a *prima facie* case has been made out.

3. If these are to be relied on, the Tahsildar imported from Madras in 1871
large quantities of brandy, rum, port, Colombo arrack, &c., on several occasions
and disposed of them in Rajahmundry, Dowlaishwaram, and other towns.

4. The informer is his nephew, who acted as his assistant and clerk, and as
such was entrusted with the papers and accounts. He has recently quarrelled
with his uncle, who brought a criminal charge against him, and this he admits
has induced him to prefer this charge.

5. As the alleged offence was not committed in discharge of his revenue or
judicial functions, I have not waited for the sanction of the Board.

6. I have not considered it necessary to suspend him on an unproved charge,
but have summoned him and his brother under Section 21 of the Abkari Act.

7. I shall send a further report in a few days.

THE Board await the Collector's further report.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

To the Acting Collector of the Godavery District.

Ext. J. W. Fischer

[illegible][illegible]

యం వచ్చును అప్పుడు రుక్మిణి లక్ష్మి
యందు నెల్లదా బులెన్ల ప్రమాణ వాక్యము
గూర్చు వాడ మునాది నా న దరుక ర్త సంగతి
అప్పుడు విన్న ప్రయినలు వా నప్పుడ న పడె గా
మమ జుట్టి యనుచు జరుగా వడమ నకు
అ/క/4 సంకెడ్డింబు చి4 వా ర్థమున వ్రాత
మూలముగా తెలియ చేసి నా ను పిమ్మ వ
అప్పుడు రుక్మిణి 19 వా ర్థమున వా
మరయు వాంగము లము ప్రయనినం
దు నను న్ను నే క ము జరిగ న పరు వాద యం
త వా లము న పు జ్జెర్గ ము జుట్టి నా మి నా
అప్పుడు వివా రం బు లన న దే నా తాలనిబం
దు నా నా ము జుట్టి న పరితం రింకు వ గియుంక
సంతు న ను న్ను కే ము ప్రయి ము నే ను నా వివా
రింకు జ ము నా నా గా ము నా నా నా నా
న దరు వా ద నే జ రింకు నా నా నా నా

[illegible]

[illegible]

చి/2 బాండ్రి 1875 సం వత్సరం -
వ మ వ ద్దో ము డు.

Quincy

S.

1194/3
The Honorable Revenue Board
of the Madras Presidency
The Humble Petition of Panikarum
Venkata Rangachari Sahib
of Yeragudam Taluk in the
Godavery District.

In acknowledging the
receipt of order No 22 dated 24th June
1875 issued by the Subcollector
in charge communicating the
subject of a letter to your Board
from Mr W S Foster, the Collector
of the Godavery District recommen-
ding my dismissal from Govern-
ment Service and directing me
to afford explanation in answer
to the same, I respectfully beg to
state as follows.

I was given to understand
that in June 1868, W A Happing,
the late Head Assistant-Magistrate
of this District issued an order to
the Submagistrate of the Kottapalli
Division, who had then the Magistrate

Charge of this Taluk stating
that the wood drifted by the
Godavery river which was
larger than that used as fuel
such as beams, beam planks &c
were being misappropriated
at random by the Seizors and
directing him that an account
should therefore be kept of
the wood so seized in order to
prevent its misappropriation.
That the wood should be given
to the proper claimants, and
that persons appropriating such
wood to their own use should
be punished on the Criminal
Side. Besides this whenever ^{the} claimants
came forward in time there obtained
a practice of issuing a notice fixing
the time in the Gazette regarding
such drift-wood of making over
the same to persons establishing
their claims to it within the given
time, and, if not, of disposing

1194/5
of the same by sale and
carrying the proceeds thereof
to the Credit of Government.
2 It appears that the late
Tahsildar and Magistrate
issued a deed to the Village of
Tallapudi in common with some
other Villages, No 38 on 3rd July 1872
stating among other circumstan-
ces, that a list of the pieces of
wood seized should be kept
in order that the public business
might be carried on with facility
with reference to the circumstances
stated in the above 1st para.
3 In obedience to such
orders, the Village Munsiffs
and Karams were in the habit
of causing pieces of wood so
seized in their Villages to be
watched, and of submitting
reports to the Taluk on the
subject. On some persons

Establishing their claims to
Some pieces of such wood
it was usual to cause the
owners to pay some proper
hire to the man for the seizure
of wood from the Godavery
River, to make over the wood
to them and to submit a report
to the Divisional officers on
the circumstances of the case
with the record. They used
to approve of such proceedings

