M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 98

(2) Date of repair 24.4.1969

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1002
~~B.P. No.~~

Press
Mis.

Dated 25.7.1876 196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, *25th July* 1876.

No. 256. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th June 1876, No. 1,504 :—

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 11th April 1876, No. 1,004.

Read also the following papers :—

Telegram from N. Narasimha[illegible]mi, dated 1st April 1876.
Petition from ,, ,, 19th ,, ,,

From H. Sr. A. GOODRICH, Esq., Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd April 1876, No. 652.

I HAVE the honor to enclose, in original, record of the inquiry held by the Principal Assistant Collector on the charge brought against N. Narasimahswami, late Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate of Viravilli, called for in Board's Proceedings, dated 11th April 1876.

2. Mr. Melville, who was then Acting Collector, has not placed on record any reasons for reappointing N. Narasimhaswami as Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate.

3. I enclose, in original, deposition taken by the Principal Assistant from the priest referred to in paragraph 2 of my letter, No. 455 of March 23rd last, who was found in the Ganjam District. Although holding a putta for the land, he states that he has never seen it, though he visited N. Narasimhaswami at a village near to the place where the land lies; but that he entrusted it to an agent, and denies that N. Narasimhaswami had any interest in the land whatever.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Records of Inquiry.

THE foregoing papers relate to the alleged misconduct of N. Narsimhaswami Puntulu, at the time he was employed as Sub-Magistrate of Viravilli.

2. It appears that in the village of Kottapilli, in the Madgole Zemindari and within the Viravilli division, there is a plot of land called వేలంబయలు or "Auction Site." In January 1875, when a relative of the Sub-Magistrate was manager of the Zemindari, this piece of land was given on putta to a priest residing under the same roof with the Sub-Magistrate. The terms of the putta granted the whole plot, the capacity of which is shown as 15 garce, at a "Kattubadi" of Rupees 7-8-0. Mr. Roupell estimates the value of the annual outturn of paddy at Rupees 450. This putta was registered on the 28th January 1875. The Collector and the Principal Assistant are convinced that the tenure of the priest Pabmanabha Acharryaur is merely nominal, and that the real grantee of the land is the Sub-Magistrate, Narasimhaswami.

3. In a case of this kind, it is of course very difficult to obtain evidence which can be regarded as absolutely conclusive, and it is quite impossible to place any great reliance upon oral testimony unsupported by corroborative facts. But apart from the statements of the witnesses, which may or may not be true, it is clear that the land was given upon very easy terms, and the cadjan memorandum shows that the peons in the Sub-Magistrate's employ had a good deal to do with the removal of the landlord's share of the crop, and that that share was deposited in the house occupied, in part at least, by the Sub-Magistrate. Then, again, the

priest, who is the nominal holder of the putta, has never seen the land, and he states that he entrusted the management of it entirely to his agent who resides at the Sub-Magistrate's house.

4. Upon a full consideration of all these circumstances, it seems far more probable that the grant was made in [illegible] to Narasimhaswami Puntulu than to the [illegible] this view of the [illegible] supported in a great measure by the character of the Sub-Magistrate's defence. The Board are willing to give due weight to the plea that the charge is the result of a conspiracy. Some ill-feeling must always precede a complaint of this nature, but after making every allowance, it is impossible to find in the petition which has been put in, anything which materially weakens the presumption that N[illegible]imhaswami was interested in the transaction. On the contrary his defence contains at all events three gross misstatements, one relating to the extent of the land, another to his absence from Chodaveram, his head-quarters, at the time of the delivery of the landlord's share of the crop at his house on the 10th January 1875, and a third regarding the circumstances which led to his degradation in 1868. The first of these misstatements is contained in paragraph 10 of the petition to the Board, where the Sub-Magistrate lightly speaks of the "land in question yielding only two garces of paddy, amounting to the paltry sum of Rupees 60 a year," whereas, according to the registered document and by the admission of the priest, the yield of the land is not two but fifteen garce. The second misstatement is contained in his deposition before the Principal Assistant on the 31st January 1876, in which he says that at the time the crop was delivered he was away touring in the taluq, the fact as shown by his diary being that he was at Chodaveram at that time. The third misstatement is contained in paragraph 21 of the petition where the Sub-Magistrate states that Mr. Roupell's assertion that he was degraded in 1868, is a mistake, and adds that Mr. Minchin satisfied himself that he was innocent and restored him to office by making him Taluq Sheristadar of Golcondah. Now it appears from the record that the history of this transaction is as follows: In consequence of Narasimhaswami's manipulation of a criminal case on his file, Major Grove, the then Senior Assistant, reported him to the Acting Collector, Mr. J. H. Master, for negligence, dilatoriness and suspicion of corruption, and Mr. Master ordered his transfer to another division in order that he might be more under surveillance. Presently, upon the return of the permanent Collector, Mr. Minchin, that officer was at some pains to ascertain the details of the Sub-Magistrate's irregularities, and after full inquiry removed him from his appointment with the remark that "if the conduct of the Sub-Magistrate was not caused by corrupt motives, he is utterly ignorant of his duty and on either supposition is unfit to hold so important a post." For a while Narasimhaswami stood appointed Taluq Head Gumastah (15th June 1868 to 24th July 1868) until he was made Taluq Sheristadar of Golcondah, which latter office he held till November 1870, when he was appointed by Mr. Melville to be Sub-Magistrate of Viravilli. Mr. Melville has not left on record his reasons for restoring him to his former position, probably he considered that he had been sufficiently punished.

