

Revenue (19/9) Department.

MI. J. ELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 198

DATED 12-1-29

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that the Govt. sees no sufficient reason to modify the order already passed on the case of Mr. G. F. Vas, late Asst. Insp., Salt, Alkali & Customs Dept.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
So	272	Rev	13.2.99				

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8605

From

The Secretary to the Commissioner
of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue,
Madras.

Order Mis. No. 198 of 12.1.99

The Government
sees no sufficient reason
to modify the order
already passed on the
petitioner's case.

(from order)

Ms. 12.1.88

Mis. No. 4927

Dated 12th December 1898.

Received

Registered

Enclosures 36.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

To the B. of Rev. Sep. Rev.
with 35 encls.
petr.

Submitting to Government, with remarks,
petition from Mr. J.E.F. Vas, late Assistant
Inspector, Salt, Abkari and Customs De-
partment, praying for a reconsideration of
the orders passed in Government Order Mis.
No. 3829, Revenue, dated 23rd September 1898.

P.E.
11.1.99

all except petr

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
CHO	743	900/99	

PRICE 1 pie. ^{2.000}/_{1-9-08.}



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Dated 12th December 1898.
MisNo. 4927.

-----:0:-----

Read petitions from Mr. J. E. F. Vas, late Assistant Inspector,
Salt, Abkari and Customs Department, dated 9th and 10th Decem-
ber 1898.

Resolution.

Submitted to Government.

2. The Memorial contains many misrepresentations but no new
matter.

(True extract.)

G. H. M. S.
Acting Secretary.
15.12.98

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,

with petition and enclosures (35).

Petition
of
J. E. F. Vas
lately an Assistant Inspector
of
Salt, Alkali & Customs Department.

PETITION

066

To.

REVENUE DEPT.

His Excellency

Lieut. Arthur Elibank Hancock GCMG; PCIE

Governor and President in Council

Fort Saint George.

The Humble Petition of J. R. F. Van.

Calley an Assistant Collector of

Salt Abkari & Customs Revenue

Department.

Most Respectfully Sheweth.

That your Petitioner has been
informed by G. O. No. 3829 dated 23 Sept-
1898 in reply to his Memorial dated 20th
June 1898 that "The Government sees no
reason to interfere on the Petitioner's behalf"

2. Your Petitioner therefore begs
to approach your Excellency with the following
new and important facts on which the
merits of the whole case depend, and which
afford very good grounds for a reconsidera-
tion of the order already passed on the
above said Memorial

3 Your Petitioner begs to state
that Paras 5 and 35 of the Memorial are
not very clear on the Subject of the "Form
of Enquiry". That being the case the Govern-

no corrections. Dated 11/11/98

17/11/98

The B.D. remarks
that this review
petition is
"gainsaying"
"misrepresents"
"no new"
"no matter"
P.C.

③ pp 124-131 of file folder

No corrections.

[Faint, mostly illegible handwriting at the top of the left page.]

X With reference to the paragraph, at-
tention is invited to the following state-
ment made by the pet. before the Dy.
Commr. on the 14th Decr 1897.
"I will hand in a written statement
of what I have to say in my defence
(Sug) 7.0 this evening. I have in all
the papers I wish to see (p. 101 of file).
p6

[Faint, mostly illegible handwriting at the bottom of the left page.]

From the
statements
taken down
by the Dy.
Commr. (p. 90-101 of
file) and
the pet's sub-
sequent ex-
planation
(p. 102-115 of
file) it is
plain that
the Dy.
Commr.
what were
the several
heads of
charges against
him.
p6

3
At all a fact. The charges were not at all
framed or reduced to writing by the Dy
Commr. which your Petitioner could be
called upon to explain, neither was your Petitioner
made aware of any charges and the evidence
in support of them, or called on to explain any
specific charges, or allowed to give a full
explanation of the statements taken by him
from your Petitioner, day by day from 7th
to 14th December inclusive either in the state-
ments themselves or subsequent to them.

4. The truth of the above allega-
tions made by your Petitioner will be clearly
seen from the following facts viz (1) That
the Dy Commr did not frame charges
or inform your Petitioner of any charges before
starting the enquiry. (2) He simply went on
taking down statements in his own hand from
your Petitioner day by day from 7th to 14th
December inclusive by "Set" questions to
which answers in the form of "yes" or "no"
were only allowed, and any qualification
or explanation of the answers so taken being
disallowed, any sprinkling of qualifications
was again answers to such "Set" questions.
He also gave your Petitioner to understand
that the charges would be framed at 108th
end of the enquiry, and the explanation of
your Petitioner would then be taken down
in writing. (3) On the 14th December - the
day of the end of the enquiry - 1897
no correction

This point was
not made in
the previous
petition.
p6

Commissioner gave your Petitioner only five
hours time - from 2 to 7 PM - to submit his
explanation on the ground that he (Dy Com)
was about to leave Muklatini for his
head quarters on the 15th morning and that
therefore his Report should be closed on the
14th night. The Dy Commissioner was not
going then on any leave or transfer. (4)
Even then the Deputy Commissioner did not
frame Charges in writing, nor was your
Petitioner even told on what points the
Explanation was needed. (5) The time given
was wholly insufficient even to go through $\frac{1}{10}$ th
(one-tenth) of the voluminous record carefully
and to submit the explanation on that portion
alone, not to say that all the matter elicited
by the Dy Commissioner during an enquiry
extending over 8 days was fresh in your
Petitioner's memory. It will also be observed
that Drafting and fair Copying several fourteen
sheets of matter after Consulting record was
no mean work for five hours and more
was not at all possible. (Enc. 31) (6) The great-
est part of the points, thus explained by
your Petitioner, in the absence of his being
informed of the specific Charges against him,
were simply thrown aside as irrelevant as they
were not at all touched by the Dy
Commissioner in his report (Enc 35) which
is the Copy of Charges against your Petitioner

No corrections
Munir

x This Statement is altogether wrong.
The several heads of indictment
brought against the late Deputy Comm.
were those with reference to which the
late Deputy Comm. had submitted his explanation
in his statement made by him from 12.9.76
14.12.97 and the written defence filed on
the 14th inst.

(7) The Dy Commissioner having taken your Petitioner's Statements Day by Day from 7th to 14th December in his own hand and also his written explanation on the 14th December as explained above wrote his Report (Enc 35). (8) This Report of the Dy Commissioner has been treated by the Board as a Copy of the Charges against your Petitioner on which the Board have passed their Dismissal order (Enc 1). Before proceeding further your Petitioner most humbly begs to inform your Excellency, that in the first enquiry against your Petitioner conducted by the Assistant Commissioner Mr. Simpson, the Board did not pass at once orders on the Dy Commissioner's Report (Enc 24) before putting that Report into the hands of your Petitioner, for which purpose they called him to Madras and took down his defence before passing this first order (Enc 28) But in the second enquiry conducted by the Dy Commissioner they did the reverse and passed their second (Dismissal) order "ex parte". On the Authority of the above facts, it is conclusively proved that the Statements taken from your Petitioner Day by Day by the Dy Commissioner from 7th to 14th December were taken (Enc 30) and also the explanation taken from him by allowing only five hours time on the 14th December prior to the writing of his report dated 14th December - which in this particular case is said to be the Copy of Charges - cannot be held as having been the explanation of

No corrections

the Charges Contained in the Dy Commissioner's Report, but they can only be held as having been a material for having the Charges enumerated in the Report. Therefore it is conclusively proved that the Board passed this dismisal order on the Dy Commissioner's Report without at all taking down the defence of your Petitioner.

5 Your Petitioner most respectfully begs to state, that assuming that the nature of the case was such, that no charges at first could have been framed without an enquiry and therefore the Dy Commissioner was justified in taking down answers in the form of "yes" or "no" by "act" questions and in framing his Charges at the end of the enquiry. Even then it cannot be held that the Dy Commissioner was justified in disregarding the orders of the Government of India, which should have been followed and could have been followed. The Dy Commissioner was not at all justified in compelling your Petitioner to give an explanation within five hours (from 2 to 7 PM) on the ground that he had to leave the place the next morning and that therefore he should close the Report by the 14th night. Your Petitioner most respectfully begs to ask, even in case your Petitioner has actually made aware of the specific points on which the explanation was needed, could this have been called a full explanation. Surely there is not even a shadow

That the Dy Commissioner was not at all justified in calling your Petitioner to explain without informing him at least of the points required by the Dy Commissioner &c explained. Therefore it is conclusively proved that the statements taken by the Deputy Commissioner from your Petitioner stage by stage from 7th to 14th December inclusive and his explanation by only allowing him some hours time without even informing your Petitioner of the points required by him (Dy Com) &c explained prior to the writing of his Report - which is said to be the copy of charges in this particular case - is not at all an explanation of the charges set forth in his Report, on which the Board have passed their dismissal order.

6 Your Petitioner most humbly begs to state that the Dy Commissioner misreported the fact of the form of enquiry to the Board for his lines clearly state "His statement of defence is enclosed" (para 8 &c 35) and the Board in turn in their impression language misreported it to Government. It is perfectly clear from para 4 of this petition that the Board would not have at all passed their dismissal order before calling your Petitioner to explain, if they were aware of the full facts. Your Petitioner gave his explanation of the charges framed by the Dy Commissioner, in his Memorial. As the Board's dismissal order was not passed

No corrections. *[Signature]*

It is submitted that the Dy. Commr was negligent in speaking of the statements taken down by him and his written explanation submitted by the petitioner as the latter's statement of defence. It is well known as a matter of fact that this could not be expected to explain fully with reference to the several charges against the petitioner. But the Dy. Commr's statement in his Report, referred to by the petitioner, is clearly a misstatement of the facts.

Your Petitioner has explained from the Dy Commissioner's Report what he thought to be the Chief matters touched upon by the Board, and also some other matters to show the great bias of the Dy Commissioner, although the whole of the Dy Commissioner's report (Enc 35) admits of a very simple and most satisfactory explanation.

+ Please see remarks made by Dy Commissioner's remarks addressed to the Dy Commissioner's report (page 3) in Enc. No. 3829
23.9.95
Hog P

+ 7 Your Petitioner most respectfully begs to state, that the statements taken from him, step by step by the Dy Commissioner only prove that your Petitioner had not done "this" and "that" work, and the absence of reasons why he had not done this and that work is conspicuous. Hence the matter contains no explanation in the statement itself - for no explanation or qualification was allowed - there is no explanation of it also in the explanation given by your Petitioner to the Dy Commissioner within the five hours time allowed, neither have the Board called on your Petitioner to explain. Your Petitioner will quote one example, out of many, to illustrate this. The statement taken by the Dy Commissioner on the 7th December contains the following lines "I never write any licenses myself, they are all written by a peon" (lines 22 to 24 Enc 30). There is no explanation of these lines in the statement itself as it was not allowed, neither in subsequent explanation filed with the Board.

one correction. *[Signature]*

9
- within the 5 hours time allowed - Contains
any explanation on this point elicited on
the 7th December by the Dy Commissioner (See 31),
and the Charge in the Dy Commissioner's Report
framed Subsequent to the above on 14th Decemr
Thus that "The licenses and permits have been
all written by a person" (See 35). Your Petitioner
would most respectfully ask can his elab-
orations taken stage by stage by the Dy Com-
missioner and his explanation given in 5 hours
time allowed, be said to have been an expla-
nation of the above Charge of making the person
to write licenses and permits? In fact
there is no explanation, Or can it be
said that the matter itself admits of no
explanation whatever? But the explana-
tion to the Charge is very simple viz that
in all the other remaining eighty-two J.T.
Circles, licenses and permits, are only writ-
ten by persons and not even by Clerks and
never at all by the Superintendents or J.T. As-
sistant Superintendents, and in Brechnapatnam
Circle itself they (licenses & permits) were
so written, "before" "during" and "after"
Your Petitioner's time. But the matter as
it stands in the Dy Commissioner's Report
assumes a very grave aspect and carries
no other conviction to the reader, but
that that your petitioner was given up
to drinking and so negligent and so slo-
thful and so inefficient.