4 As stated in the 3rd para,
one of the persons so claiming,
named Baudh Brahman
Sasthulu complained that 30
pieces of wood vizt one at Jodi-
pudi, 27 at Vakhadrapuram
Agraharam, 1 at Vighnawara-
puram and 1 at Chidipidi
belong to him and proved his
claim there. It was there

194/110
decided that they should be
made over to him. A P. G. No 9
dated 26th November 1872 was
addressed to the late Head
Assistant Magistrate stating
the circumstances of the case
and submitting the record
on the subject. The late 3rd
Class Magistrate issued S. No
115 dated 22nd idem to the Magis-
trate of the Tadipudi Village
Common with the other 4 villages
directing the delivery of the pieces
of wood under dispute to the
said person. 29 pieces of the
wood, except the one at Tadipudi
were made over to him. The
Village Magistrate submitted
a report to the late Salug
Magistrate on the 24th November
1872, complaining that when the

Salidar of the village went about to make over the said piece of wood to the claimant, Sastri, in due difference to the orders given him by the village Magistrate with reference to Sakid No 118 above alluded to, one Garra Ranganaikulu who had seized the wood in question prevented him (The Salidar) from doing so, and refused to receive the hire offered to him for the seizure.

The matter of this report was brought to my notice subsequent to 18 July 1874 on which I assumed charge of this Taluk. Baudhi Brahmuna Sastri, in whose favor the wood under dispute was decided, prevented himself and complained of the matter to me. I was engaged in disposing of the Criminal

Cases remaining up to date and the arrears of Correspondence connected with the Revenue matter, and in collecting the arrears of Revenue over due, and then went round about the most part of the Taluk in order to gain information of the affairs of the Taluk because I was new to it. I then returned to my Head Quarters. Shortly after, the Magistrate of the said village came to the Taluk Kutehri on some other business, when I asked him about the wood in question. He then replied to me that he had not then with him the papers connected with the case, but that he would attend before me with the record afterwards and give an answer about the same, and then went away. He did not attend as stated by him. On enquiry, I was informed that he was sick.

these circumstances, I took leave
for one month from 13^d October
and on my return, I found that
the case of the disputed wood was
still lying over and then issued
a written order to the said Magis-
trate on the 4^d December 1874. Where-
upon, he attended my office on
19 January of this year and gave
a deposition on the matter. I
therefore took up the case on the
file and tried it because a Crimi-
nal case is Cognizable notwith-
standing some time had elapsed
before the presentation of the charge
and because it could not be rejected
on the ground that it was barred
by law of limitation.

The undermentioned cir-
cumstances will evince in detail
that there was not unnecessary
delay on my part after my
transfer. The period between

18^d July 1874 on which I took charge of this Taluk and
19 January of this year on which the case was filed
I deduct one month from
13^d October to 13^d November
during which I was absent
on leave

I deduct again the period
intervening the 4^d December
on which a Fardid was
issued to the Village Magis-
trate and 19^d January
on which he attended
and the case was filed

Remaining period
Even this delay is ascribable
partly to my tour on Circuit
throughout the Taluk as above
stated and partly to the nonatten-
-ance of the Village Magistrate
though he was ordered to
appear. As it is my duty
to dispose of the paper (means charge)

which calls for such measures,
I brought the case on the file.

7 It was concluded from
the record of the Enquiry of the
case that the Defendant Rangar-
-raikulu had prevented the
wood being taken which was
watched under the orders of
the village Magistrate because
the following circumstances
will bear out the said fact:

As the Defendant was the
Sriyos of the wood under dispute
and anxious to receive the
hire of Sriyure at any time,
he kept the wood in question
under his supervision until
such hire was paid to him.
He has no exclusive right
of possession of the wood
in question.
In the present case,

Read the following papers :-

No. 575. Endorsement of the Un-
Revenue, Agriculture, and C.

Read the following letter from
Secretary to the Governmen
Government of India, Depart
Bombay Castle, 7th June 1877.

With reference to your Memorandum,
Customs duty on certain chemical preparatio

Letter from the Surgeon-General, Indian Medical,
ment, No. 2,144, dated 25th May 1877.
Memorandum from the Commissioner of Custom
Opium, No. 1,200, dated 21st May 1877.

20 per cent. of spirit, mentioned in your col
spirit, rectified spirit, or absolute alcohol.

From Surgeon-General W. G. HUN
Department, to the Secretary t
Bombay, 25th May 1877, No. 2,14

With reference to Government Resol
Department, I have the honor to request the
of "Spirit" mentioned therein is to be un-
2. The favor of an early reply is soli

MADRAS.

