

(1) Number of pages 26

(2) Date of repair 18.8.1973

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

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

2075

Press
Mis.

Dated

22.6.1877

107

Not to be folded or roughly handled

8/2

2075
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

22nd June 1875.

Read the following paper :—

No. 477. Endorsement of the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 13th June 1877, No. 1,24

Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel C. S. HEARN, Inspector-General of Police, to the Hon. D. CARMICHAEL, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 11th June 1877, No. 2,593.

With reference to G.O., No. 1,567, dated 26th April 1877, I have the honor to forward two letters from the Superintendent of Police, North Arcot, on the subject.

2. There would seem to be some confusion of dates in Mr. Whiteside's letter. He says that he wrote to the Superintendent of Police regarding the illicit trade in toddy on the 11th June 1875 and again on the 10th May 1876, and that when he found at last that he could obtain no assistance from the Police, he issued his order to the Chittoor Tahsildar on the 12th June 1876.

3. But this order was really dated 2th June 1875, and all the detective operations took place in that month of the year. Consequently, only one day would seem to have elapsed between the Collector's first letter to the Superintendent of Police and his order to the Tahsildar.

4. Finding that a letter, dated 7th October 1874, was also alluded to by the Collector, I thought that this might have been his first letter requesting assistance, and that the interval of inaction, of which he complained, might really be that between October 1874 and June 1875. Captain Cox, however, in reply to my reference, states that the letter of October 1874 merely gave a list of licensed shops and contained no allusion to the existence of illicit trade.

5. It would seem, therefore, that Mr. Whiteside's statement in paragraph 6 of his letter to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, that the attention of the Police had more than once been specially directed to the subject, was made under some misapprehension. But it is clear now, from the dates furnished, that the detective operations sprang entirely from the Collector's letter and order in June 1875, on information furnished by the toddy renter; and I quite agree with Mr. Whiteside that the failure to bring to light any of these frauds previously is discreditably to 1st-class Inspector Mootoorpun in charge of the taluq,—a man who is quite able to obtain information in such a matter if he chooses to exert himself. Captain Cox (in reply to my reference) does not suspect dishonest reticence.

6. With regard to the remarks of the Tahsildar finding unlicensed shops open after the disturbance of the sellers by the Police, it may be observed that the houses of unlicensed vendors cannot be searched by the Police without warrant. Unless, therefore, the Police information in such cases is kept secret, subsequent proceedings are futile, as evidence is sure to be destroyed. The Police would avoid "disturbing" the sellers if possible. The station-house reports, which are forwarded in regular rotation, seem to show that the occurrence reports were not antedated.

ed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Chief Secretary.

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

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

No 2593

Chief Office of the Inspector General
of Police
Madras 11th June 1877

2075
3

From,

The Inspector General
of Police,

To, The Chief Secretary,
to Government,
Fort Saint George

Sir,

Enclosures 2

With reference to G.O. No 1567
dated 26th April 1877, I have the
honor to forward 2 letters from the
Superintendent of Police North Arcot
on the subject.

2. There would seem to be some
confusion of dates in Mr Whiteside's
letter - He says that he wrote to the
Superintendent of Police regarding
the illicit trade in toddy on the
11th June 1875 and again on the
10th May 1876 and that when he
found at last that he could
obtain no assistance from the
police he issued his order to
the Chittoor Tahsildar on the 12th
June 1876.

3. But this order was really
dated 12th June 1875 and all the
detective operations took place
in

With Sale of Toddy in North Arcot Dis-
order. - Communicated to the Board of Revenue
from the Inspector General of Police for-
warding two letters from the Superintendent of
Police regarding the same, observing that there is
some confusion as to dates in Mr Whiteside's
letter, but that it is allowed by the Inspector
General of Police that the Police are to blame for
not having brought to notice the existence of the
illicit trade before the Collector's attention
was called to the matter.

G.O. 2593 June 1877, No 2,075.

Date June 22/77

Encl.

REVENUE.

to,

do,

do,

G.O. of (1877) 2593.

in that month of that year. Consequently only one day would seem to have elapsed between the Collector's first letter to the Superintendent of Police and his order to the Tahsildar.

4. Finding that a letter dated 7th October 1874 was also alluded to by the Collector I thought that this might have been his first letter requesting assistance and that the interval of inaction of which he complained might really be that between October 1874 and June 1875. Captain Cox however in reply to my reference stated that the letter of October 1874 merely gave a list of licensed shops and contained no allusion to the existence of illicit trade.

5. It would seem therefore that Mr. Whiteside's statement in Para. 6 of his letter to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue that the attention of the Police had more than once been specially directed to the subject was made under some misapprehension. But it is clear now from the dates furnished, that the detective operations sprang entirely

2075
2

entirely from the Collector's letter and Order in June 1875 on information furnished by the new toddy renter, and I quite agree with Mr. Whiteside that the failure to bring to light any of these frauds previously is discreditable to 1st Class Inspector Mootoo curpan in charge of the taluq, a man who is quite able to obtain information on such a matter if he chooses to exert himself. Captain Cox (in reply to my reference) does not suspect dishonest reticence.

6. With regard to the remarks of the Board of Revenue regarding the Tahsildar finding unlicensed shops open after the disturbance of the Sellers by the police it may be observed that the houses of unlicensed vendors cannot be searched by the Police without warrant. Unless therefore the police information in such cases is kept secret, subsequent proceedings are futile,

futile, as evidence is sure to be
destroyed. The police would avoid
"disturbing" the sellers if possible?
The Station House Reports which
are forwarded in regular ro-
tation seem to show that the
Occurrence Reports were not
antedated.

2 Enclosures to be printed

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obedt Servt.