One mislata

delegated his work to his peers. Almost the whole of the Dy Commissioner's report is in that misleading form, for want of qualification or explanation and biases a reader at once against your Petitioner, though the matter was in itself a perfectly harmless one. Hence it is clearly seen from this one example - quoted out of many - that the four epithets viz "Stupid," "Negligent," "Indifferent," "Drunk" out of the Dean, given by the Board (para 3 line 1) to your Petitioner on the authority of the above said Dy Commissioner's Report, are conclusively disproven. Again in the statement taken by the Dy Commissioner there may be a slight sprinkling of explanations here and there, but it does not therefore necessarily follow that they are the real explanations or full explanation of the matter. In fact they are only answers to the "Let" question put by the Dy Commissioner. Taking one example out of many - by putting the case before the house for the sake of argument - "I lost my proper uniform at Durgarajapalan as I did not know the D.C. was coming" (line 258 259 line 30) as an example of the explanation of the charge - framed subsequent to the statement - of not wearing proper uniform. Referred in para 21 of the Memorial, the explanation will make the charge worse for the charge only says "he does not wear proper uniform" (line 3) and the explanation implies that he does not wear uniform at all, as never heard of.

No correction.

with the Dy Commissioner. Perhaps the Dy
Commissioner may elicit that the lines "I left
my proper uniform at Durgarajapalan as I
did not know the D.C. was coming" was a mis-
take for lines "I left my proper uniform helmet
at Durgarajapalan as I did not know the D.C.
was coming", but for that mistake the eliti-
ment is correct. Therefore your Petitioner begs
to quote another example, the lines "I did not
look for them myself because I cannot under-
stand Telugu" (lines 5658 to 30) imply that
his failure to search for the 776 was due to
his want of knowledge of Telugu, which is not
the real fact and his knowledge of Telugu had
nothing to do with it, even the Telugu person
who deals with them was not able to get the
776 in question. All the 776s were with the
Dy Commissioner the previous night, with other
77 Records, and access to them was not possible
then or the next morning, till the Dy Commissioner
was ready to start on horse back at 6. Hence
it is conclusively proved that the apparent
explanations are not the real explanations of
the matter, but simply answers in the form "Yes
or "No" to the continued set questions. Even
they are said to be a part of the explanation
they are not at all a full explanation of
the matter.

I your Petitioner most res-
pectfully begs to elicit that it has been
a fact that the Dy Commissioner was not
two com. was

Not the explanation given by him to the Dy
Commissioner who allowed only five hours time
for it (Ex 31) giving no specific instances
the explained has become completely useless
as most of the matter contained in it does not
find a place in the Dy Commissioner's report
which in this particular case is the copy of
charges against your Petitioner, and it has
also been conclusively proved that this expla-
nation cannot be held to have been an
explanation of the above said Dy Commissioner's
Report, and therefore it was not at all your
Petitioner's defence of the charges set forth in
that Report, which is the copy of charges in
this particular case - but simply a material
which either encouraged or discouraged the
Dy Commissioner to frame his Report. There-
fore the statement made by the Dy Commissioner
in those words "His statement of defence is correct"
(para 35) is misleading

I your Petitioner most
respectfully begs to place the history
of his previous service before you. He
was appointed as. ag. actg. District Inspector in
February 1888, he was confirmed as 3rd
Assistant in April 1889 and promoted to
Second grade in April 1891. Your Petitioner's
promotions up to 1891 were rapid, but of
1891 he never got any promotion. Though
he was very hard and received the Commenda-
tion in every circle he was not promoted.

The whole of the above is true.

Please
see para 3
of the BP
in Ex. 3929
239

without exception previously to joining Krish-
 napalan, a very remarkable fact. He was
 placed in charge of Pandracha factory from July
 1891 to March 1894, he did a lot of hard work there
 which brought an increase in Revenue of about 2¹/₂
 Lacs and half lakhs of Rupees to Government.
 in a short period of two years & 8 months of
 his tenure of office there, as compared with
 the figures for eight years and 4 months previous
 to his time (vide appendix H). He established the
 the reputation of the factory by the destruc-
 tion of 1889 salt, and prevented its contin-
 uated closure by making salt of a very su-
 perior quality (Pandracha is a monopoly
 factory worked by Government, it manufac-
 tures Contraband salt which should compete
 with the Bombay salt in Hyderabad market)
 and laid the foundation of a new factory,
 and he also obtained strong commendations
 from the Superior Mr Poole who was an
 Inspector or Assistant Commissioner of
 Pandracha factory during the period your
 petitioner was there - from July 1891 to March
 1894 - and from Assistant Commissioner Mr
 Mainwaring, Mr Hunter, Mr Lohu, Mr
 from April 1894 to September 1896 your
 petitioner served at Cannanore as a District
 Officer. The District inspection reports
 of the Deputy and Assistant Commissioners
 covering the same period are very good
 (Mr Simpson only, out of all the District
 Officers in the two divisions).

14.

Officers inspected your Political Promotion
and out door work - an unusual thing altogether
- and remarked (badly on that portion of the
work) he did a lot of hard work there, and
he also received the Commendation from the
two Inspectors Messrs Aramada Azcayr
and Sheahagiri Rau. From September 1896
to February 1897 your Political Service at
Changshet District, and also got the Com-
- mendation from the Inspector Mr. Smith
then. All these (except those of Messrs Main-
warring and Russell) have been shown in para
36 and Appendix D of the Memorial to which
a reference may be made. Notwithstanding
all these very ~~long~~ ^{uninterrupted} Com-
mendations of work your Political has been
kept down by the Dy Commissioner Messrs
Merriman & Fowler by finding faults. On
a ^{personal} perusal of para 34 and Appendix C
of the Memorial the ~~reaps~~ ^{means} re-
solved to by them for finding faults will
not come themselves to your Excellency.
The Board themselves in para 7 of their dis-
- cretary order admit the good work done
by your Political in the following words "Mr
Vass's work at Pandraba received the Commen-
dation of the Assistant Commissioner in
1894, and more recently three
written favourably regarding
him". This is the Board comes
The whole perusal of the
two Commissions.

to March 1894, previously to joining Krishna-
patam. Therefore your Excellency may now be
pleased to see, that in your Petitioner's case,
failure to get a promotion will not necessarily
imply that he was not doing good work in the
past before joining Krishnapatam, and on
the other hand there is conclusive proof
that he was really doing good work in every
place he was posted to, and therefore
there must be something wrong somewhere.
Your Petitioner will now clearly place before
your Excellency the reason why he did not
get a promotion after 1891 notwithstanding
the Commendations received. The facts are
these: Mr J. P. Wright the Dy. Commis-
sioner (who visited Pandraka twice between October
1891 and August 1892 after Krishna District
was formed into a Sub Division and given
over to him -) who promised double promotion
to your Petitioner for the exceptionally good
work done at Pandraka, when there was so
much talk of closing the factory before
the Sub Division was formed died in 1892.
He was succeeded by Mr Fowler as Acting
Commissioner, during this time Mr
Hawkins the Asst. Assistant Commissioner of
Mysalipatam at your Petitioner's Rajpetit
recommended to Government that the 1893
Salt of Pandraka made during Mr Mar-
tin's tenure of office as Dy. Commissioner
of Pandraka should be taken into consideration
as the best. This

Government passed their order sanctioning
 destruction of 1889 salt with remarks. This
 hurt Mr Merriam's feelings. Mr Foster had
 to report and Mr Merriam came back as
 the Dy Commissioner of Paudraka again, Mr
 Merriam at once ordered to stop the des-
 truction of 1889 salt in anticipation of
 sanction from Government; and reported
 favorably about the 1889 salt and had the
 Government order sanctioning destruction
 cancelled in 1893. The Board was at last
 satisfied that the 1889 salt of Paudraka was
 very bad and the Government was finally
 asked to sanction its destruction in 1897
 again. Mr Merriam had even got sanction
 from the Board about 1889 salt, he ordered
 that the 1889 salt should be sold in con-
 junction with other salt in certain pro-
 portion, the Board questioned his authority to
 do so and did put a stop to the practice.
 Your Petitioner must humbly beg to mention
 some minor facts which conclusively prove
 that the Dy Commissioner Mr Merriam had
 really a very great dislike against your
 Petitioner on account of 1889 salt of Paudraka.
 After Mr McMeekin's Scheme of Construc-
 tion of a new set of pans altogether and abandon-
 the manufacture of salt in the old pans
 was sanctioned in 1893 - the scheme was
 worked out by your Petitioner. Your Petitioner
 is fully satisfied that the scheme was
 as in the interest of the Government.

be possible to manufacture Salt in the near-
set of pans in the first year of its Construc-
tion as this work will not be than complete,
and that the Manufacture should go on in the
old lines. The Dy Commissioner Mr. Merriam
Sanctioned this proposal in these words:
Manufacture at Pandraka will proceed
on the old lines next season, and work can
be commenced as usual in anticipation of
Sanction of Estimate which should however
be sent in without delay." in his letter No
5359 dated 30th November 1893, but in doing
so he remarked against your Petitioner in these
words: "Mr. Vas had been eminently success-
ful at the factory since he joined it and it
is time to alter matters." Notwithstanding
the Commendations received by him from
Messrs Mc Murdo & Poole in April 1893
(Appendix D). The work commenced under the
supervision of your Petitioner and was in
very rapid progress, the Assistant Mr.
Poole when he took charge of the factory
reported in A3, and also in his own diary that
goes to the Dy Commissioner, that "this year
the works for manufacture are far ahead
of those of previous years". Your Petitioner
work also received the Commendation from
the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Russell in
February 1894, on a visit to the factory he
(Mr. Russell) remarked in connection with
the work that in his opinion "Mr. Vas was doing
as in his own lines." This

The estimates were sent up in the usual manner but the Dy Commissioner Mr. Merriam in forwarding them to the Board in 1894 remarked against your Petitioner to the effect that "Mr. Ves is a useless delatory Officer, I have not seen him, I shall be shortly going to Pandraka for inspection and then I will be able to form a correct estimate of his abilities and report the result to the Board" (the quotations are not exact words but come thing approaching them, the Board may kindly quote the exact words against this, Copy of the Dy Commissioner's above letter ^{to the} Board was communicated to the Petitioner). Your Petitioner is glad to say that when the Dy. Commissioner Mr. Merriam was on his way to Pandraka for inspection, he (petitioner) got a transfer order to the Southern Division from the Board to proceed expeditiously and so the Dy Commissioner Mr. Merriam and your Petitioner did not meet each other. Hence it is conclusively proved that the Dy Commissioner Mr. Merriam was unjustly remarking against your Petitioner without any reason at all. The reason why your Petitioner did not get a promotion at Pandraka notwithstanding the strong commendations received and unparelled good work done during 1893 or 1894 is very easily explained. The hard and good work done at Pandraka was thus thrown away, your Petitioner most humbly begs leave to say that ^{as in} two corrections. Yours truly

Condition by improving the quality of Salt, and
also at a time when they came to a Conclusion
That all attempts to improve the quality of Salt
are in vain for the heavy additional expense
on works will be hardly paying. I spared no
pains in the direction of both mental and
bodily exertions and I got out the plans to
improve the quality of Salt, and I improved the
quality of Salt and made it as good as "Ranby
Salt" and "Mr McHester" planned at the
future factory at Pandroka and according
to his plans I surveyed and levelled and
prepared estimates to the best of his satisfac-
tion in the least possible time. It was a very
heavy and unpleasant work for the
wade through mire and water, miles and miles.
The strain on my system was so much that
immediately afterwards when I went to the
Doctor for insurance he had to reject my
life for a period of 6 months. The estimates
were subsequently sanctioned and the work
when I left Pandroka was almost brought
to a point of completion by me" (Ref. Para.
3c.d of Petitioner's appeal petition to Board in
1894). Your Petitioner most humbly begs
to give here the remarks by the Superior
at Pandroka. (1) Mr Postle who was the Surveyor
or the Assistant Commissioner of Pandroka
during the whole time your Petitioner was
there (from July 1891 to March 1894) wrote
thus in his report dated 13th Nov 1894

Your Petitioner request viz "Results are not
 lost sight of and will be placed before the
 A.C. on his inspection" "A.C. on your inspec-
 tion of the factory full particulars will be
 given I think it would then have a better
 effect with the D.C."; In 1892 Mr. Marshall
 Assistant Commissioner Mr. Mainwaring writes in
 these words "This is not the time or place
 to ask I shall judge from results". In April
 1893 Assistant Commissioner Mr. Mac Martin writes
 "I hope so. I am sure and trust the Inspector
 will think so too, that he sees the results" "If
 Mr. Poole can make out a good case for Assis-
 tant Inspector's promotion I have no objection
 to sending him on to Dy Commissioner". In January
 1894 Assistant Commissioner Mr. St John writes
 "Stick to your work as you are now doing so
 that the work he, at the factory this year may
 rebound to your credit" "I am very pleased
 to see the vigour and general improvement in
 Mr. Vass's work and have informed the Dy
 Commissioner accordingly" In February 1894
 Assistant Commissioner Mr. Russell writes
 "Mr. Vass ^{was} doing his best" (Ref appendix D
 and inspection remarks). Your Petitioner most
 humbly begs to state that the above facts
 clearly prove that "Mr. Vass" was not a meddling
 Officer as Mr. Merriam reported to the Board
 and that the report was an outcome of dislike
 and bias. Messrs Merriam and Fisher both
 being ^{men} ~~men~~ ^{with} a strong dislike to the
 two corrections.