DEPARTMENT.

No. 2,113.

By the Government of India Department of

Colonel E. W. RAVENSCROFT, C.S.I., Chief
to A. O. HUME, Esq., C.B., Secretary to the
Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce, dated

dated April 1877, on the subject of the levy of
imposing a large proportion of spirit, I am directed
forward the accompanying copies of papers
ed in the margin; and to request that you will
so good as to favor this Government with
early instructions of the Government of India
the point therein raised as to whether by the
ation above quoted is to be understood proof

D., Acting Surgeon-General, Indian Medical
Department, Revenue Department, Bombay, dated

No. 2,374, dated 14th April 1877, Revenue
of being informed whether by the 20 per cent.
proof spirit, rectified spirit, or absolute alcohol.
the information is required by the Store-keeper.

No. 200.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

According to the Tariff, the duty charged ordinary spirits is Rupees 4 Imperial gallon of
the strength of London Proof, the duty being eased in proportion as the strength of the spirit
exceed London Proof.

Proof spirit is the only spirit of standard strength, and if a standard is to be adopted as the
basis of calculation it must be proof spirit. There is no standard strength for rectified spirits or
absolute alcohol, which are always over proof.

But it would appear to be the intention of the Government of India to charge all medicinal
preparations officially recognised containing 20 per cent. and upwards of their bulk of spirits as if
they were composed entirely of spirits and taking into account the description of spirits, or whether
such preparation is above or below proof.

If this presumption be correct, there is no necessity for a standard. The result will be that a
liquid containing 20 per cent. of spirit of any strength will be charged 4 Rupees per gallon.

Otherwise by retaining proof spirit as a standard a liquid containing less than 20 per cent. of
rectified spirit or absolute alcohol would become chargeable with duty as containing more than 20
per cent. of proof spirits.

The adoption of such a standard would, of

in favor of Government.

(Signed) L. REID.

Revenue Department

From G. H. M. BATTEN, Esq., Officiating
Revenue, Agriculture, and C
Bombay, dated Simla, 18th J

In reply to your letter, No. 3,541
"cent. of spirits," in my letter, No. 8.
"spirits, or absolute alcohol, I am directed

Copy of above correspondence for
No. 80, dated the 6th April last.

as in continuation of

C. J. LYALL,
y to the Government of India.

7, No. 2,113.

COMMUNICATED to the Board of Revenue
in continuation of G.O., 14th April 1877,
425, for the information and guidance
Directors of Customs.

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

576.

ORDER THEREON

Separate Revenue, No. 25.

Customs.

the Board of Revenue.

No 3545 of 1877

13

Revenue Department
Bombay Castle, 4th June 1877.

From

The Honble E. W. Ravenscroft, Es.
Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Bombay

To

A. O. Hume, Esquire, C.B.,
Secretary to the Govt. of India
Departt. of Rev., Agri. & Comm.

(Sir.)

With reference to your Memorandum
No 81 dated April 1877 on the subject
of the levy of Customs duty on certain
chemical preparations containing a
large proportion of spirit, I am directed
to forward the accompanying copies of

Letter from the Surgeon General
Indian Medical Department
No 2146 dated 25th May 77

Memo from the Commissioner, Customs
and Opium No 1200 of 1877

papers noted in
the margin and to
request that you
will be so good as to
conform with the early
instructions

favour to

The term "20 per cent. of spirits" — Com-
municating to the Board of Revenue for its inform-
ation and guidance of Collectors of Customs,
correspondence from the Government of India relating
thereto — means "proof spirit."

STAMP
NO 3545-578

G.O. No 200 June 1877, No 2113

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

REVENUE.

Govt. of (1877) Bombay

Instructions of the Government of India
the point therein raised as to whether
the 20 per cent of spirit mentioned in
a communication above quoted is to be
understood Proof spirit, rectified spirit or
absolute Alcohol.

I have &c
Ld. D. Mackenzie,
For Chief Secy. to Govt.

N^o 2144 of 1877. *DX/2*
Bombay 25th May 1877.

From

The Surgeon General,
Indian Medical Department,

To

The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
Bombay.

Sir,

With reference to Government Resolution
N^o 2374 dated 14th April 1877, Revenue De-
partment I have the honour to request the
favour of being informed whether by the
20 per cent of "spirit" mentioned therein, is
to be understood Proof spirit, Rectified spirit,
or absolute Alcohol.

2. The favour of an early reply is
solicited; the information is required by the
Storekeeper.

I have &c
D. W. G. Hunter M.D.
Acting Surgeon General,
Indian Medical Department.