5. Had N. Narasimhaswami Puntulu been a man of unblemished reputation, the Board, notwithstanding the strongly-expressed opinion of the district officers,

would have been prepared to give him the benefit of the doubt in the present case. But looking to his antecedents which afford a *primâ facie* probability against the uprightness of his conduct, they are fo[illegible] the conclusion which has been arrived at by the Collector; and feeling [illegible]ng necessity which exists for enforcing integrity and independence of charac[illegible] the case of Sub-Magistrates in charge of Zemindaries they resolve to reco[illegible] Government that N. Narasimhaswami Puntulu be dismissed from the service.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 257. ORDER THEREON, 25th [illegible] 1876, No. 1,002.

Miscellaneous.

It appears here that the Collector and the Principal Assistant are convinced that the tenure of the Zemindar's priest is merely nominal, and that the real grantee of the Zemindar's benefaction is the Deputy Tahsildar, N. Narasimhaswami Pantulu. The Board of Revenue state that they are forced to the same conclusion, and they recommend the dismissal of the accused from the public service.

2. His Grace the Governor in Council has carefully read the record of this case, and fails to discover sufficient grounds for convicting the Deputy Tahsildar of corruption, or for justifying his dismissal, after a service of 23 years. There is no doubt that the land in question was registered in the priest's name, nor is the Deputy Tahsildar's connection with the negociations for leasing it to the present tenant by any means established. The fact that the priest of the Zemindar is also the Deputy Tahsildar's priest, that his agent and the Deputy Tahsildar occupied the same house, and that the Deputy Tahsildar is connected by marriage with the Manager of the Zemindari, appear to have given rise to the suspicions and accusations which are made the foundation of the case.

3. It is observed that the Deputy Tahsildar has already been transferred from his late charge to another; and, adverting to the want of confidence with which he is now regarded by the local officers, founded on his alleged proceedings in the Madgole Zemindari, and on a previous occasion when he was temporarily degraded, the Governor in Council is of opinion that he should be now transferred to another district, or, if no present opportunity offers for such transfer, be reduced from the grade of Deputy Tahsildar to the next rank.

4. The irregularity of procedure on the part of the Principal Assistant in conducting the examination in the absence of the accused has no doubt attracted the attention of the Board of Revenue.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
" the Accountant-General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Govt. of 1876 Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated July, 25th.

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 25th July 1876, No. 1,002.

Nos. 256-257.

N. Narasimhaswami Pantulu, Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate of Viravilli, in Vizagapatam District.—Considering that — instead of being dismissed, should be now transferred to another district, or if no present opportunity offers for such transfer, be reduced from the grade of Deputy Tahsildar to the next rank.

1002/3

No. 1,004.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 11th April 1876.

Read the following letter from H. ST. A. GOODRICH, Esq., Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd March 1876, No. 455:—

I HAVE the honor to forward, for the consideration of the Board, the report* of my Principal Assistant Collector of his investigation into certain charges against the Sub-Magistrate of the Viravilli Taluq in his Division.

2. On receiving this report I at once wrote to him stating my opinion that the evidence of the priest, in whose name certain land whose tenure is questioned, ought to have been first taken, and I enclose his reply.†

3. The Principal Assistant has also submitted certain correspondence‡ relating to misconduct of the same Sub-Magistrate some years back.