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

Petitioner also had the misfortune to serve under the very same officers from October 1892 to March 1897. Mr Fowler had also said many things against your Petitioner which will not be dealt with here to save time and space. They unjustly reported your Petitioner for punishment and did not send his name to the Board for promotion. The punishment awarded at Pandroche was without your Petitioner's knowledge as shown in appendix C of the N. M. L. Your Petitioner was superseded by Leon of officers and his brother officers promoted with him in 1891 are now respectively first grade in the 250. Your Petitioner was thus punished and superseded for no other reason than doing his work ably and honestly before God and man. The Board was not aware of all these facts and the reason why your Petitioner's name was not sent up for promotion. Your Petitioner made three applications for promotion in 1894, 95, 96, respectively through Mr Fowler, but it is a remarkable and strange fact that no endorsement has been received from the Board to any of them whereas other officers who make appeals for promotion are always favored with a reply. Messrs Morrison & Fowler opposed your Petitioner and the reason why he did not get promotion in 1895, 96 is clearly seen.

[Faint handwritten text at the bottom of the page, possibly a signature or additional notes.]

reasons. The first permit (awarded at Pandora in 1893) was not communicated to him and his appeal was not possible, as your Petitioner was waiting for a copy from Board for his permit. Appeal petition he did not appeal against the permit awarded at Canaan in 1896 communicated to him in June, and besides that the papers connected with the permit were not supplied then or even afterwards when asked (Ref Appendix C). The third permit was communicated about the end of August 1897 - at a time when the petitioner was sick and also detained in Enquiries conducted by Mr Simpson in September and October, and by the Board in November, and by the Dy Commissioner in December. As the Dismissal order of the Board itself is dated 24th December, and therefore your Petitioner had no opportunity to appeal.

10 Your Petitioner begs most respectfully to state that it has been clearly explained in para 8 of the Memorial that the widow's work was ^{the} not done. Therefore when the work itself was not neglected or allowed to suffer then your Petitioner cannot be said to have been guilty of neglect of widow's work. The Dy Commissioner's remarks on your Petitioner's widow's work are misleading any reader who is not conversant with the practical work of the Department. Your Petitioner therefore wishes to place before you a list of the names of the widows who have been allowed to continue in the service of the Department.

of the Presidency in the execution of the widow
J.S. work. Your Excellency will then be able to
form a right estimate of your Politician's neglect
of widow J.S. work. The widow J.S. work is
both executive and clerical. The clerical por-
tion of the work consists of writing licenses and
permits, and writing the registers J.S. 8, J.S. 8a;
J.S. 9, J.S. diary and making up monthly accounts
and returns. The licenses and permits and J.S. 8
and J.S. 8a are written almost daily as J.S. 6
applications from the Treasury come in. But J.S. 9
and J.S. diary, are written once in every month,
which are nothing but fair copies, - for office
use - of monthly returns and licenses that J.S. 9 is
a very neat bound book. Your Politician
now without any fear of even the slightest
contradiction goes to state that in all the
J.S. Circle of the Presidency - without any ex-
ception in the ~~Presidential~~ or J.S. Assistant
Secretaries (for they are one and the same) do
no clerical portion of the J.S. widow work, but
they attend only to the executive portion of
the J.S. widow work, which is very heavy in itself
and enough to keep them fully occupied.
Licenses and permits are invariably written
up only by the Vernacular kind of persons.
Not even the clerks and never at all by J.S.
Assistant ~~Secretaries~~ and J.S. 8, J.S. 8a, J.S. 9,
J.S. Diary are all written up by the clerks and
by the ~~persons~~ who make up the monthly ac-
counts. ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~persons~~ ~~who~~ ~~make~~ ~~up~~ ~~the~~ ~~monthly~~ ~~accounts~~
Two corrections. ~~the~~ ~~persons~~ ~~who~~ ~~make~~ ~~up~~ ~~the~~ ~~monthly~~ ~~accounts~~

Board, Collector of the District, and the Assistant
 - and Commissioner direct by the S.T. Assistant
 Suspect Separately. Your Petitioner was not
 known to S.T. at Krishnapetam, he was a S.T. Minister
 - and Inspector of Calicut Circle in 1890 where
 his in-door S.T. work received full accommodation,
 though he never did in his own hand the Clerical
 portion of it and he received a promotion in
 April 1891, he has also served in many S.T. circles.
 The Board might not be aware of the above proce-
 -dure. The Dy Commissioner - who is expected
 to inspect the S.T. Circles - was fully aware of the
 above procedure followed in his Sub Divisions
 at least, and he does not inform ^{the} the Board of
 the same, but on the contrary he frames his report
 in such a way as to give any reader to understand
 that your Petitioner should have done the whole of
 the Clerical in-door S.T. work in his own hand.
 Your Petitioner presumes that the Government
 must have come to the same conclusion while
 perusing the Dy Commissioner's Report (P. 7).
 Your Petitioner must humbly beg to state that the
 statements taken from him slice by slice by
 the Dy Commissioner by "Set" questions without
 any qualification, explanation, correction
 his report, therefore the Dy Commissioner
 was not justified in taking down such a
 statement, but your Petitioner was bound to
 answer in the form "yes" or "no" such a
 question to avoid being discredited.
 As to the Dy Commissioner's

Your Petitioner most respectfully draws your
 Excellency's attention to the fact, ^{that} if the facts
 to write up licenses and permits 1778, and 1779
 1779 and 1780; in the Officers own hand is
 considered as a neglect of the indoor S.T. work,
 as the Dy Commissioner in this particular case
 — in order to prove neglect of indoor work. by
 Your Petitioner — makes out, that it clearly
 of others that all the other remaining eighty two
 S.T. Officers have also neglected their indoor
 S.T. work, a fact which in itself is very strong.
 Therefore it is conclusively proved that even
 in case your Petitioner had not done any in-
 door S.T. Clerical work in his own hand, he
 could not have been held guilty by the Dy Com-
 — missioner of neglect of S.T. indoor work, as
 the Officers in the Presidency are only required by
 the Board to do the executive portion of the
 S.T. indoor work — which in itself is very heavy —
 and not the Clerical portion of it. Hence it is
 conclusively proved that the misleading statement
 made by the Dy Commissioner in these words "the
 indoor work + + + the work has not been very bad
 done, but I fear her has is not entitled to any credit
 for this fact." wholly fails. (para 3 & 35)

11 The Clerical portion of
 S.T. indoor work is very heavy, lengthy, tedious,
 and difficult. The Board is fully aware of this
 and after sympathizing with the S.T. Officers
 and then wants to

The Board have sanctioned a 2nd clerk for every 2nd Circle on a higher pay of Rs 20 & Rs 25 as no paid Candidate will come to heavy work on a small salary. The Dy Commissioner was fully aware of Board's proceedings No. 128 15-3-97; 374 2-9-97; 77 3-3-94; 494 18-10-93 which admit that the 2nd clerical work in the Presidency is very heavy and should be mitigated. The Commissioner is also aware that Krishna-pati Circle forms a part of the Presidency. The Deputy Commissioner was also aware of the Board's Proceedings No. 433 dated 16th September 1893 which Communicate G.O. No. 817 Rev dated 13th September 1893, sanctioning a 2nd clerk on Rs 20 for Krishna-pati Circle. But the Dy Commissioner in para 4 of his letter (Enc 35) in speaking about the clerk says "but he could quite well do the work of one" at the introduction of the 2nd Septem in 1893 it was admitted by the then Dy Commissioner that the widow 2nd work at Krishna-pati Circle could not be done by the 2nd officer alone - who ever he might hope to be - and therefore a clerk was necessary. The Dy Commissioner was also aware that the 2nd clerks are men on high pay of Rs 20 and 25 per month. Therefore it is conclusively proved that the Dy Commissioner was not justified in making out - for the purpose of getting out a case of neglect against your Petitioner -

work alone, out of eighty three I T circles
the Presidency, was not heavy. A fact
which in itself is very strange. However
in the face of Board Proceedings N^o $\frac{403}{16-9-95}$
Communicating G.O. N^o $\frac{817}{13-9-93}$ Rec: The Dy Com
missioner was not justified in making the
following assertion to the Board viz "It is true
that he is entitled to a Clerk. + + The suspect
has arranged that he should have the Council
paid Clerk in the Circle, and no paid Candi-
date can be found to accept the appoint-
ment" (line 35) and leaving the suspect alone
without ~~without~~ ^{the} even taking any note of
his extremely high handed and mean ^{and} action,
when the matter came to light.
Only possible use of this assertion was to
on the reader - who is not aware that a
high paid I T Clerk ~~was~~ ^{has} already
been appointed - The good nature of the suspect
Mr. Davies.

12 The Dy Commissioner's
Statement to the effect that your Petitioner's
Predecessor did the I T Clerical work himself
as set forth in these lines "in fact his pre-
decessor did it" (para 3 line 35) has not even
got the Board's approval and has been
bracketed aside by them in these words "The
much or little of his predecessors is not in
question" (para 5 line 1) Hence it will be
a waste of time to go into the details ^{of the}
to set a point which is not at issue.