15/200 of 1877

Revenue Department

According to the Tariff, the duty charged on ordinary spirits is Rs. 4 Imp. Gall. of strength of London Proof, the duty being increased in proportion as the strength of the spirit exceeds London Proof.

Proof spirit is the only spirit of standard strength and if a standard is to be adopted as the basis of calculation it must be Proof spirit. There is no standard strength for rectified spirits or absolute alcohol which are always over Proof.

But it would appear to be the intention of the Government of India to charge all Medicinal preparations officially recognized containing 20% and upwards of their bulk of spirits as if they were composed entirely of spirits, and taking into account the description of spirits as whether each preparation is above or below Proof.

63
If this presumption be correct, there is no necessity for a standard. The result will be that a liquid containing 20% of spirit of any kind will be charged 4/- per Gall.

Otherwise by retaining Proof spirit as a standard a liquid containing less than 20% of rectified spirit or absolute alcohol would become chargeable with duty as containing more than 20% of Proof spirit.

The adoption of such a standard would of course be in favour of Government.

D. L. Reid.

(True copies)

M. Wilson

Registrar

Department of Revenue and Commerce.

From

N^o 96. 6/4
G. S. M. Patten, Esquire,
Secretary to the Govt of India
Department of Rev, Agric &c.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Bombay.

Customs.

Simla, dated the 18th June 1877

Sir,

In reply to your letter N^o 3545
dated the 7th Instant, enquiring whether
by the term "20 per cent of spirits," in
my letter N^o 81 dated the 6th April last
is meant Proof spirits, rectified spirits or
absolute alcohol, I am directed to state
that, "Proof spirit" was meant.

I have &c,
G. S. M. Patten
Offg Secy to the Govt of India.

No. 9

Copy of above correspondence
forwarded to the Government of
Madras in continuation of No. 80 dated
the 6th April last.

No. 10 order

Chas. L. Lull

Under Secretary to the Govt of India

11/11

Thomas 187) Sept

No 3016

From

Gov. of India

Rev. Mr. Esq.

Dated 18 }
Recd. 25 } June
1898.

Forwarding copy of
correspondence stating that the
term "20 per cent. of spirits"
means "Proof spirit"

With Order

Communicated to the Board of Revenue

in Confirmation of P.O. no dated 1077 No 1

for the information and guidance of Hon.

26-6-77.

11/7/1898 (Received 1077)

This presentation said to have been
made, is the act done to stop
a public business which was
to be carried out under the orders
of the village Magistrate, which
are based upon an order issued
by a third class Magistrate in
obedience to an order of the
Head Assistant Magistrate.
The village Magistrate also
comes under the head of "Public
Servants under Section 21 of the
Penal Code. Section 186 shows
the wording "His public duties",
but not the word "Legal duties".
The act of the village Magistrate
done under the orders of his
Superior, appears to be a public
act. Under these circumstances,
this offence was taken under
Section 186.

If it is taken otherwise I

requested I might be excused,
taking it to be a mistake of Law
on my part.

8 Whereas this section (186) provides
for three months imprisonment
and a fine of Rs 500, I sentenced
the party to one month's imprison-
ment. From the nature of the
record, as well as the refractory
spirit said to have been shown
by him in committing the offence
in the first instance, I thought
it necessary to inflict such
punishment as no restriction
is to be observed in sentencing
the convicted person within the
prescribed punishment.

9 The papers said to have been
lying over in arrears is the
Saidpur Village Dunsiff's
report alluded to in para 5.
The original report was sent

11/4/44
to the District Magistrate with
Arzn No 45. It is not now in arrears.
10 As stated in my Arzn No 69,
the wood under dispute was
valued at about Rs 4, which
was acquired by begging in the
Upper Godavery Department. The
prevention in taking the wood
was made by the defendant who
is by profession a cultivator
and a common man who was
sentenced by me to one month's
imprisonment. This my procedure,
I state, to be an error of judgment
on my part. But it was not binding
to do so. The Board I humbly
trust will observe that there
is no sufficient reason to warrant
such a conclusion. This dislike
only is the main cause.
11 When I was in the Rajahmundry
Taluk, Mr Snaithe the then acting
Joint Magistrate wrote in about October

or November 1873 a letter to
Mr S Foster Esqr. the then Magis-
trate of the District recommending
that I had good experience in
Magisterial duties and that the
powers of a second class Magistrate
might be conferred on me.

That gentleman has also
assented to it and supports the
recommendation to the Higher
Authorities. I request a reference
may be made to the said two papers.