4. The Sub-Magistrate is under suspension.

5. The Principal Assistant's letter reviews with some care the evidence before him, and though I believe more proof of the corrupt action of the Deputy Tahsildar might have been obtained, I am perfectly satisfied of his guilt.

6. When at Madgole both in January and in February, I knew that Mr. Roupell's inquiry was proceeding, and referred the many who complained to me of the oppression and venality of the man to him, telling them that the Sub-Magistrate's conduct was under investigation, and that all who had evidence to give should go to the Principal Assistant's office, and give it. I made some memoranda of a few of the statements which I forwarded to Mr. Roupell. Certain men followed me even into the Golconda hills to a great distance into a country whose climate they greatly dread to make their complaints.

7. I believe that the facts to which the witnesses depose are inconsistent with the Sub-Magistrate's innocence of the charge of corruptly receiving the grant of the lands in question.

8. I believe his dismissal to be the only adequate punishment for his offence, and recommend that it be sanctioned.

* No. 53 and enclosure.

† No. 73.

‡ No. 54 and enclosures.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From N. A. ROUPELL, Esq., Acting Principal Assistant Collector, to H. ST. A. GOODRICH, Esq., Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, dated Waltair, 25th February 1876, No. 53.

I HAVE the honor to submit the further report, alluded to in paragraph 3 of my letter, No. X, dated 22nd ultimo, the main facts of which are to be found in the depositions made by villagers of Kottapilli, and a statement taken from the late Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate of Viravilli.

2. In the village of Kottapilli there is a plot of land called "auction site" (వేలంపాటలు) for which in January 1875 a putta was granted by the late Madugula Rajah to one *Peddinti Padmanabha Acharyulu*. This putta was registered at Madugula on 28th January 1875. I have by me true copy thereof, from which it seems that the "auction site" lands, 15 garces, were granted at a Kattubadi of Rupees 7½. This would represent about 30 acres, and a total annual outturn, excluding straw, of Rupees 450 worth of paddy.

3. It is alleged and has evidently been the common talk of the village that this land was in reality granted to the late Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate Nyayapati Narasimhaswami Pantulu, and that the latter held it in the name of P. Padmanabha Acharyulu, who is his private priest.

4. The evidence obtained may be conveniently divided into two heads—

The first referring to the part played by the Sub-Magistrate in the grant of a cowle to 1st witness.

The second referring to the removal of a portion (the landlord's share) of the crops of some of the holdings in "auction site" early last year to the Sub-Magistrate's house in Chodaveram and to its storage there.

5. As regards the first head, the evidence of 1st witness Behara Sannamma (or Sanyasi) is explicit. He states that he went to the Sub-Magistrate's house in Chodaveram about a year ago to get a cowle for his holding in "auction site;" that the Sub-Magistrate was there and gave him a cowle (which he produced); that the Sub-Magistrate had this cowle and the corresponding kadapa written by a Brahmin lad identified by witness as 11th witness; that, upon perusing the cowle, witness remarked that the Sub-Magistrate's name was not entered in it, but that of Peddinti Padmanabha Acharyulu; that the Sub-Magistrate said, in answer to this remark, "What does that matter to you? The land has been given to the priest. Take the cowle;" that he noticed the priest was there by his marks and beard; that the priest did not sign the cowle which was attested by K. Jagganna, priest's agent (10th witness); that the priest never spoke to him (witness) about the cowle, but that "the Sub-Magistrate did all this." Witness adds that the land was granted nominally to the priest, but that the management of it was in the hands of the Sub-Magistrate, and that "all the villagers in Kottapilli know very well that the late Sub-Magistrate has been holding lands under the Madugula Sirkar."

6. The Sub-Magistrate, the Muktiyar (10th witness) and the writer (11th witness) of the cowle all deny the truth of 1st witness' statement, saying the cowle was not given in the Sub-Magistrate's house, but in that of the Muktiyar; that the Sub-Magistrate was not present, and that the latter never had anything to do with the land in question.

7. There is no direct evidence in support of 1st witness' statement, though it appears from the depositions of several witnesses (2nd, 3rd, 4th, 6th, and 7th witnesses) that the Sub-Magistrate is commonly spoken of as the holder of "auction site."