The Commissioner. D. Davies

but suffice it to say that your Petitioner's
Predecessor (not predecessors) did not
the whole of it as alleged by the Dy Commissioner
and that your Petitioner's other predecessor
— who always had a clerk with them — never
did it, but your Petitioner who had no clerk
did at least some of it, as admitted by the
Dy Commissioner in these lines "The Dy
Commissioner has occasionally written up himself"

13 The Dy Commissioner's
Assertion in para 3 (Ln 35) — That he saw
some of the Drafts were in the hand writing
of the Sub-Inspector therefore they are not the
productions of your Petitioner — proves
nothing. Your Petitioner begs to state that in
this particular case they were either the
fair copies of the original manuscripts
as in the case of "779 and 77 Diary" or
they are Drafts dictated as in case of "Sales"
but in either case they are the sole produc-
tions of your Petitioner. On the 9th of December
the Dy Commissioner has taken down the following
Statement from your Petitioner viz "The Sub-
Inspector writes my 779 and 77 Diary always
We Draft it jointly" (lines 106 to 108 Ln 30) and "The
Drafts shown as written from me were dictated
I dictated from notes. I cannot show any of
my notes as I keep none of them. I can't re-
member that the latter proposition was" (lines 11
121 Ln 30) in the presence of the Sub-Inspector
As long as the Dy Commissioner did not self

30

Call on the Sub-district to refute your
 Petitioner's Statement that the 779 and 77
 diary were drafted jointly, at a time, when he
 called on him to refute the other statement, and
 therefore it is clear that it was then admitted
 the Dy Commissioner that the original Manu-
 -pts of the 779 and 77 diary were the /
 tions of your Petitioner, 779 is not a trans-
 book, but a printed and bound book for of-
 use, and also a neat office copy and 77 diary
 is a similar book though not printed. I think
 it is conclusively proved that 779 and 77 diary
 are fair copies for office use, copied into the
 neat books by the Sub-district from the ori-
 ginal manuscripts of your Petitioner. It will
 take about two hours - each month - to write these
 779 and 77 diary books. Signing 779 book is
 optional and not compulsory, whereas signing
 is compulsory, it is distinctly stated in the Cir-
 cular orders of the Board of Revenue. There is
 no reason why 779 alone should be signed
 more than why 77 diary 778, 778a need not
 be signed. As for the second point,
 your Petitioner most respectfully begs to state
 that the particular draft in question, of which
 the Sub-district - brought forward by the
 District - was prepared to give the contents
 in detail and verbatim as being very fresh
 in his memory on the 9th of December 1877
 the draft itself was made on 12th July, 1877
 and the Sub-district has well known
 the correctness of the same.

interested, and which formed a part of Math-
 Pals and one about which there was a long
 Correspondence between your Petitioner and
 The Director on the subject of not attending
 Math Pals. Your Petitioner begs to state
 that this draft and the file was with the
 -lor and the Sub Director - who was in
 need of the Dy Commissioner - was also
 the Director that day. Your Petitioner was
 only able to give the general outline and
 principle on which the Draft was made and
 not the names of places mentioned in the
 Draft as clearly seen from these lines "I do
 not remember any of the names mentioned in
 it, it was simply a compilation of the reports
 of Sub Directors" (104 to 106 En 30, Note Math Pals
 Pals 100 to 106 line and 1077 proposals line 1 are the
 and the same); The Dy Commissioner did not
 make the Sub Director to repeat the Draft
 and marked your Petitioner's request. If the
 request was allowed your Petitioner would have
 clearly proved that this was a false charge
 got up by the Director, he would have made
 the Sub Director to give a list of his names
 in repeating the contents of the Kings which
 he himself had written & requested to
 this draft about his own drafts. The draft
 of the Dy Commissioner's Report N E ⁶³
 (En 24) Shown to your Petitioner by the
 Commissioner himself in November 1897 -
 is called the Board was not in self
 one correction.

Dry Commissioner's hand writing, but it is
 like his own production, and in this particular
 case the draft must have been either fair
 copied or dictated. The following is the
 statement taken from your petition by the
 Commissioner on the 9th of December viz "All the
 drafts shown as written for me were dictated
 & dictated from notes. + + I cannot be certain
 what the latter proposals were (the Sub Inspector
 who is present states that he wrote the proposals
 and is prepared to say what they were)" (Lam 118 & 123
 & 30) and the Dry Commissioner's report from
 Subsequent, to this statement, on 14th December
 runs thus viz "As for the reports + + + and
 the rest have been written for him by the
 Inspector of the Gudur Range. He alleges that
 he dictated them, but, as he is quite ignorant
 of their contents, while the Sub Inspector
 who knows all about them, denies the truth
 of the allegations, I cannot accept it" (L 35)
 This is a serious misrepresentation of facts
 on the part of the Dry Commissioner, for it is
 clear that the Sub Inspector was able to give
 the contents of only one particular draft viz
 "D.D. proposals" (and that paper solely
 refers to Muthukar sales in which the Inspector
 was interested against your petition) and
 not of other drafts.

14 The Dry Commissioner
 in para 3 of his letter (L 35) says "The Register
 - has been accessioned & written up himself"

and thereby admits that your Petitioner at least did some portion of the JY widow's work, whereas the remaining other 82 JY officers of the Presidency never wrote even a part of the JY Registers than as above. Properly speaking the JY widow's work of the Krishna-palan Circle should have been attended to by your Petitioner and an able Clerk on the 20 per month. But the Clerk was wrongly made use of by the Deputy himself and hence the clerical portion of the work also devolved on your Petitioner. The Deputy did not at all give your Petitioner's Clerk a hint even for a single minute out of 256 days your Petitioner was a JY Assistant Deputy of Krishna-palan Circle. Out of ten Sub-deputies sanctioned for Circle, your Petitioner only made use of two Sub-deputies with permission (para 9). As explained in para 8 of the memorial, the Dy Commissioner in taking down the statement of your Petitioner on 14th December made an attempt to prove that Mr. Thekur Rao Sub-deputy was also made use of by your Petitioner, but the attempt failed, as the lines "I thought it was the duty of the Gudur Sub-deputy" (lines 179-180 in 30 clearly prove. Therefore the Dy Commissioner's assertion "He has interfered with the work of most of them to a considerable extent in order that they may do his own" (para 10) is misleading. The Gudur Sub-deputy

one correction.

himself might have called for 100 days at
Gadur, but it does not necessarily follow that
he so called solely on account of your Petition
Gadur is his (Sub Inspector) Head quarters
and the Centre of Communication of his Range
and also of the whole Circle, and a place
through which the Superior Officers of the De-
partment constantly pass and on whom he
is bound to attend, and it is also the Head
quarters of the Stationary Sub Magistrate here.
Whom the Sub Inspector is bound to attend
for his Dees, therefore the Dy Commissioner
Assertion "The Gadur Sub Inspector had
been kept nearly half his time dancing at
- audience on him in this way" (p. 35 para 6) is
misleading. The Dy Commissioner cannot
allege that the Sub Inspector would not
have at all called at Gadur in case your
Petitioner was not a Dy Assistant Inspector
there. Gadur Sub Inspector was made use
of by your Petitioner on 43 days - in the ab-
sence of the Clerk whom the Inspector may
make use of - out of 256 days (Dy Com figures
at the enquiry and para 2 p. 31), in these 43 days
the Sub Inspector also did his own work. It
has been also proved in para 8 of the Memo-
rial that this occasional use of the Stationary
Inspectors with permission has not in any
way interfered with their legitimate work.
So the advocate that your Petitioner really
named so - the Sub Inspector on the
one Commission D. No. 10th

43 days would not be equal to the advantage
he (Petitioner) would have had if he had
his own Clerk, who was wretchedly made use of
by the Inspector, & evidently a Clerk in the 20
would be decidedly far superior to a
Sub Inspector in Clerical work. Under these
Circumstances your Petitioner most humbly
begs to represent that it is conclusively
proved, that he was overworked in his own
legitimate sphere of ST indoor work. As
long as the ST indoor work turned out as
good as shown in para 8 of the Memorial, your
Petitioner was entitled to credit of doing
ST indoor work single handed (with some
occasional assistance with permission), which
would have been in the ordinary course of
business done by him and a Clerk in the 20
— and is so done in the other remaining copies
— two ST Circles — and that therefore the
Day Commissioners' strictures passed on your
Petitioner's indoor work are unjust. Your
Petitioner begs to state, that he was not
only thus overworked in his own legiti-
mate sphere of ST indoor work, but he was
also overworked by the Inspectors giving
him additional work which did not legiti-
mately belong to your Petitioner as shown
in para 33 of the Memorial, and his work
was also greatly interfered with by the en-
quiries started against him. Your Petitioner
respects the Sub Inspector's Office & the Inspector's Office.

as shown in para 38 of the Memorial. Under the above circumstances it was wholly impossible to do the indoor & T. clerical work without some assistance. The Board's impression that your Petition was dependent on the Sub-dispensing been. Your Petition was ignorant of toluque. As set forth in para 5 of their dismissal order is thus proved to be wrong. The Board's impression set forth in the following lines viz "getting the Sub-dispensing to do it in spite of orders which confined them to their legitimate work" (para 2 En 1) has been already proved to be wrong in Para 8 of the Memorial. The rest of the matter has been explained in para 8 of the Memorial.

15 Your Petition most respectfully begs to state that the outdoor work also was not neglected. The principle of outdoor work is - in case of officers having offices - that the ~~indoor~~ indoor work should be first attended to, and the outdoor work should be attended to only in case there is time to do so. There is no exception to the above rule. The limit of the work to be done is not defined any where, it only depends on the time left at the disposal of each officer after attending to indoor work. Weekly disburse and monthly returns are the only two things that clearly show this and there-

one correction. D. M. W. 1

whether or not - taking other work into Consideration - The Officer concerned did not - except outdoor work. The absence of any remarks in the Diary or monthly returns will conclusively prove that the out-door work reported then and there was considered as satisfactory taking other work into Consideration. It would be unreasonable to suppose that any Superior Officer would remark against any Officer's diary on outdoor work without taking the indoor work into Consideration. Your Petitioner was a District Officer in Pune in 1888 and a J.T. Assistant District Officer in Calcutta in 1890, in both the places he did no outdoor work - for very heavy indoor work took all his time - and he received no censure on this account on his diaries, but on the contrary his work received Commendation and he was promoted in 1889 and 1891 April. From the statement of the District Officer Mr. James before the Dy Commissioner it is perfectly clear that he says he was fully aware at the very commencement of his taking charge that your Petitioner was neglecting work for he says "I have been in charge of this Circle since the 10th July. I did not meet Mr. V. till the 8th August. In the interim I had heard accounts of his inactivity. ++ I met him at G. and as he had received an Engineering training I gave him a map to do which the Assistant

one correction. D. A. M. 11/11/11

Commissioner required. I failed to get the map from him; and was obliged to send my third reminder to him. Through the Assistant Commissioner. At the same time in my letter No 1357 dated 29-8-97 in connection with this matter I informed the Assistant Commissioner, that Mr Simpson was working most unsatisfactorily. I based my opinion on his work generally (En 33). I think it is reasonable to suppose that the Inspector Mr James being fully aware of the existing nature of things at the very commencement of taking charge was thus placed in a better position to find flaws in your Politician's work, and notice any neglect if there was really any. There were no remarks against your Politician's outdoor work either by the Assistant Commissioner or the Inspector Mr James. Mr Simpson is an Officer of long standing and well experienced and fully knows how much outdoor work could be expected from each Officer while perusing their weekly diaries and monthly returns, taking other work done into consideration of course. He has dealt with many Officers other than your Politician. The Inspector Mr James was not a new comee to the Department, he was himself an Assistant Inspector for a long time long. He was placed in charge of the Bhubaneswar Circle, he knew fully well how much he did and how much he could expect from others. And he also knew fully well as he says that

no correction. I am with

57
 Your Petitioner was neglecting his work. Therefore the absence of the remarks by him on your Petitioner's outdoor work is a Con-
-sistent proof, that the outdoor work was neglected by your Petitioner, but attended to as far as possible Consistently with the other work done during the same period. Your Petitioner most respectfully begs to state that more outdoor work was not possible under any circumstances whatever for the following reasons (1) Heavy & violent work entailed on account of the suspect's conduct in wrongly taking away Petitioner's clock for his own unauthorized use. (2) Extra work that was not legitimately his but given to him by the Suspect as shown in para 33 of the Memorial (3) Time taken up by Enquiries (4) Sickness and malaria as shown in para 38 of the Memorial. Your Petitioner also begs to state, that if the clock was not wrongly made use of by the suspect he would have had more time at his disposal for more outdoor work, being relieved of ^{the} some portion of indoor work, therefore the fault lies with the Suspect. The rest has been explained in paras 9 to 14 inclusive of the Memorial.

16 Your Petitioner most humbly begs to state that the suspect Mr James took charge on the 10th July, and after the first rains had set in, and therefore there

One mistake August 1

was no room for him to remark against your
 Petitioner's inspection of Saline Soils - even if
 in case your Petitioner had time at his disposal
 to inspect them - as Saline Soils are only
 inspected during the hot weather and not
 at other times of the year. The rest has been
 explained in para 10 of the Memorial.