12 I submit that the 186 which
I took and the decision made
by me under the same, may be
admitted by the District Magis-
trate to be consistent with the
law in our view. If it was not
however the proper section the
proper course which the Superior
Officers adopted in General Cases
is to submit the case to the High-
Court for revision under a proper
Section. Such being the case.

The Collector's recommendation
for my dismissal must be
entirely based upon his dislike
towards me through my misfor-
tunes and without any cause
whatever. But it cannot be
held otherwise. In 1874, when
that gentleman recommended
to the Honorable Board for my
dismissal, they reduced me to
a lower class. I beg to request
the Board will observe that that
gentleman has again reported
me from an ill feeling continued
ever since that his former report
proved ineffectual. I am a
Servant of about 23 years standing.
I have been a Sahildar and
head of Police for some time
and also a second class Magistrate
for a time after the introduction
of the Penal Code amounting in
all to 18 years forming a portion
of the above stated period and I

1194
46

have passed several decisions.
Towards me a servant of
such position, it will be just
for the Superior officers to consider
that it was a mistake on my
part and that it might be altered.

Further the Board will observe
that the recommendation for
my dismissal is mainly
attributable to the dislike of
the Superior officers towards
me.

Please peruse this
12th July 1875

I remain &c &c
Signed P. M. K. Ranga
Charles P. R.

A true translation

W. J. C.

By Collector

1855

From

J. Madison Bow

Good night of 11. 11. 55

School of Trade

H. O. Phelps Esq.

Ag. Collector of Tarragon

Sir

In enclosing a bill

for the salary of the establishment attached

to the establishment under my charge,

I have the honor to request that you

will do me the favor of ordering the

payment of the sum thereof

from the Public Treasury.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Yours most obedient servant
J. O. Phelps

Recd
11. 11. 55

Wm. L. Burleigh

have to give the four inspectors on Rupces 25. The taluk is populous, and there is a great influx of people from other parts just

13. 11. 57
14. 11. 57
15. 11. 57
16. 11. 57
17. 11. 57
18. 11. 57
19. 11. 57
20. 11. 57
21. 11. 57
22. 11. 57
23. 11. 57
24. 11. 57
25. 11. 57
26. 11. 57
27. 11. 57
28. 11. 57
29. 11. 57
30. 11. 57
31. 11. 57
32. 11. 57
33. 11. 57
34. 11. 57
35. 11. 57
36. 11. 57
37. 11. 57
38. 11. 57
39. 11. 57
40. 11. 57
41. 11. 57
42. 11. 57
43. 11. 57
44. 11. 57
45. 11. 57
46. 11. 57
47. 11. 57
48. 11. 57
49. 11. 57
50. 11. 57
51. 11. 57
52. 11. 57
53. 11. 57
54. 11. 57
55. 11. 57
56. 11. 57
57. 11. 57
58. 11. 57
59. 11. 57
60. 11. 57
61. 11. 57
62. 11. 57
63. 11. 57
64. 11. 57
65. 11. 57
66. 11. 57
67. 11. 57
68. 11. 57
69. 11. 57
70. 11. 57
71. 11. 57
72. 11. 57
73. 11. 57
74. 11. 57
75. 11. 57
76. 11. 57
77. 11. 57
78. 11. 57
79. 11. 57
80. 11. 57
81. 11. 57
82. 11. 57
83. 11. 57
84. 11. 57
85. 11. 57
86. 11. 57
87. 11. 57
88. 11. 57
89. 11. 57
90. 11. 57
91. 11. 57
92. 11. 57
93. 11. 57
94. 11. 57
95. 11. 57
96. 11. 57
97. 11. 57
98. 11. 57
99. 11. 57
100. 11. 57

Sanjivani Residents' Office
11th November 1857
The Acting Collector
Sanjivani

I have
int. of the aggregate
b. 10. dur on account
abstracts paid by
account of Bandhan on
this office for October last, a.
having you will cause Rupces 2287. 4 " to
be sent to the Deputy Sanildar at Madhyani
and remit the remainder Rupces. 22838. 7. 10
to the Residents' office at Sanjivani at your
convenience.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient Servant
W. S. S. S.
Acting Officer

Sanjivani
Date 11th Nov 1857
Resident's Office

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

1857

1835

11.2.1835

From the West of England

Benbow

To the Collector of

India

With reference to my
Memo of the 11.2.1835

reference to former receipt of the
Account of the Court and of the

Court for the month of October
1834

1834

in
your favour

of the Court

on the 11.2.1835

1835

The Registrar

East India

12.2.1835

1835

on the 11.2.1835



W. B. Smith
1857
W. B. Smith
1857

W. B. Smith
1857
W. B. Smith
1857

W. B. Smith
1857
W. B. Smith
1857

W. B. Smith
1857
W. B. Smith
1857

W. B. Smith
1857
W. B. Smith
1857

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

26th May 1877, No. 1,825.