C. Mearns

Inspector General of Police

2075

SR

Revenue 1877 Despatches
No 2889

From
Chief Secretary

Dated 13th June 1877
Recd 13th June 1877
No 1248

Encl: 2

Transferring
letter from the Inspector
General of Police, for-
warding 2 letters from
the Supt of Police North
Arcot regarding the
illicit sale of Toddy.

22-6-77 No 2075

No 677-

C. 19 June 77 R. 22 June 77

2075

No 434

North Arcot -
District Police Office.
Chittoor, 14th May 1877.

From
The Superintendent of Police

North Arcot District

To
The Inspector General of Police
Madras

Sir,

With reference to the Assistant Inspector
General's Endorsement No 2087 dated 11th Instant.
by Proceedings of Government dated 26th ultimo,
herewith returned, I have the honor to inform you
that the dates on which the Police reported the
cases of illicit sale of Toddy were ascertained by
me from Station House Reports filed in my Office.
It appears however from the Tahsildar's List
that 4 of the 15 occurrence Reports are dated a day
later than the Station Reports containing particulars
of the same facts.

The dates of despatch and receipt noted upon these
Reports show that they were despatched and received
in due course and I have every reason to believe
that they are correctly dated although I am not
in a position absolutely to affirm that such is the case.

I am unable to account for the delay which is said to have taken place in the Occurrence Reports reaching the Taluk Magistrate; but it is strange that under the peculiar circumstances the delay did not excite his suspicions;— if it did excite his suspicions it is much to be regretted that he did not bring ^{it} to notice at once when prompt enquiry would have exposed the dishonesty of the Police.

The Board of Revenue remark that it is odd that if the Police disturbed the sellers on the dates they reported the existence of the shops, the Tahsildar should have found the shops open a few days after. I submit that it is equally remarkable that the Police should have found other shops open after the Tahsildar's visit to them.

I do not quite understand when it was that the Collector issued to the Tahsildar the order to enquire about the illicit sale of Saddy in the Chittoor Taluq. The Board of Revenue and the Tahsildar say that it is dated 12th June 1875 but this is contradicted by the Collector's letter to me dated 10th May 1876, from which and also from the whole tenor of his letter No 227 dated 4th July to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, it is clear that some considerable interval elapsed between the date of his first letter to me (11th June 1875)

and the date of the order to the Tahsildar.

2075
8
It is impossible that this interval— upon which Mr Whiteside dwells with considerable emphasis founding upon it some of his gravest imputations on the Police— was in fact an interval of only a single day.

I mention this matter only because it appears to me to be of some importance as affecting the amount of credibility to be attached to the Tahsildar's statements that the Police did not precede but followed him in the detection of the 15 unlicensed shops.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant.

W. H. Cox
Captain
Superintendent of Police

Adib-

From
Middl. of Police
to the Inspector General
of Police
dated 14th March 1875
No.
Enclose - the

Recd 6.22 June 1877
L.L. 477
1877 Department
Enclosure No. 1 -

In a letter from
the Insp. Genl of Police
dated Madras 11th
June 1877 No. 2593
S. 22.6.77 v. 1875
From

The Supt of Police
North Arcot
To the Inspector Genl
of Police

Rev. 2889/77
Correspondence

regarding illicit
sale of toddy in
the North Arcot Dist.
A. July 1875/77

2075
210

No. 487

Madras 1st June 1877

From the Supt of Police
N. Arcot

To the Inspector General of Police
Madras

Sir in reply to your Memorandum No 174 dated 17th Mch. I
have the honour to inform you that the Collector's letter to
me No 878 dated 8th Oct. 1874 simply informed me that
certain toddy shops had been licensed. It is hard of course
that this letter can account for the confusion of dates.

I received the Collector's letter No 655 dated 11th June 1875
on 11th June and at once issued orders which led to increased
action and the discovery of unlicensed shops. After the
Collector's house was searched and his name seized the
whole system of fraud came to light and the illicit sale
of necessity ceased. No Police had not been active in the
matter as they ought to have been prior to 11th June 1875 but I
have no reason to suspect them of dishonesty.

No Occurrence Reports are till the salary maybe paid
from Station Reports each case in the list was ascertained
personally by the Police. I have the honour to be
no 1567.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
H. Woodroffe
Supt of Police.

2075
1877 Department
Enclosure No. 2

In a letter from
the Insp Genl of Police
dated Madras 11th
June 1877 No. 2593
p 22-6-77 v. 27
from
the Supd of Police
North Arcot

To the Insp Genl of Police
2 Madras
Rev: 2889/77

Regarding the
delay on the part of the
Police in the discovery
of unlicensed toddy
shops after the matter
has been brought to
notice by Dist Magistrate

Rev 2889/77
1 July 1877

dates in Mr Whiteside

10 N. 2075 of 22-6-77. R.D.
Proceedings of the Madras Government

2075
12

Read letter from the
Inspector General of Police
dated 11 June 1877, No 2593,
forwarding 2 letters from the
Superintendent of Police
North Arcot regarding the
illicit sale of toddy.

1 Communicated to
the Board of Revenue with
reference to correspondence
recorded in G.O. 26 April
last, No 1567 R.D.

2 There appears to be
some confusion as to
dates in Mr Whitesides'

Let

Letter dated 4 April 1877
but it is allowed by the
Inspector General of Police
that the police are to
blame for not having
brought to notice the
existence of these illicit
toddy shops before the
Collector's attention was
called to the matter.

3 The Governor in Council
notes that in Col. Mearns's
opinion there is no ground
for supposing that the
Police Occurrence Reports
were antedated. It is

satisfactorily

2075
13

in To the H^{on}ble Secy to Govt
6 Inspector General of Police
- Judicial Dept

satisfactorily explained
why the shops were not
"disturbed" before the Taluq
authorities intervened

gll

50
Illust. sale of
Foddy in North America