17 Your Petitioner most humbly
 begs to draw your Excellency's attention to
 the Statement, made by the Assistant Deputy
 in Charge Mr James before the Dy Commissioner
 which had caused the Dy Commissioner and
 the Board to form an entirely erroneous
 idea of the whole matter and ended in the
 dismissal of your Petitioner. Mr James
 had deliberately supplied false informa-
 -tion to the Board as regards your Petitioner's
 intemperate habits and has thus committed
 an offence punishable under Sec 182 of
 I.P.C as could be very easily proved from
 the following facts. Mr James says "I
 had formerly told the Assistant Commissioner
 that Mr Millie a railway Contractor and
 a Mr Coghlan a local fund Supervisor had
 both told me that they had seen Mr Vee the
 woman for liquor and get them questioned
 by the A.C. They stated that they had not
 told me so" (p 33) From this Statement
 of his it is very clear that he was seeking
 your Petitioner and collecting information
 as regards his intemperate habits.
 No corrections

during the inquiry by the Assistant Commissioner against your Petitioner, and giving out the same to the Assistant Commissioner. That he was not at all required to do so, and further his statement which says "I met Mr. Lee again on the 4th or 5th of Dec. at Dargalajapalam at 7 or 8 AM. I did not think Mr. Lee perfectly sober, but when I asked his men if they would corroborate me if I reported the matter they declined to do so. They were Mr. Mc Murray (not Assistant Magistrate of Dargalajapalam) facting house ^{Mr. James's} subordinate) and Mr. White the light house Superintendent. As I would not have been able to substantiate my statement, I did not report it." (Ex 33) which clearly shows that Mr. James took great interest - unsolicited for - in establishing your Petitioner's intemperate habits, and also had a great determination to do so, and all this happened previous to the Dy Commissioner's inquiry. Now the Board in their first order required from the Assistant Commissioner and the Deputy Mr. James a report based on their own observation of the man for they say "and to receive from his brother and Assistant Commissioner reports based on their own observation of the man" (Ex 28). This order of the Board reached Mr. James on the 4th of December through the Dy Commissioner direct, his statement before the Dy Commissioner is dated 14th December. There was an interval of ten days, and sufficient time to allow Mr. James to make his statement.

him to give the 2 parts of his own observations
of the man. Met your Petitioner on 13th
(Thirteen), different occasions, as shown in
para 26 of the Memorial and Appendix B of
the same, at different hours of day and night,
yet in his statement before the Dy Commissioner
— that he was ordered by the Board to speak
nothing but truth — he says that he met your
Petitioner only twice. He is very distinct and
sure about these meetings and also gives a
vivid description of each, he says "I have
been in the charge of this Circle since the 10th
July. I did not meet Mr Vas till the 8th August. In
the interim I had heard accounts of his inten-
perance + + I met him at Gudur. As he had an
Engineering training I gave him a map of the
which the Assistant Commissioner required" "I
met Mr Vas again on the 4th or 5th October at
Durgaraja station at 7 or 8 AM. I did not think
Mr Vas perfectly sober, but when I asked
two men if they would corroborate me if I re-
ported the matter they declined to do so. They
were Mr Mc Murray and Mr White light house
Superintendent. As I would not have been able
to substantiate my statement I did not re-
port it." (Para 33) And again when questioned
by the Dy Commissioner whether he was aware
personally or otherwise, that your Petitioner
and his family were suffering from malaria
Mr Vas again qualifies the above two
meetings and states that "Mr Vas was
Mr Vas's son."

on the two occasions on which I saw him
 one of dysentery and one of lumbago. I can
 say whether he was really suffering from those
 diseases. I know nothing about his family
 being ill. They left shortly after I came to the
 Circle". From the above statement it is con-
 clusively proved that Mr Vance had delib-
 -ately made a false statement viz That he
 has met your Politician only twice. In fact
 he has also met your Politician on four dif-
 -ferent occasions between his alleged first
 and second meetings, as shown by the Memo-
 rial clearly proves it. The object of Mr Vance
 in suppressing the other eleven meetings was
 to exaggerate your Politician's alleged intem-
 perate habits, with a false plea that he had no leisure
 for a more extensive personal observation and
 secondly to conceal the important fact of
 your Politician's suffering from malaria, which
 Mr Vance had himself observed during the
 meetings

18 Your Politician not except-
 ing to state that in addition to the above men-
 tioned matters, there are some other minor
 points in Mr Vance's statement which prove
 that his statement (No 33) is not worth credit. In
 speaking about your Politician's family he says
 "They left shortly after I came to the Circle"
 This is not a fact, Mr Vance took charge on
 the 10th July and your Politician's family
 left on the 21st of June so could be proved

No corrections D. M. 11

from railway luggage lockers at Gaden. Mr. James says "I know nothing about his father being ill. ^{left} Shortly after I came to the end of this statement of his is certainly disingenuous, for he knows that your Politician's family has left the place and also knows the time of their leaving but does not know the reason of their leaving, and again the lady Mrs. Van has complained on the two occasions on which I saw him once of dysentery and once of lumbago. I cannot say whether he was really suffering from these diseases" are also of a similar nature. The rest of the matter has been explained in para 26 of the Memorial.

19 Your Politician most kindly begs to state that the detective Mr. James in his statement before the Dy Commission says "On the 10th November in connection with comparative figures of 556 results I remarked" do this at once and let this practice of shirking work on your part come to an end". I have not as yet received those comparative figures" (p. 33) and thereby makes a serious charge of neglect of work against your Politician which neglect even hampered him (detective) in his duty. Your Politician begs to state that his failure to maintain a 556 register, and to give comparative figures from the register would not have in any way hampered the detective in his duty, for 556 work does not form a part of his duty, and the information asked

on correction

For by him is of no use to the Board, either
 or Assistant Commissioner, as all the information
 required by them was directly supplied by J.
 Politimer ~~was~~ who was the J.T. Assistant Inspector
 of Leiknapalaam Circle. Jmr Politimer's Office
 and the Inspector's Office were quite distinct
 and separate from each other and the work was
 also independent of each other's. The Inspector
 knows very well that this very heavy task of
 tabulating the old J.T. be could not be done
 without any assistance, and he also knew that
 Jmr Politimer was also working without a clock.
 Under such circumstances it is clearly seen
 that the Inspector's request was really meant
 to worry Jmr Politimer under the show of duty,
 and this alone serious Complaint before the
 Dy Commissioner was frivolous. Jmr Politimer
 must humbly beg to state that the Dy Commis-
 - sioner who was fully aware of the Board's Pro-
 ceedings No 77 dated 3 March 1894 which
 in speaking about the maintenance of 776
 registers says "The maintenance of this and
 other registers not approved by the Board should
 be forth with stopped" (para) and abolishes
 the maintenance of the Registers of J.T. be -
 which the Inspector Mr James wanted Jmr
 Politimer to maintain notwithstanding the Board's
 strict orders to the contrary - did not listen to
 any notice of Inspector's Conduct, though the
 Board had distinctly forbidden the very
 particular J.T. be Register being opened in

Two copies in Jmr's

in order to minimize the work of the Clerk
 but on the contrary the Dy Commissioner
 wanted to make this into a great case of
 neglect and took down the following state-
 ment from your Petitioner in his own hand,
 which says "He has repeatedly called on me
 for comparative figures of the work. I have
 not given them. On my diary for week ending
 9th October he remarked "Corresponding figures
 of last year must be given, are you maintain-
 a register of the work. If not open one at once"
 (lines 241 & 246 & 30). Other frivolous
 complaints by the Inspector Mr James are
 explained in paras 30 and 31 of the Memo-
 rial, it has been already proved in para-
 14 of this petition that the Inspector was wrong
 making use of your Petitioner's Clerk. Under
 such circumstances it is conclusively proved
 that the person hampered in duty was your
 Petitioner and not the Inspector Mr James
 at all, and therefore the Complaints made
 by him (Inspector) were entirely frivolous,
 though they were very strongly supported by
 the Dy Commissioner in these lines "and
 shows Mr James has been labouring under
 very considerable difficulties with such an
 incompetent officer under him" (para 9th & 30).
 It is also observed from paras 14 and 15 of
 this petition that your Petitioner was
 really overworked in every possible way
 as proved by facts - That Mr James

No Complaints

Wm. J. ...

might say - and facts are stubborn things.
 Your Politician begs to state that the Plea
 made of the depositions Mr James
 says "I have remarked on Mr V's poor shape
 inspection, detection, examination of mixed
 topics, and on almost every point on the issues
 which go to the defendant's commission" (p. 33)
 is not at all true if your Politician's memory
 does not fail. Your Politician begs to state
 that his predecessor had six orders
 but Mr James cut down his number to four
 on the ground that the sanctioned strength was
 only four and that he had no authority to
 give him six - it has been clearly seen on
 in the case of the Clerk that Mr James had
 very little regard for authority - all the Poli-
 tician's predecessors and the Politician himself
 had two orders knowing persons to write
 licenses and permits, but Mr James reduced
 his number to one, and thereby caused great
 deal of inconvenience to duty. Mr James
 and your Politician were not in good terms.
 All these facts conclusively prove
 that Mr James was really trying his best
 in all directions to hamper your Politician
 in duty, and that your Politician was
 really hampered in duty, and not in doing
 Mr James, and therefore the dangerous
 impression given by Mr James to the public
 as set forth in para 6 of this order which
 says "the reports required from the Circles"

no corrections

Suspect and the Assistant Commissioner
 who how the former has been hampered
 in duty by Mr Vas" is wholly wrong.

20. Your Petitioner must respectfully beg to state that as regards his suffering from sickness and malaria the Deputy Commissioner says as follows: "Mr Vas has complained on the two occasions on which I saw him once of dysentery and once of lumbago. I can't say whether he was really suffering from these diseases (En 33), the Dy Commissioner being so biased by Mr Vas's says "His friend the Gudur Hospital Assistant has treated him + + + whether he was really treating him for the results of drunkenness I am unable to ascertain, as he left the place the morning I arrived (para 8 En 35). The Dy Commissioner in the above statement seems to make two allegations viz (1) That the medical treatment was a sham (2) That the Hospital Assistant left Gudur probably to avoid the Dy Commissioner as is implied in the words "The morning I arrived". Your Petitioner begs to state that the Hospital Assistant of Gudur had already stated to the Assistant Commissioner that "I attended Mr Vas and his family several times in Gudur both in the day as well as at night but I never found Mr Vas make for liquor" which statement conclusively proves that he (Hospital Asst) never observed any signs of your Petitioner being ~~drunken~~ ^{drinking}.

One Commissioner (Mr Vas)

Though he was in the habit of attending on
your Politician and his family, therefore the
first allegation by the Dy Commissioner fair
your Politician begs to state that there was no-
thing to prevent the Dy Commissioner from getting
the required information in writing and clearing
his doubt, Judur Hospital Assistant was
not the only medical officer that treated your
Politician but the Medical Officers of Koli
Phikharkoti, Mathurkar, and Vankatagiri had
also treated him, and there was nothing to
prevent the Dy Commissioner from interro-
gating them at least, all of them were at
their post and the Dy Commissioner did visit
Vankatagiri during surgery. From the evidence
it is clear that the Dy Commissioner did ac-
tually interrogate the Acting Hospital As-
sistant of Judur with the following result viz I
have treated Mr. V. myself three times
here and once at Vankatagiri, on both occa-
sions for Dysentery. I can't give the exact
date. I gave him Dover's Powder, bismuth and
Pulvis Kino" (Ex 34). As regards the second
allegation the Dy Commissioner's coming to
Judur and the Hospital Assistant going
away from Judur was synchronous and
precludes nothing, the Hospital Assistant was
given a month's privilege leave to go to his
native place, he was relieved in the course
of business. ^{Politician} left the place after settling
(as is natural) his ^{long} ^{unconvenient} ^{business}
R. L. Corrie

to suppose that he would have been wasting his Privilege leave time at Gadag, in addⁿ to this fact there was no request from the Dy Commissioner to him to stop, hence the second Allegation also fails. Doctor Giffard's Certificate shown in para 38 of the Memorial conclusively proves, that your Petitioner was suffering from Chronic Malaria even on 20-1-98 and ~~that~~ ^{the} ~~Dr. Giffard~~ Dr. Giffard's Bill corroborates it. The Commissioner saw your Petitioner for the first time. Mr James took charge on the 10th July. It is a fact that Mr James was fully aware of your Petitioner suffering from Malaria and therefore he has suppressed the 11 meetings. In April 1897 the Dy Assistant Commissioner Mr Hawkins met your ~~Commissioner~~ ^{Dr.} Petitioner at Koda and he saw that your Petitioner was suffering from Malaria. In June 1897 Inspector Mr Hawkins and the Assistant Commissioner Mr Simpson saw that your Petitioner was suffering from Malaria at Dyke's bund and at Dargarajapalan. In September and October 1897 the Assistant Commissioner Mr Simpson saw that your Petitioner was suffering from Malaria. When he came for enquiry. When your Petitioner went up for 3rd class Terrestrial ticket on 3 January 1898, he was very late for examination, he came after 1 PM. Though his name was repeatedly called

out after 11 A.M.; at which he was refused admission as being very late, but on explanation he was permitted to the President Honorable Mr. Whitcomb (now the Honorable Member of Council) that your Politician was subject to malaria and had an attack of it in the morning, he was allowed admission and he passed the test. Your Politician's wife and three children are still subject to malaria, this fact can be easily verified by Government - if required - from the records of Royapet Hospital and from Messrs W. E. Smith & Co and Duff & Co. Therefore the dangerous impression given by Mr. James to the Board as set forth in para 5 of their order in these words "from which one may safely conclude that Mr. Vas had no serious illness and certainly not the malarial fever of which he has all along made so much in these papers" is completely proved to be wrong.