8. Upon the subject of the second head of the evidence, 1st witness again speaks explicitly. He says that a year ago, at harvest time, the crops of four (3rd and 4th witnesses and two others) individuals named (and ascertained to be past and present holders of portions of "auction site") and of others, were removed to the Sub-Magistrate's house at Chodaveram; that two of the Sub-Magistrate's peons named (8th and 9th witnesses) came and took it away in bandies; that witness accompanied the bandies under orders from the Manager to the Sub-Magistrate's house; that the Sub-Magistrate received the grain at his house in Chodaveram; that witness saw him there and measured the grain at the Sub-Magistrate's house and stored it there. Fourth witness says "they were then (*i.e.*, the day the grain was taken in bandies to Chodaveram) putting the grain into the Sub-Magistrate's house. I saw them doing so."

9. The Sub-Magistrate in his statement denies ever having received any rice crop at his house in Chodaveram last year. He says he heard that his priest's Muktiyar (10th witness) had some grain brought and stored there, but that he (Sub-Magistrate) did not see this, as he was then away from headquarters, touring in the taluq.

10. The Muktiyar (10th witness) states the grain was brought to him for the priest, and was stored in his house, and not in the Sub-Magistrate's.

11. It is gathered from the statements enclosed, that, at the time of the issue of the putta to the priest by the Madugula Rajah's Manager, the lands of "auction site" were enjoyed by several individuals. Into the nature of their tenure it is unnecessary to inquire, but the enclosures show that some of the occupants were very summarily dealt with, being ousted forthwith; while the crops of all—sometimes in their entirety, sometimes the landlord's half-share merely—were removed from the land and conveyed to different places.

12. It would be only natural to expect that such high-handed proceedings would have called forth complaints from the sufferers, but the Sub-Magistrate says no complaint was ever received by him.

13. In contradiction of this statement 4th witness deposes that he had given the Madugula Manager Rupees 50 for the privilege of being left in possession of his property and that when the crop was carried away, he (4th witness) went with the bandies to the Sub-Magistrate's house at Chodaveram and there complained to the Sub-Magistrate, who said, "he would request the Madugula Rajah to give some other land to witness" in lieu of that taken away. Second witness too says he complained to the Sub-Magistrate about the spoliation of his property, and was referred by the latter to the District Munsif's Court.

14. It should be mentioned that the house, or rather building, occupied by the Sub-Magistrate consisted of several separate portions. The Sub-Magistrate and the Muktiyar (10th witness) declare that the grain was placed in the portion occupied by the priest and in the granaries appertaining thereto. Similarly there might be confusion in the minds of the witnesses in regard to the real tenant of that portion of the building in which the cowle and kadapah of 1st witness were drawn up. But 1st witness says he is well aware that the Sub-Magistrate's house was divided into separate portions, and that the portion occupied by the priest and his Muktiyar were severed by a court-yard from that in the tenancy of the Sub-Magistrate.

15. The statements of the two batta peons (8th and 9th witnesses) of the Sub-Magistrate named by 1st witness were given with caution and differ sufficiently to prove that the one or the other, or both, were influenced more by motives of fancied expediency than of truth. Eighth witness produced some memorandums written on cadjan leaves, true translation of which is forwarded as well as the originals. These memorandums, witness says, were given to him and to 9th witness by the shroff of Kottapilli and were taken by them to the priest's agent (10th witness) in Chodaveram. Witness says he was never a batta peon in the Sub-Magistrate's office, and he does not know where the landlord's share last year on "auction site" was taken. He denies that people say that "auction site" is held by the late Sub-Magistrate whose name he does not know. Witness was with 9th witness all the time the latter was in Kottapilli, which village he left in 9th witness' company. Witness did not see the "Bhagam" on "auction site" measured that day; he did not accompany the grain that day when taken away to Chodaveram. He did not see it taken away.

16. Ninth witness says that last year he was the Sub-Magistrate's batta peon; that the morning of the day he and 8th witness received the cadjan leaves, K. Jagganna (10th witness and agent of the priest) had told him to take a letter to the Thanedar and bring back any "Bhagam" he gave. Witness brought no grain that day, but saw some brought the following day. Witness did not see any put into the Sub-Magistrate's part of the house. Witness does not know that any portion was brought away for the Sub-Magistrate. None was so given to witness, who did not accompany the bandies from Kottapilli. Witness has every now and then for a month or so at a time been Sub-Magistrate's batta peon. Witness saw the "Bhagam" measured on the threshing-floors "in auction site," the day he got the cadjans. Witness does not know why the shroff wrote that the grain was delivered by "witness as Sub-Magistrate's peon."