Famine Relief.

Read the following paper:—

No. 522. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th May 1877, No. 2112.

Read the following letter from J. GROSE, Esq., Collector of Nellore, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Nellore, 30th April 1877, No. 2029.

With reference to Board's Proceedings, 10th March 1877, No. 1,119, I have the honor to report as follows with regard to village inspection.

2. *Atmakur, Rapur, Venkatagiri.*—These tracts are in charge of the Additional Sub Collector. With regard to Venkatagiri, he proposes to have eight Inspectors on Rupees 15 and two Supervisors on Rupees 35. This is in accordance with the scheme sanctioned for Polur in Board's Proceedings, 31st March 1877, No. 488, and I have allowed the establishment to be entertained, in anticipation of sanction. With regard to Rapur and Atmakur, Mr. Crole thinks no new expenditure is necessary. So early as the 8th March, he issued a circular regarding village inspection, a copy of which is enclosed, and he describes the results as successful. He has, at the request of the Tahsildars, allowed certain Settlement and other officers to assist the Revenue Inspectors.

3. *Kandukur, Kanigiri, Ongole, Podile, Darsi.*—These tracts form the Sub-Collector's charge. He proposes to have an additional inspector in each Revenue Inspector's division, one in Podile and one in Darsi, and to give each inspector two subordinate overseers. The inspectors seem to me to be necessary for Kanigiri and Kandukur, but I think one will do for Ongole, where the Northern part of the taluq is the only part where there is great distress, comparatively speaking. I do not think there will be much advantage in giving overseers to these inspectors. The Village Munsiffs must be made to do their duty. One inspector each for Podile and Darsi will be simply useless. Special arrangements are necessary in Podile and Darsi, as in Venkatagiri and Polur, though the distress there is less. There are 123 villages in Podile and 136 in Darsi. I think they should be divided into ranges of about fifty villages each, and that the inspectors should be required to visit each village once a fortnight. In this case, there should be three inspectors for each division. I think it will be necessary to pay most of these inspectors Rupees 25 each, and request that this sum may be sanctioned as a maximum.

4. *Kavali.*—This taluq is in charge of the Assistant Collector, Mr. Power. Here the Revenue Inspectors will be of no use, in consequence of the approaching jamabandi, and an arrangement which Mr. Underwood has made for getting the accounts of each village prepared by the curnam on the spot under the inspection of the Revenue Inspectors. Thinking the matter in this taluq urgent, I have authorized Mr. Power to entertain four inspectors on Rupees 25 each, in anticipation of sanction.

5. *Gudur, Polur.*—These tracts are under the Deputy Collector of Naidupett. A scheme for them was sanctioned in Board's Proceedings, 31st March 1877, No. ——. I am afraid the amount sanctioned for Gudur may prove to be insufficient. If so, I shall address the Board again on the subject.

6. *Nellore.*—The Nellore Taluq is immediately in charge of the Collector. I believe we shall have to give the four Revenue inspectors a horse allowance of Rupees 5 each, and employ three extra Inspectors on Rupees 25. The taluq is important and populous, and there is a great influx of people from other parts just at present.

7. I am sensible of the want of uniformity in these proposals, but I fear that the greatest stress of the famine is upon us; that there is no time to be lost; and that the only chance of good results lies in giving each divisional officer an establishment which he can get to work at once.

8. The cost of the schemes proposed for sanction is (per mensem):—

Atmakur	...	...	...	...	...	Rs
Rapur...	...	...	...	...	...	0
Venkatagiri	...	...	...	...	...	190
Kandukur	...	...	...	...	(Max)	75
Kanigiri	...	...	...	...	(Max)	75
Ongole	...	...	...	...	(Max)	25
Podile	...	...	...	...	(Max)	75
Darsi	...	...	...	...	(Max)	75
Kavali	...	...	...	...	...	100
Nellore	...	...	...	...	...	95
						710
Already	} Polur	...	...	...	...	220
sanctioned		} Gudur	...	...	...	24
						954

9. To show what was originally done in the matter of village inspection, I enclose copy of a circular issued on the 17th March, paras. 6 to 10 of which contain directions on this point framed, I may remove, after perusal of Mr. Crule's order referred to above.