If your Politician most respectfully begs to state that Mr. James only given out the true facts of the whole case to the Dy Commissioner and the Board, that your Politician would not have been dismissed or the Assistant Commissioner Mr. Chinnappa censured by the Board (para 6 & 1) or the Hospital Assistant of Gudra suspended and what is worse the Dy Commissioner - who then believed him - and the Board would not have

no correction. *W. E. Smith*

been placed in a awkward position, the
fine the nice little game played by Mr. Lane
was very dangerous.

22 Delicta Para 15 of Memorial.
Your Petitioner begs to state that out of 8 cases
then were delicta by his pens in his absence.
Your Petitioner with his pens delicta 8 cases
in 8 months and 20 days whereas his Predecessor
with his pens only delicta two cases in six
months and 15 days. (para 31)

23 Ability to ride, para 17
of Memorial. Your Petitioner begs to state
that on 11-12-97 during their inspection of
tree marking, the Dy Commissioner and your
Petitioner went to a neighboring village in
full gallop for about two miles in search of
a native Doctor to treat a person - who followed
them - who was supposed to be a bika for a real
Cobra. This fact clearly dispenses with the
ride

24 Knowledge of Telugu, para
18 of Memorial. Your Petitioner begs to
state that the Board is misinformed on this
matter. The assistance of the sub-inspector
was not at all sought for Telugu work or
work involving Telugu knowledge, but for
purely English Clerical work. The only Telugu
or Clerical work was writing letters and
permits in Telugu and that was done by a
person as admitted by the Dy Commissioner
(para 35)

no correction.

Am. 11.11.11

Officers Vilelia - Circle viz The Assistant
Commissioners Messrs Hawkins and Simpson
And your Petitioner met both of them. The
Dy Commissioner later your Petitioner's clerk
met in the following way viz "When I was
ordered in to meet the D.C. at Durgajapatam
I went to Durgajapatam to get my 2765
(lines 237 to 239 En 30) as these lines sound
very strange any reader may infer that
your Petitioner's object was to delay meeting
the Dy Commissioner and thus avoid meeting
but the facts are otherwise. Your Petitioner
received a telegram on the 12th evening
in the following terms "Come immediately with
all your records for Dy Commissioner's
inspection" it said not even a word about
renewal of examination, and this telegram
(received before the letter) made your Petitioner
at once go to Durgajapatam to fetch
all his records. Your Petitioner travelled
98 miles by Road in 50 hours (para 16 En 1).
Therefore it is conclusively proved that
your Petitioner had no intention at all of
delaying or avoiding to meet the Dy Com-
missioner and the fault lay with the
Inspector

29. Chaughat affair para
29 of Memorial. Your Petitioner begs to
state that his transfer from Chaughat
District was not at all due to the state-
ment made by the District agent as per
no correction. I am, Sir,

para 7 of (P. 28) may imply. The fact is that your Petitioner's transfer order from Chang & Trika as per is dated 28th January 1897, published in Fort Saint George Gazette Part II page 98 dated 2nd February 1897. The leakage in the vat was discovered by your Petitioner on 24th February 1897, your Petitioner left Changanak in 6th March 1897, and the statement by the District agent was made in the middle of April 1897.

30. Dykes' bond para 30 of Memorial your Petitioner begs to state that the breach of the bond took place about the 12th of May, and the work of tracing the bond made by the Inspector was entrusted to your Petitioner after the breach, and hence the work became doubly difficult.

31. Disposal of Cases para 32 of Memorial. Your Petitioner begs to state that in depreciating his work in these lines "He enquired into Cases on his own. Showing has not taken him fine minutes each, as the accused without exception have admitted their guilt" (para 3 & 35) the Deputy Commissioner has entirely lost sight of para 34 of C.O. 1 of 1891 which clearly says "Inspector must give each Case a very careful consideration, therefore, before determining to prosecute, and must understand that this merits as public servants will, to a large extent, be engaged in the same".

by the standard of the proportion which he may find between the number of cases they prosecute and that of those in which they obtain convictions". Besides that there is no rule that every admitted case should be set up to the Magistrate, and the Magistrate is bound to convict such case.

32 Your Petitioner most respectfully begs to state that the charges of Drunkenness and intemperate habits set forth in Board's final order (No 28) were included in the Memorial - although it was quite unnecessary to do so as they do not form a part of the Board's dismissal order - only to show to your Excellency how the Board were jumping from one charge to another when they found that the desperate attempts made to prove them one by one failed. The lines "It cannot be but such habits - if a fact - are known to Superior Officers and reflected in his general work" (para 7 No 28) clearly prove that the Board admit that the charges have failed, and therefore they want to establish intemperate habits at least by the standard of work done. And it has been shown proved in this petition that your Petitioner's work was well done, and also that your Petitioner was over worked, and it is also proved that your Petitioner was working without a clerk and turning out work, in which the Commissioner himself was unable to find any one wise in the -

not necessary

flame observation as perused in para 8 of the Memorial, therefore it is conclusively proved that Politina had no intemperate habits in him. If your Politina was really slothful, negligent, indifferent and drunken as the Board say on the Dy Commissioner's Authority the state of the Office and work could be easily imagined than described at a time when your Politina had to work without a Clerk. Another test the Board applied to prove intemperate habits was by personal observation, it has been also clearly proved in paras 26 and 27 of the Memorial that the results of personal observation also were in favour of your Politina. It would not be out of place to mention here from memory that Mr Simpson in his Summary - Copy of which was refused by the Board but your Politina was allowed to read it - had already given his Conclusive findings after a very careful judicial enquiry on the five counts brought against your Politina by the Sub Magistrate in his explanation to the Collector (Encls). The counts were (1) That your Politina travelled the very morning (14th June) by the train (2) He travelled in a state of intoxication (3) He came to the Sub Magistrate's house at 8 o'clock that morning. (4) He was in a state of intoxication when he came to the Sub Magistrate's house. (5) That he was in a state of intoxication in the evening, and he again met the Sub Magistrate. His

No correction. Amur...

*The book since the date of the report shows he is sober copy of the report 175/16-17

finding on (1) (3) (4) Counts is that they are "disproved" and on (2) (5) Counts that the Charges are "not proved". Much has been said by the Dy Commissioner in his first report (En 24) about Sub Magistrate's and Railway incidents - notwithstanding Mr Simpson's Summary and the whole evidence before him - Your Petitioner now proposes to deal with that report in order to show to your Excellency that the allegations made by the Dy Commissioner against your Petitioner are mere speculations and not borne out by any evidence before him, for fear that on reading that report (En 24) your Excellency may suspect your Petitioner.

33 Your Petitioner most respectfully begs to state that the Dy Commissioner in para 3 of his letter N^o C ⁶³/₉₋₁₁₋₉₇ (En ²⁴/₂₄) makes a misleading assertion to the effect that the assistance sought for by your Petitioner from the Station-house-Officer and the Sub-Magistrate was to compel his peons to do menial work. But the facts are otherwise. The evidence of the Petitioner and his witnesses - it is unnecessary to quote here in order to save time and space - clearly points out that there was no question at all of enforcing menial work from the peons, that there was an ordinary request as usual. In addition to the above fact, the Sub-Magistrate himself in his explanation to the Collector (para 143 in the correction) says that the

Days" the assistant Inspector came to my house
 and asked me to give him help, because his
 peers wanted to meet him " he again says
 that his peers were preparing to meet him".
 From the above statement of the Sub Magistrate
 himself - & the Collector - it is clear that the
 attendance sought for from him by your Petitioner
 on both the occasions he met him viz at 1 PM
 and 6 PM was not at all to enforce criminal
 work from his peers, though the reason assigned
 by the Sub Magistrate to the Collector is also not
 true. The Station Line Officer in his State-
 ment says " At about 12 o'clock the same
 day Mr. Vas stood in the Deemed Bungalow
 Porandah and called a Constable who was
 standing at the Police station, which is
 about 60 yards from the Bungalow. The
 Constable went to Mr. Vas and returned with
 a piece of paper on which was written "Narsoo"
 and told me Mr. Vas wanted Narsoo arrested
 again " I do not know what has become of
 the piece of paper on which Mr. Vas wrote
 the word "Narsoo" I did not mention anything
 about this in my diary of that day" (Ex 7).
 It is for this conclusively proved that the
 misleading assertion made by the Dy Commr
 Milimer is not at all a fact. The version
 given by the Sub Magistrate in his own
 self defence is also not a fact: Sub
 Magistrate's friend Constable No 638 which
 is in (Ex 9) states " That day after 12 o'clock
 he came to the Bungalow -

And after Mr. Vas had left the police station to go into the village. Salt pens harass and the others came to the police station and said that Mr. Vas had got angry with them and given a passport to go to Shrikankota and that this was unjust. Again his witness Sheshu Ling P.H.O (Ex 7) stated "I only saw these three salt pens up to 1 PM that day and did not see them again". From the evidence of Jm. P. L. Vas and his witnesses it is clearly seen - it is unnecessary to quote evidence here to save time and space - that the pens were given a passport by 1 PM that day to go to Shrikankota in advance. Where Jm. P. L. Vas was also going, and the fact of this going away in advance by 1 PM with a passport has been corroborated by the witnesses cited by the Sub Magistrate. Hence it is clear that there was no reason at all for Jm. P. L. Vas to go to the Sub Magistrate and ask his assistance for protecting himself from the beating of his pens as alleged by the Sub Magistrate. Therefore it is conclusively proved that the help sought for by Jm. P. L. Vas was for reasons other than those stated by the Dy Commissioner to the Board or wrongly stated by the Sub Magistrate to the Collector in his own self defence. The reasons are set forth in detail in paras 2 to 5 and 16 of Enclosure 12, which are here recapitulated for easy reference.

No mistake V. A. S. S. S.

I came to Gudur on the 14th from Camp. I had orders to meet my Superior at Durgarajapalan on the 15th to go to Shikharikhat + " My head quarters is Durgarajapalan which is very malarious this year, hence I always take my family with me out in Camp as I did not get a house for them either at Gudur or Vankhazgiri " "As they were all sick I had to keep them behind this time for medical treatment " "Though I am supplied with tents, I did not pitch them this time at Gudur, but stopped in the Dravel's Bungalow for this reason viz (my wife was afraid to live in tents during my absence for fear of robbers). In connection with this I may also state, that we had practical proof of it for on the night of the 3rd of May at Gudur opposite to the Police Station where my tents were pitched, robbers entered my tents and cut a window screen with a knife and removed my trunk and broke it open, this was found at a distance of a furlong the next morning " + " I am gone out in Camp this night and I leave my family and Agha behind with no other person with them, the doors of the Dravel's Bungalow have no proper bolts. The rooms cannot be locked and they are insecure and my wife is afraid of robbers. So I have kind enough to order the police men to have an eye on Dravel's Bungalow.