17. It would seem from the entries on the cadjans that, on the third day of the bright fortnight of Pushya, Bhava year (corresponding with 10th January 1875), certain shares of grain raised by the occupants of portions of "auction site" were delivered by Magistrate's peon, Sakuru Kannayya, and by the Thanedar to 1st witness and his brother (6th witness).

A portion of the cadjan containing some writing has been torn off. On one page is the entry "Amount paid in cash to Magistrate's peons, Rupees 1-8-0."

18. I have just ascertained, upon reference to the Sub-Magistrate's Diary, that he was at Chodaveram from 1st to 20th January 1875, an entry to that effect being made for each day including the 10th January. This is a most important discovery when considered with reference

to his explanation that when the grain was brought to Karri Jagganna's (10th witness') house in Chodaveram, he (Sub-Magistrate) was touring in the taluq. The latter assertion is thus proved to be untrue, and the statements of the 2nd and 4th witnesses that they saw the Sub-Magistrate at his house at Chodaveram, as well as their description of what then took place, derive corresponding confirmation.

19. The presence of the Sub-Magistrate on the spot at the time when coupled with the part played by the "Sub-Magistrate's peon Sakuru Kannayya," and the amount paid in cash to Sub-Magistrate's peons "1-8-0" as evidenced by the cadjan memorandums, appear to be very suspicious circumstances.

20. Sixth witness, brother of 1st witness, says he did not go to Chodaveram with the grain which he states was taken there, though one of the cadjan entries would point to his having received charge of some from the Thanedar. Sixth witness and his sons appear to have played a very independent part, and to have retained their lands and crops in the general spoliation.

21. The remarks of 6th witness as to his being sent for upon two occasions by the Madugula Manager deserve attention. This witness' lands (part of "auction site") had been under attachment by the Manager for three months when a serious case of housebreaking occurred in the village of Isakkapilli in the Viravilli Taluq, and not far from Kottapilli, in the month of August last. In the course of the inquiry into that case, and subsequently, it transpired that there was strong ill-feeling between the Sub-Magistrate and the Police. The explanation given by the latter was that the late Madugula Rajah and his Manager used frequently to endeavour to persuade the Police to make improper use of their powers and authority, and that, upon refusal, the Police thereby incurred the ill-will of the Madugula authorities and similarly made an enemy of the Sub-Magistrate who is connected with the Manager. Sixth witness was one of the witnesses in the housebreaking case. The release of his lands from attachment, and their restoration to him by the Manager *before* witness came before me to give evidence in that case, and the earnest inquiries of the Manager *after* the case was decided, as to the information tendered by 6th witness as to the Sub-Magistrate's holding land in Kottapilli, would seem to indicate an attempt on the Manager's part to satisfy and please witness as well as the Manager's anxiety at the Sub-Magistrate having been mentioned as a holder of lands in Kottapilli. The Manager may have feared lest the Police would bring this matter to notice.

22. The statement referred to by 6th witness is enclosed. On the reverse of the same paper is the statement of the village Munsif (7th witness) both to the effect that the Sub-Magistrate held lands in Kottapilli. The Munsif proved himself a very unsatisfactory witness in the housebreaking case, and has since verbally retracted his former deposition (enclosed); since, in fact, he came to know that the Sub-Magistrate's conduct in holding lands was objectionable. In the first instance, I was under the impression that there was no good reason for suspecting the Sub-Magistrate, as the putta for the land was in the name of another. Later I found that the rumours of the enjoyment of the lands by the Sub-Magistrate were very prevalent and thought they might have some foundation in fact. The Sub-Magistrate, as you are aware, was then transferred to Ankapilli.

23. The Madugula Manager married the Sub-Magistrate's niece, who is the sister of the Sheristadar of your office. It seems, too, that the daughter of the Manager is shortly to be married to the Sub-Magistrate's son.

24. This will sufficiently explain the reluctance evinced by most of the witnesses in speaking out before me. They feared to offend Government officials no less than the Madugula Manager.

25. I must advert to one matter very clearly established in the enclosures, *viz.*, the personal interest taken by the Manager in the delivery of the "auction site" lands to the putta-holder, The Manager, the Thanadar, and the Madugula peons, as well as two batta peons of the Sub-Magistrate, all took an active part, all being present on the spot, in securing for the priest the lands and landlord's share (if not more) of the crops even of that harvest. All this active interest on the part of the Manager would be intelligible if exercised in behalf of his connexion, the Sub-Magistrate. It cannot be supposed that the Manager would so exert himself in the case of every fresh issue or transfer of a putta, and no satisfactory reason has been given for his taking so much personal trouble on account of the priest, or for the services of the Sub-Magistrate's peons being employed in favor of the latter.