The Collector's proposals are approved, and the establishments asked for sanctioned.

2. They are summarized below:—

Venkatagiri...	{ 8 Inspectors on Rs. 15.			} Maximum rates.
	{ 2 Supervisors on Rs. 35.			
Kanigiri ...	3	Do.	do.	
Kandukur ...	3	Do.	do.	
Ongole ...	1	Do.	do.	
Podile and Darsi }	6	Do.	do.	
Kavali	4	Do.	do.	
Nellore ...	3	Do.	do.	

Horse allowance to 4 Revenue Inspectors at Rupees 5 each.

3. The instructions referred in para 9 are approved.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secretary.

No. 523.

ORDER THEREON, 26th May 1877, No. 1,825.

Miscellaneous.

RECORDED.

2. The original enclosures to the Board's Proceedings are returned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,
Additional Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
.. the Accountant-General.
.. the Financial Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

7. I am sensible of the want of uniformity in these proposals, but I fear that the greatest stress of the famine is upon us; that there is no time to be lost; and that the only chance of good results lies in giving each divisional officer an establishment which he can get to work at once.

8. The cost of the schemes proposed for sanction is (per mensem):—

						RS.
Atmakur	...	...	...	...	...	0
Rapur...	...	...	...	...	...	0
Venkatagiri	...	...	...	...	...	190
Kandukur	...	...	...	...	(Max)	75
Kanigiri	...	...	...	...	(Max)	75
Ongole	...	...	...	...	(Max)	25
Podile	...	...	...	...	(Max)	75
Darsi	...	...	...	...	(Max)	75
Kavali	...	...	...	...	...	100
Nellore	...	...	...	...	...	95
						710
Already	} Polur	...	...	...	...	220
sanctioned		} Gudur	...	...	...	24
						954

9. To show what was originally done in the matter of village inspection, I enclose copy of a circular issued on the 17th March, paras. 6 to 10 of which contain directions on this point framed, I may remove, after perusal of Mr. Crule's order referred to above.

The Collector's proposals are approved, and the establishments asked for sanctioned.

2. They are summarized below:—

Venkatagiri...	{ 8 Inspectors on Rs. 15.			
	{ 2 Supervisors on Rs. 35.			
Kanigiri	...	3 Inspectors on Rs. 25		
Kandukur	...	3 Do. do.		
Ongole	...	1 Do. do.		
Podile and Darsi	{ 6 Do. do.			
Kavali	...	4 Do. do.		
Nellore	...	3 Do. do.		
				Maximum rates.

Horze allowance to 4 Revenue Inspectors at Rupees 5 each.

3. The instructions referred in para 9 are approved.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secretary.

No. 523.

ORDER THEREON, 26th May 1877, No. 1,825.

Miscellaneous.

RECORDED.

2. The original enclosures to the Board's Proceedings are returned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,
Additional Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
.. the Accountant-General
.. the Financial Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

check
H. H. H. H. H.

80418

check
26-5-77

C24-5-77 R26-5-77

Revenue Department
Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 7th May 1877

Read the following

No 2029

B25 G. R. 4687

From: J. G. G. Esq.
Collector of Taluk.

To: H. C. Stokes Esq.
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Madras.

Sir With reference to Board's Proceedings,
10 March 1877 No 1119, I have the honor to
report as follows with regard to Village In-
spection.

At a meeting of the Board of Revenue
held on 10 March 1877, the following
resolutions were passed:—
That the Collector be and he is in charge of the Addition
of Sub-Collectors. With regard to Venkatasani
he proposes to have 8 Inspectors on Rs 15 and
two Supervisors on Rs 35. This is in accordance
with the scheme sanctioned for Polur in
Board's Proceedings 31st March 1877, No 4188 and
I have allowed the establishment to be
entertained

entertained in anticipation of sanction.

With regard to Rapur and Minatur
Mr. Croft thinks no new expenditure is ne-
cessary. So early as the 8 March he found
a circular regarding village inspection, a copy
of which is enclosed and he describes the
results as successful. He has at the request
of the Tahildars allowed certain Settlement and
other officers to assist the Revenue Inspectors.

3. These tracts form the Subcollector's charge. Handur
He proposes to have an additional Ins^{Handur}
pector in each Revenue Inspector's division ^{Angole}
one in Podile and one in Darsi, and to
give each Inspector two Subordinate overseers.