Live Coriolini

Am. S. S. S.

Dear Sir, so as not to allow him to give
 any more annoyance during my absence
 and also to deputise a Constable to keep in the
 Bungalow every night till my return to prevent
 theft of property or share money and other
 valuables. From the above facts it is per-
 fectly clear that the request made by my
 Petitioner for help was a reasonable one
 for he had to go to Shrikacholia that night a
 distance of 58 miles from Gudum, he had to
 leave his family behind for medical treatment
 and not take them with him in Camp as usual,
 and Gudum was a place in itself noted for
 robbers, and robbers had actually broken into
 his tent a month and half previous to this
 he had sent all his peons in advance to Shri-
 -kacholia - and not transferred them to the Shri-
 -kacholia range. But despite of the Commission
 being wrong in former days this clear known
 that by now Mr. Vas had come to loggerheads
 with his peons apparently over the refusal
 to do ordinary work, and claimed the aid of the
 police which he did not get. That probably
 sent him to the Sub Magistrate there he had
 no better success, and so he transferred
 three peons to the Shrikacholia Sub division
 (para 2 in 28) - where he himself was for
 the peons and the Traveller's Bungalow
 Dear Sir caused a disturbance - and
 from the evidence of two panchama
 peons which says "my wife and Dear Sir"

No correction. Omit the.

wife are sisters" (En 16) and "Bungalow Deoranga and peon 248 are connected, their wives being sisters" (En 17) it is clear that the Tharawai Bungalow Deoranga was a close relative of his pen — the Tharawai Bungalow Deoranga is always present at the Bungalow, and the Bungalow was in ^{the} absence and in hope ^{of} the danger of leaving in such a place a lady and three small children and an Agha with money and jewellery — as native ladies wear and possess plenty of them and your Petitioner's wife had with her jewels alone worth about one thousand and five hundred Rupees — worth any help. Can he easily be injured than described. In addition to this the Tharawai Bungalow is only 60 (sixty) yards away from the Police station (En 7). Hence it was that your Memorialist approached to the Sub Magistrate of Gudia at noon on the 14th June because of the disturbance his pen was subjected by the Bungalow Deoranga had caused. That in the evening your Memorialist asked the Sub Magistrate to give him police assistance to protect his family against annoyance and robbery from the Deoranga as he (Memorialist) was about to leave for Shriharikata 58 miles from Gudia (para 5 of the Memorial). The rest has been explained in paras 5 & 6 of the Memorial.

one correction.

Am. 18/11/11.

34. Your Politician most respectfully begs to state that threatening to arrest him, - and calling two police men - without any reason at all was a very serious thing. The threat has been proved. But your Politician - in order to save time and space - will not enter into the evidence here as it is a matter which solely concerns the conduct of the Sub Magistrate.

35 Your Politician most respectfully begs to state that the Deputy Commissioner in para 3 of his letter No. 263 (Enc 24) makes the following misleading Assertion viz "The Sub Magistrate x x x does not appear to have had any desire to exaggerate the case against him". The facts are otherwise. The Sub Magistrate did exaggerate the case against your Politician by introducing as matter of facts into his report which never took place. In his explanation to the Collector the Sub Magistrate frames the case against your Politician in this way (Enc. viz (1) That your Politician travelled that morning 14 June by train and had a row with the Railway authorities (2) That he was drunk and travelled in a first class with second class tickets. (3) That your Politician went to the Sub Magistrate's house at 8 PM that day. (4) That your Politician was drunk and incapable. (5) That your Politician was also drunk and incapable when he

One correction. I am not the -

met him again at 6 PM; In the enquiry
 conducted by Mr Simpson (Ref His Summary)
 it was clearly proved that your Petitioner did
 not so travel on the 14th of June but on
 the 14th of May, and that he did not go to
 the house of the Sub Magistrate at 8 AM that
 day but between 12 and 1 PM; and that your
 Petitioner was not drunk and is capable
 then. Hence three statements made by him
 to the Collector out of five were thus proved
 to be completely false. And the remaining
 two were proved to be "NOT proved" In
 addition to this fact it has been already
 proved in para 33 of this petition that the
 statement made by the Sub Magistrate to the
 Collector in self defence that your Petitioner
 wanted his assistance ~~from~~ ^{him} for protecting
 himself from the beating of his peers and
 for no other purpose whatever and which state-
 ment he has subsequently confirmed in
 these lines viz "I see the report made by
 All that I have written in it is correct and
 true + + + Mr Per came to my house about
 9 and 9 that morning and made the request
 mentioned in ~~the~~ ^{my} report. I cannot remember
 any other request" Mr Per did not tell me
 that the Provost's Bangalore building was
 insecure and as he was leaving his gun
 behind in it with valuables he wanted help
 (Ex 5) is false. In addition to the Sub
 Magistrate's statement to the Collector

Three corrections

M. S. -

"Subsequently when I happened to see the
 Station Master he told me that this very
 gentleman being out of Senses made some
 hubbub at the station that very morning"
 (para 6 & 4) has been denied by the Station
 Master himself in these words. viz "I did not
 tell the Sub Magistrate that it was on the
 14th June that Mr. Fox travelled in a first
 class Compartment with a second class
 ticket and made a hubbub, but I told him that
 it occurred on one day without specifying
 the date" (Ex 22). Your Petitioner also begs to
 state that on the 14th June morning he and the
 Sub Magistrate travelled by the same train
 and alighted at Gadur. The Sub Magistrate
 states "I might or might not have travelled in
 the train from Mellore to Gadur on the 14th
 June morning. I am not certain about
 this" (Ex 5) Under the above given circum-
 stances and facts the Dy Commissioner
 giving credit to the Sub Magistrate —
 and that too after the enquiry was ~~complete~~
 complete and all the evidence was placed
 before him and Mr. Simpson had already
 given his finding — was rather very strange.
 Your Petitioner regrets to inform your
 Excellency that no notice at all was taken
 of the Sub Magistrate's conduct by the Dy
 Commissioner. The Collector — who always
 wishes that his subordinates should be
 perfectly honest and truthful — would
 be corrected. *Amnestia.*

have been too glad to be informed of the fact that the honesty and veracity - a character highly essential and indispensable to a Sub Magistrate - of the Sub Magistrate was thoroughly impeached. The Dy Commissioner ^{your} had of long so indirectly suggested to the Board that another enquiry might be started against your Politician as is clear from his lines "I have no personal knowledge of Mr. Var Nor have I yet had an opportunity of inspecting his work. I may mention that I ordered him into Krishna-patnam yesterday (13th) for his trial & inspection, and that he did not appear." (Enc 24). The Board took up the suggestion and started a second enquiry into your Politician's work.

36. The railway incident was thrown off by the Chief Commissioner Mr Simpson as being false on the very first day on the very statements made by the parties. The result, ^{11/10} without even calling for further evidence or defence. The Railway - The incident happened on the 1st of May and the Sub Magistrate's incident happened on the 14th of June ^{11/10}. This false charge is taken up by the Sub Magistrate to help Martin for in para 6 of his explanation ^{11/10} the Cheater he says "I happened to see the Station Master at the station, he told me that very gentleman, being out of service & in

Three corrections I am exp...

Some hubab at the Station that very morning, and that as he travelled in the first class carriage with a second class ticket, a report was made against him to his superior which was still under enquiry" (Ex 4). The Station Master denies this before Mr Simpson in these words "I did not tell the Sub Magistrate that it was on the 14th of June that Mr Vas travelled in a first class compartment with a second class ticket and made a hubab, but I told him that it occurred on one day without specifying the date" (Ex 22). The Sub Magistrate and your Petitioner on the 14th of June morning travelled by the same train and alighted at Gudur a fact which the Sub Magistrate himself cannot deny for he says "I myself have not travelled in the train from Nellore to Gudur on the 14th June morning. I am not certain about this" (Ex 5) wherefore it is conclusively proved that the false charge was solely got up by the Sub Magistrate himself - in his own self defence - as he was perfectly aware that nothing of the sort had occurred on the 14th June morning.

37 your Petitioner most respectfully begs to state that the Deputy Commissioner has again made a misleading statement to the Board in para 6 of his letter C⁶³₉₋₁₁₋₉₇ (Ex 24) which says no correction. I am with.

"The Charge rests on the evidence of the Guard and the Station Master the former whom I assert that there was plenty of room in the 2^d class carriage, and that he remained with Mr Vas at the starting and at the intervening stations telegraphing besides to his destination". This misleading statement has made the Board to form an entirely erroneous idea of the matter before them. But as a matter of fact the evidence of the guard and the station master conclusively disproves the charge. The guard in his statement states (Ex 20) "At Vankalichikam Chabram the first station from Nellore I asked Mr Vas why he and others were travelling in the first class compartment, and he said there was no room in the second class" "I told the station master at Gudur to check the excess fare from Mr Vas, and to go on from Gundur the next station, leaving Gundur, to the Gundur station master to check the excess fare. The object of this was to bring the matter to the notice of the traffic managers" "There was room for four passengers in the 2^d class compartment that day" "Mr Vas had his wife and children and a servant with him". The station master states "There was room for three passengers in the second class" (Ex 22). Taken into consideration that the 2^d class carriage could only sit 16 passengers, with no luggage

no correction Omit 11th

According to the railway rules, and according to the Guard's statement, as and according to the Stationmaster's statement, the train passengers had already taken their seats with their portable luggage, it stands to reason that six more additional passengers (as admitted by the guard above viz. Mr. Van. Mrs. Van. Mrs. Van. & one child) with their portable luggage could have occupied the 2^d class carriage which was already full and ^{as amended} ~~stated~~ with the luggage (the SIR permits one child with a 2^d class ticket to travel in the 2^d class in charge of children). The answer will be surely in the negative. Granted that the passengers already seated had no portable luggage at all with them, and your petitioner too had no portable luggage with him, even then six more additional passengers could not have occupied the carriage according to the railway rules. So it is conclusively proved from the statements of the guard and the stationmaster that there was no sufficient ^{room} in the carriage. It is also clearly proved that the guard did not communicate with your petitioner at the starting station. The guard also admitted that he went back ^{from} to Gudur from Pandodu the next station after leaving Gudur. There your petitioner alighted (after half an hour for the train to run Gudur + Pandodu) and not when your petitioner was travelling as alleged by the Dy. Commr.

For correction. (Amended)

From the Authority of the above facts it is
 conclusively proved, that the above misleading
 statement made by the Dy Commissioner & the
 Board is not borne out by the evidence of
 the Guard and the Station Master before him.
 Again taking into consideration that there was
 no room in the second class as clearly proved
 above, and also that there was no time to
 exceed the 2nd class tickets at Nellore and to
 get first class tickets, for the guard himself
 states "Mr Ves came to the Nellore station just
 before the train started. It was at the last
 movement. I made no protest against his
 movement. I made no protest against his
 getting tickets as he was late" (Ex 23). And
 also taking into consideration that your Petitioner
 was willing to give the difference between
 the first and second class, free of charge
 of the Station Master. There is
 "Mr Ves said that he would pay the difference
 between 1st & 2nd class, but he was not
 pay the excess penalty which was demanded
 of him for not having given notice to the
 Guard or Station Master at Sterling station"
 "He said I could refer the matter to the
 Superintendant" (Ex 22), therefore it is clear
 that the statement made by the Board in
 their first order on the Authority of the Dy
 Commissioner's Report to the effect that
 "Mr Ves travelled + + + in a first class
 without any good reason for doing so" (Ex 24)
 is not at all a fact. Therefore the

Two corrections. I am, Sir, &c.

Conclusion drawn by them viz "The reason
could be only the one the railway servants
assign viz Mr Vas was drunk" (Ex 28) also
fails.