26. The priest appears to have been a purely absentee landlord, no one having once seen him on the land. Indeed he is known to but few from all accounts, and it would seem that he but rarely visited Chodaveram. The Sub-Magistrate, too, appears to have kept away from the land, one witness only (1st) deposing to having seen him there. This witness states that the Sub-Magistrate came upon two occasions and inspected the land once before the grant of the putta.

27. The Sub-Magistrate says these reports against him have been circulated through the instrumentality of the Police and of the late Madugula Manager. It is not shown that the latter had anything to do with these proceedings. The matter was, it is true, first brought to notice by the Police, and that they and the Sub-Magistrate were upon ill terms is not open to doubt. But no explanation has been furnished by the Sub-Magistrate for the confirmation and detailed account by the witnesses of the report of the Police. There is no stated reason why the royts should share the ill-feeling of the Police against the Sub-Magistrate, unless indeed they felt they had been injured by him in the matter of their lands, and, in this case, their ill-feeling would only be additional testimony to the truth of their story. For reasons already given (paragraph 24) they had strong ground for submitting to the appropriation of their lands without complaint to the authorities; but, when summoned and questioned, they, with the exception of 5th witness (who was evidently determined to say nothing he could keep to himself), explained and corroborated the report of the Police.

28. In the face of such documents as the putta and cowle and kadapa, all of which refer to the priest as Puttadar, it would be impossible otherwise than upon confession to establish conclusively the complicity of the Sub-Magistrate. To my mind, however, in spite of the existence of these documents, the case against the Sub-Magistrate is not at all satisfactorily cleared up in his favor, but gives good ground for suspecting the honesty of his conduct.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From N. A. ROUPELL, Esq., Acting Principal Assistant Collector, to H. ST. A. GOODRICH, Esq., Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, dated Waltair, 26th February 1876, No. 54.

WITH reference to my letter, No. 53, dated 25th instant, I have the honor to forward the enclosures marginally noted, from which you will observe that the character of the Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate was called in question in 1868, when he was Sub-Magistrate of Palconda; that he was then transferred to Gajapatinagaram; and that soon afterwards the District Magistrate, on the recommendation of the Senior Assistant, sanctioned his removal to some subordinate position.

1. Letter from Senior Assistant Collector, dated 16th April 1868, No. 61.
1. Letter to Senior Assistant Collector, dated 20th April 1868, No. 238.
1. Letter from Senior Assistant Collector, dated 27th May 1868, No. 86.
1. Letter to Senior Assistant Collector, dated 1st June 1868, No. 313.
1. Letter to Senior Assistant Collector, dated 15th June 1868, No. 334.

2. The pay-abstracts show that he ceased to be Sub-Magistrate of Gajapatinagaram on 26th June 1868. From 27th idem to 18th July 1868 he was first Gumasta to the Bobbily Deputy Tahsildar, but appears to have been on leave on private affairs. After the 18th July 1868 he was out of employ till the 24th idem, from which date he drew pay as Taluq Sheristadar of Golconda.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From N. A. ROUPELL, Esq., Acting Principal Assistant Collector, to H. ST. A. GOODRICH, Esq., Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, dated Waltair, 14th March 1876, No. 73.

WITH reference to your letter, No. 2 extra, dated 2nd instant, I have the honor to inform you that the summons issued for the appearance of Peddinti Padmanabha Acharyulu was returned yesterday with an endorsement that he is not to be found in Ramathirthalu, which is alleged to have been his residence. His evidence could not therefore be taken.

2. The Deputy Tahsildar Nyayapati Narasimhaswami Pantulu says that he went to Jaggarnadh about six or seven months ago, and that he may now be either at that place or at Berhampore or Chetterpore in Ganjam District.

3. I am making further endeavours to procure his presence, but much doubt whether I shall be successful.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copies of correspondence.

THE Collector is requested to forward the record of the inquiry held by the Principal Assistant Collector.

2. It appears that N. Narasimhaswami was reduced to the post of Taluq Sheristadar in 1868, but no explanation is given regarding his restitution to his former rank in 1870.

3. Pending the Board's decision on the present charge, the Deputy Tahsildar will remain under suspension.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Acting Collector of Vizagapatam.

Exd. J. Wright.