The inspectors seem to me to be necessary for
Handur and Handur, but I think one
will do for Angole where the Northern part
of the Taluq is the only part where there is
great distress. Comparatively speaking
I do not think there will be much
advantage in giving overseers to these
inspectors. The village Missiffs must
do

6/8/85
had made to do their duty. One Inspector
each for Podile and Darsi will be simply
useless. Special arrangements are necessary
in Podile and Darsi as in Venkataji and
Poter though the distress there is less. There
are 123 villages in Podile and 136 in Darsi.
I think they should be divided into Ranges
of about 50 villages each and that the
inspectors should be required to visit each
village once a fortnight. In this case
there should be 3 inspectors for each division.
I think it will be necessary to pay most
of these inspectors Rs 25 each, and request
that this sum may be sanctioned, as a
maximum.

Navale 4. This Taluq is in charge of the Assistant
Collector, Mr. Power. Here the Revenue Inspectors
will be of no use in consequence of the appor-
tioning of Jamabandi, and an arrangement
which Mr. Underwood has made for
getting the accounts of each village pre-
pared by the Curmums on the spot under
the

The inspection of the Revenue Inspectors.
Thinking the matter in this Taluk
urgent, I have authorized Mr. Pinner
to entertain 4 Inspectors on Rs 25 each
in anticipation of sanction.

5 These tracts are under the Deputy Collector
Collector of Naidupet. A scheme of Police
for them was sanctioned in Board
Proceedings 3rd March 1877 No—

I am afraid the amount sanctioned
for Cudus may prove to be insufficient.
Also, I shall address the Board again
on the subject.

6 The Nellore Taluk is immediately in Nellore
Charge of the Collector. I believe we shall
have to give the 4 Revenue Inspectors a
horse allowance of Rs 5 each; and employ
3 extra Inspectors on Rs 25. The Taluk
is important and populous and there
is a great influx of people from other
parts

parts just at present. 7/5/80

7. I am sensible of the want of uniformity
in these proposals, but I fear that the greatest
step of the famine is upon us, that there is
no time to be lost and that the only chance
of good results lies in giving each division
an officer and establishment which he
can get to work at once.

8. The Cost of the schemes proposed for
sanction is—(per mensem)

Atmakur —	Rs.
Rapur —	—
Venkatapur —	190
Kandukur — (max)	75
Kanigiri — (max)	75
Angole — (max)	25
Pootle — (max)	75
Darsi — (max)	75
Navab —	100
Nellore —	95
Alindy } Police	220
Sanctioned } Cudus	24
	954

9. To show what was originally done
in

in the matter of Village Suspicion, I enclose
 copy of a Circular issued on the 17th March,
 paras 7-10 of which contain directions
 on this point framed, I may remark,
 after removal of Mr. Leake's order referred
 to above.

Mellor
 Collector of Revenue }
 30th April 1877 }
 Character
 1/10/8/1877
 Collector

The Collector's proposals are approved and
 the Establishments asked for sanctioned.

2. They are summarized below.

Venkatapur	8 Inspectors on Rs 15	Maximum rates.
	2 Supervisors on Rs 35	
Kandur	3 Inspectors on Rs 25	
Kandur	00	
Ouzole	1 Inspector on Rs 25	
Podile & Dandee	6 Inspectors on Rs 25	
Kavali	4 00 00	
Mellor	3 150 00	

House allowance to 1/4 Rev. Ins-
 pectors at Rs 5 each.

3. The instructions referred in para 9 are ap-
 proved.

(Quoted by Extract)

O. The collector of Mellor.
 (Signed)

1/29/8/1877
 Secretary
 W. H. H. H.

The Additional Secretary to Govt. R.D. Secretary
 with 2 original enclosures to her authority.

8
 1877

25th of Dec. 1877
 35th of Dec. 1877
 1st of Jan. 1878
 5th of Jan. 1878

Dec. 1877
 1st of Jan. 1878
 5th of Jan. 1878
 1st of Feb. 1878
 5th of Feb. 1878
 1st of Mar. 1878
 5th of Mar. 1878

No. 1325

1. Howard.
 2. The official business
 of the B. & O. R. R.
 (Maine)

26 Aug 1877
 27 Aug 1877

Appraising Collectors' papers
 and determining the liability
 of the B. & O. R. R.
 to the State of Maine

With notes

20 of Jan. 1878
 21 of Jan. 1878
 22 of Jan. 1878
 23 of Jan. 1878
 24 of Jan. 1878
 25 of Jan. 1878
 26 of Jan. 1878
 27 of Jan. 1878
 28 of Jan. 1878
 29 of Jan. 1878
 30 of Jan. 1878