38. Your Petitioner begs to
state that the station master of Gudur
is fully aware that travelling in a state of
intoxication is an offence, and he had already
prosecuted a rich man before the 2^d class
Magistrate of Gudur for so travelling in 1897
when your Petitioner was there and got him fined.
The present case against your Petitioner
as made out by the sub magistrate was not
a simple case of intoxication, but a highly
complicated case consisting according to
him of (1) Intoxication (2) mangling
(3) assault (4) and refusal to pay. There
fore with penalty. Under such circumstances
even to suppose that they (Station Master
the Guard) would not have at least made a
mention of it (viz about intoxication and
other conduct) to the Assistant District
Magistrate in their reports - if such was
really the case - is unreasonable. Further
to collect excess fare and penalty is the
duty of the station master himself and a
reference to the District Magistrate is at
all needed. This (intoxication if really
fact) would have been at least a
reason why reference - a most unusual
thing - was needed, and it would be
no correction. One with the

also served as an explanation why the excess
fare and penalty was not collected then
and there. Therefore the Dy Commissioner
asserts "Their Official Reports to their
Superiors corroborate their statements though
they say nothing (as is perhaps natural)
about Mr Vas being intoxicated" (Ex 24) is
quite ^{strong} ~~unsubstantiated~~ and is in direct contra-
diction to the existing practice.

39 Your Petitioner begs to
state that a series of trivial charges
in Contravention of Board's Proceedings
No 467 dated 6th October 1890 which
says that undue tendency to find trivial
faults should be avoided are brought again
him by the Dy Commissioner. Board
have passed them over and they do not find
a place in the dismissal order. But they
were explained in the Memorial. ^{Complained}
to your Excellency the great bias of the
Dy Commissioner against your Petitioner.
As most of the charges were over with
foundation.

40 Your Petitioner begs to
state that the Board on the authority of the
Dy Commissioner have remarked against your
Petitioner that he is ignorant and ineffi-
cient, in para 3 of their dismissal order.
Your Petitioner most humbly begs to draw
your Excellency's attention to para 4
of the Memorial, and to state that a per-
one correction. *Am. with.*

Phase
Part 2
See Mr. P. 382
239

of his qualifications and abilities, that
seemed to have, among the inspectors at
the Merchant's inspection in the Department
could be said to be an ignorant and in-
efficient man. The remaining epithets are
explained in paras 27 & 32 of this petition.

41. In summing up the case
against your Petitioner he most respectfully
begs to draw your Excellency's attention
to the fact, that the case against him is
not one of "Fraud," "Dishonesty" or "Vulgar
- edness" and therefore it is not of a grave
nature. The Board at first wanted to
treat it as a pure case of Drunkenness and
Doped out Mr Simpson the Merchant Com-
missioner to hold a regular enquiry. The
enquiry conducted in the form of a judicial
enquiry established beyond doubt that drunken-
ness was not at all proved. ^{Completion}
Mr Simpson's Summary and the ^{above} evidence
of the case against your Petitioner
before him the Dy Commissioner wrote
his misleading report implicating your
Petitioner, and made an indirect suggestion
to the Board that he would now enquire
into your Petitioner's work. The Board took
up the suggestion made by the Dy Commis-
sioner and wanted to see, if a case of neglect
of work could be made out against your
Petitioner, "This time" It cannot be but
that such habits - if a fact - are
no correction. I am Sir, Yr
Obedt Servt

to his Superior Officers and reflected in his general work. The Deputy Commissioner Central Division is now directed to thoroughly inspect the Assistant Commissioner's Office and ascertain how it and his range have been administered" (para 7, 8 & 28) are very clear, and departed the very Dy Commissioner to inspect your Politician's Office and work. The Dy Commissioner made it out a case of neglect of work, and also made a series of trivial charges, and the Board thereupon passed their dismissal order and in so doing they only dealt with the question of neglect of work and nothing more. Your Politician now most humbly prays that in dealing with this case of neglect of work your Excellency will take into kind consideration the following eight important facts:

- (1) That there were no previous complaints by the Assistant Commissioner and the District at all of neglect of work against your Politician.
- (2) The object of the enquiry conducted by the Dy Commissioner was to prove neglect of work.
- (3) That enquiry was not held strictly on the lines laid down by the Government of India.
- (4) The Board and the Dy Commissioner themselves admit that the office work itself was not neglected or allowed to suffer.

Office work complained of as not having been done in your Politician's own hands, that, which is done by jacks and me emotion.

I am, Sir, Sir,

* With reference to the above para 6 of the B.P. under No. 3829 d 23.9.98 para 9 of the office note under that No. As regards (4) the, please see B.P. No. 659 d 24.12.97 (Encl D) + para 5 of the office note under No. 3829 d 23.9.98

76.
Clerks in all the other remaining eighty two
PS Circles and which would have been
done at Trinidad by your Petitioner
Clark and peers in the ordinary course of
business (6) That your Petitioner sanctioned
Clark was wrongly made use of by the despot
and that your Petitioner had no clerk with
him even for a single minute out of
the 256 days he was there, and therefore
your Petitioner was greatly hampered in
duty and was obliged to ask for assistance
(7) That your Petitioner was overworked, in
his own legitimate sphere of indoor work - in
the absence of the clerk - and also by other
extra work given by the despot, not
legitimately his own. (8) Your Petitioner was
subject to Malarial fever.

42. Your Petitioner most
respectfully begs to draw your Excellency
attention to para 37 and 41 of the Memorial
and prays for mercy and states that in
case any of the charges against him are
proved, that the punishment meted
out by the Board is too severe in its
form, and that too for the first offence.

43 In Conclusion your
Petitioner therefore most respectfully
prays that the said order of the
Government may be reconsidered,
and your Petitioner reinstated in his
office with arrears of pay, after
no correction. Alfred W. S.

A due Consideration of the matter stated
in this Petition
For which act of Kindness & justice your
Excellency's Petitioner and his poor family,
Consisting of a young wife and three small
Children, who are now almost left destitute
by the Board's unjust order with, as in duty
bound, ever pray.

Am. ex. 4. 1898.

Rozapettab. Madras.
Dated 19th Novem^r 1898

Note This Petition Contains Seventy-seven
pages written on one side, all signed and
corrected numbered and initialed; it also
contains one Appendix. All the ^{enclosures}
of the Memorial - except Nos 2 & 3
herewith submitted with a prayer
they may be returned to the Petitioner when
no longer required.

No Corrections *Am. ex. 4. 1898.*

no correction was made

223583
3844

Statement giving Particulars of Sales Sea for the last 10 years at the Pandraka Factory.

Year	Sales in										Total Sales	Storage.	Date of Scrapings	Remarks.
	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March.		
83-84	3955	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	9744	17790	7402	38891	nil
84-85	204	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	2994	12525	4904	20627	7056
85-86	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	8127	5903	14030	nil.
86-87	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5084	4633	9717	8882
87-88	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	2711	6189	8209	22026	28124
88-89	4917	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	1000	6970	10208	18925	nil.
89-90	747	"	"	"	"	"	250	2606	1190	920	3742	5034	17283	A 133189
90-91	3541	"	"	"	"	"	"	1550	1368	2980	10728	5379	27158	96351
91-92	4193	"	"	"	960	"	"	11836	11140	19624	25358	5048	96510	37712
92-93	3244	100	500	3702	3550	7624	4784	8870	3700	26064	32653	2278	127073	B 110766
93-94	2194	2864	11096	6138	"	8996	8870	12730	"	80	1790	1369	50000	C.
94-95	868	"	12324	10000	5920	3200	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
95-96	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"

(Appendix H)

A Out of this 33438 are on No 1 Platform. This is the dirty Salt ever produced in Pandraka. The remaining portion was ordered to be destroyed by Government in 1893

B. on II, & III Platforms only. The best Salt made in Pandraka that compared with Bombay Salt.

C. Stock in bags plenty, but not equal in quality to that of 1892; this grave rise to Mr. Mc. Masters Scheme.

In 1892 sold before Mr. Vass's arrival = 38744; Total from 83-84 to Mr. Vass's arrival = 172502.

Sold by Mr. Vass. 96510
127073
223583
38744

Note: This was an enclosure to apper petition made by Jm. P. in 1894 to the Board. No correction.

Current No. 8605 of 1898

From the Board of Revenue (Sep. Rev).
No. 4927^{mis} Dated 12th December 1898.

FOR ORDERS.

To Under Secretary.

P The petitioner Mr. J. V. V.
late an Assistant Inspector
of the Salt and Abkari
Department, prays for a re-
consideration of G.O. No. 3829
dated 23rd September 1898 in
which the Government
saw no reason to interfere
on his behalf with the order
Q of the Board of Revenue
directing his dismissal
from the service.

For a statement of
the facts of the case
attention is invited to the
note stitched with the
P G.O. referred to.

The petitioner states
that he now approaches
Government

Para 2 of the petn.

FOR ORDERS.

potent facts on which the merits of the whole case depend, and which afford very good grounds for a reconsideration of the order already passed" by Govt. on his first petition. In forwarding the review petition to Government the Board observes that it "contains many misrepresentations but no new matter".

It is submitted that the only point in the present very elaborate and lengthy review petition which appears to call for any notice is the petitioner's complaint that the procedure laid down by the Government of India for clearance in connection with the dismissal of a public servant was not followed in his case (Paragraphs 3 to 8 of the review petition). Attention is in this connection invited

Vide Sub-para 1 of the Govt. of India ~~letter~~ Resn. in ltr. d. 15.9.97 and para 6 of Bombay Govt. Resn. in ltr. d. 3.12.83 (Public).

Please see also the remarks of the B. (B) + (L) on the pages facing p. 17 of the first petn.

for copying

p. 124-131 of file
P. 5692 d. 24.12.97-pp. 1-7 of file

pp. 90-101 of the file

pp. 102-115 of the file.

of in G.O. No. 3829 d. 23.9.97, in which substantially the same complaint was made though not at such great length as in the review petition now under consideration. The several counts against the petitioners will be found detailed in paragraphs 3 to 8 of the Dy. Commr's ⁽¹⁾ letter to the Board d. 14.12.97 on which the Board's order ⁽²⁾ directing the petitioner's dismissal was based. It will be seen from the statements ⁽³⁾ taken by the Deputy Commissioner from the petitioner from ~~the 4th to 14th~~ the 4th to 14th December 1897 and the written ⁽⁴⁾ explanation submitted by the petitioner on the latter date that he knew what were the several heads of indictment against him and that he urged what he had to say in his defence with reference to them.

the petitioner's case was conducted in accordance with the rules laid down by the Government of India, and that the petitioner was given a fair opportunity of defending his conduct with reference to the several charges against him. Attention is in this connection solicited to the following remark made by the Board ~~in its report~~ in answer to the complaint in paragraph 35 of the petitioner's previous petition that the form of the enquiry was such as to completely fetter him in making his defence: "The man oralist has had as elaborate a trial as if he had been before a criminal court. The Deputy Commissioner was deputed to inquire into the way he was doing his work. It was necessary to

Remark in (b) on the page facing p. 1 the petn.

in Ex. 38298 23.9.98. P

for copy

in this connection
occurred.

Pt.
1912-98

Secy

There seems to be no ground for a reconsideration of the case. I have read through the petition. The petitioner appears to be bubbling over with words to express his grievances & seems often to forget that others are not as familiar with the details as himself. Hence the petition is not very coherent or intelligible. The gist of it is that the Dy Commissioner made a partial & hurried enquiry & in his report to the Bd was unfair & oppressive to the petitioner. This is mere assertion; no proof or circumstances supporting the assertion is put forward. If it is rejected the Dy Commissioner's report & that the petitioner clearly deserved removal from service.

cannot find in the petn now presented any sufficient reason for modifying the decision already passed by Govt. No. 10.1.99.

Do Under Secy.

Please see draft order submitted on the docket of the current. M. L. 12/1/99

vide also prev report No. 72-769 file

H. L. 14.1.99

FOR ORDERS.

189.

G.O., No.

DATED

NT No.

ENCLOSURES TO O. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT & ORN DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MRANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be co.
P = Copy abstract on.
Q = Copy heading only

A A A A A A A

C 7-499
R. 11.1