1876.
Board of Revenu
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 11TH APRIL 1876, No. 1,00

Encl

Received [illegible]

APRIL.
No. 1,004.

Narasimhaswami Puntulu, N.—Der Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate of Viravilli T Vizagapatam District.—Requesting Collect forward the record of inquiry held by Prin Assistant Collector into certain charges a —, and stating that he should remain und pension pending Board's decision on th

---

No. 1,504.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 8th June 1876.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 11th April 1876, No. 1,004.

Read also the following papers :—

Telegram from N. Narasimhaswami, dated 1st April 1876.
Petition from do. „ 19th „ „

From H. Sr. A. GOODRICH, Esq., Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd April 1876, No. 652.

I HAVE the honor to enclose, in original, record of the enquiry held by the Principal Assistant Collector on the charge brought against N. Narasimahswami, late Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate of Viravilli, called for in Board's Proceedings, dated 11th April 1876.

2. Mr. Melville, who was then Acting Collector, has not placed on record any reasons for reappointing N. Narasimhaswami as Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate.

3. I enclose, in original, deposition taken by the Principal Assistant from the priest referred to in paragraph 2 of my letter, No. 455 of March 23rd last, who was found in the Ganjam District. Although holding a putta for the land, he states that he has never seen it, though he visited N. Narasimhaswami at a village near to the place where the land lies; but that he entrusted it to an agent, and denies that N. Narasimhaswami had any interest in the land whatever.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Records of Enquiry.

THE foregoing papers relate to the alleged miscon Puntulu, at the time he was employed as Sub-Magistrate

2. It appears that in the village of Kottapilli, in the Madgole Zemindari an within the Viravilli division, there is a plot of land called [illegible] or "Auction Site." In January 1875, when a relative of the Sub-Magistrate was manager of the Zemindari, this piece of land was given on putta to a priest residing under the same roof with the Sub-Magistrate. The terms of the putta granted the whole plot, the capacity of which is shown as 15 garce, at a "Kattubadi" of Rupees 7-8-0. Mr. Roupell estimates the value of the annual outturn of paddy at Rupees 450. This putta was registered on the 28th January 1875. The Collector and the Principal Assistant are convinced that the tenure of the priest Pabmanabha Acharryaur is merely nominal, and that the real grantee of the land is the Sub-Magistrate, Narasimhaswami.

3. In a case of this kind, it is of course very difficult to obtain evidence which can be regarded as absolutely conclusive, and it is quite impossible to place any great reliance upon oral testimony unsupported by corroborative facts. But apart from the statements of the witnesses, which may or may not be true, it is clear that the land was given upon very easy terms, and the cadjan memorandum shows that the peons in the Sub-Magistrate's employ had a good deal to do with the removal of the landlord's share of the crop, and that that share was deposited

in the house occupied, in part at least, by the Sub-Magistrate. Then, again, the priest, who is the nominal holder of the putta, has never seen the land, and he states that he entrusted the management of it entirely to his agent who resides at the Sub-Magistrate's house.

4. Upon a full consideration of all these circumstances, it seems far more probable that the grant was made in reality to Narasimhaswami Puntulu than to the priest, and this view of the matter is supported in a great measure by the character of the Sub-Magistrate's defence. The Board are willing to give due weight to the plea that the charge is the result of a conspiracy. Some ill-feeling must always precede a complaint of this nature, but after making every allowance, it is impossible to find in the petition which has been put in, anything which materially weakens the presumption that Narasimhaswami was interested in the transaction. On the contrary his defence contains at all events three gross misstatements, one relating to the extent of the land, another to his absence from Chodaveram, his head-quarters, at the time of the delivery of the landlord's share of the crop at his house on the 10th January 1875, and a third regarding the circumstances which led to his degradation in 1868. The first of these misstatements is contained in paragraph 10 of the petition to the Board, where the Sub-Magistrate lightly speaks of the "land in question yielding only two garces of paddy, amounting to the paltry sum of Rupees 60 a year," whereas, according to the registered document and by the admission of the priest, the yield of the land is not two but fifteen garce. The second misstatement is contained in his deposition before the Principal Assistant on the 31st January 1876, in which he says that at the time the crop was delivered he was away touring in the taluq, the fact as shown by his diary being that he was at Chodaveram at that time. The third misstatement [illegible] ragraph 21 of the petition where the Sub-Magistrate states [illegible] ake, and add [illegible] d him to office [illegible] olcondah. Now it appears from the record [illegible] istory of this transaction is as follows: In consequence of Narasimhaswami's manipulation of a criminal case on his file, Major Grove, the then Senior Assistant, reported him to the Acting Collector, Mr. J. H. Master, for negligence, dilatoriness and suspicion of corruption, and Mr. Master ordered his transfer to another division in order that he might be more under surveillance. Presently, upon the return of the permanent Collector, Mr. Minchin, that officer was at some pains to ascertain the details of the Sub-Magistrate's irregularities, and after full enquiry removed him from his appointment with the remark that "if the conduct of the Sub-Magistrate was not caused by corrupt motives, he is utterly ignorant of his duty and on either supposition is unfit to hold so important a post." For a while Narasimhaswami stood appointed Taluq Head Gumastah (15th June 1868 to 24th July 1868) until he was made Taluq Sheristadar of Golcondah, which latter office he held till November 1870, when he was appointed by Mr. Melville to be Sub-Magistrate of Viravilli. Mr. Melville has not left on record his reasons for restoring him to his former position, probably he considered that he had been sufficiently punished.

5. Had N. Narasimhaswami Puntulu been a man of unblemished reputation, the Board, notwithstanding the strongly-expressed opinion of the district officers, would have been prepared to give him the benefit of the doubt in the present case. But looking to his antecedents which afford a *primâ facie* probability against the uprightness of his conduct, they are forced to the conclusion which has been arrived at by the Collector; and feeling the strong necessity which exists for enforcing integrity and independence of character in the case of Sub-Magistrates in charge of Zemindaries, they resolve to recommend to Government that N. Narasimhaswami Puntulu be dismissed from the service.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with three original enclosures (Records of Enquiry) a Petition and Telegram
to be returned, and copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 11th April 1876,
No. 1,004 (its original enclosure, copies of correspondence, to be returned).

Copy to the Acting Collector of Vizagapatam.

Exd. W. H. French.

Rc 256

No 2030

No 440

Revenue 1876. Department

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 8TH JUNE 1876, No. 1,504.

Despd 19 June/76

Encl. 1

6 Decs

G.O. No 1002 - 26 July 1876

Received 23 June /76

JUNE.

No. 1,504.

Narasimhaswami Puntulu, N.—Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate of Viravilli in Vizagapatam District.—Recommending to Government that — be dismissed from service for misconduct in connection with certain land.

1002/18

TO

THE MOST NOBLE
THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM & CHANDOS,
GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL,
Madras.

G.O. 25 July /76
No 1002

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF **NYAYAPATHY NARASIMHASWAMY PUNTULU**, DEPUTY TAHSILDAR AND SUB MAGISTRATE OF ANAKAPALLI, VIZAGAPATAM.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

1. That on the receipt of a very unfounded information against your Grace's Petitioner viz. that he got possession of a plot of land in the Zemindary of Madgole for his own use and benefit under the pretence (because he as public servant could not acquire land) that the same had been given by the late Zemindar to the Petitioner's priest Padmanabha Achariar in consideration of his high proficiency in the Sanscrit Literature and Sciences. The Acting Principal Assistant to the Collector of Vizagapatam (Mr. N. A. Roupell) sent to the Petitioner a note written and signed by him and dated 19th January 1876, intimating the Petitioner's suspension from service until further orders.

2. That after a time an enquiry was held, which was in its nature long, mysterious, confused and repugnant to the rules of practice now in force. The Petitioner was not allowed copies of depositions and other material papers relating to the accusation, and so was prevented from making any defence.

3. That in the enquiry the Petitioner was in particular asked to answer the following questions :—

I. Whether he had any sort of interest in the bit of land stated to have been given by the late Zemindar of Madgole to Padmanabha Achariar, the priest.

II. Whether he was at Chodaveram on the 10th of January during his inspection tour as Deputy Tahsildar.

III. Whether he had been degraded for mis-conduct in 1868.

4. The Petitioner's answers were very brief. The first and the third questions were answered in the negative, and his reply to the second was that his whereabouts would be known if his diary were looked into.

5. That after the close of the enquiry the Acting Principal Assistant Collector sent up the records of the case to the Collector with a recommendation that

the Petitioner should be dismissed from his services. The Collector, too, all in haste, and without affording the Petitioner a fair opportunity to defend himself, supported the Acting Principal Assistant Collector and thus recommended to the Board of Revenue for his (Petitioner's) dismissal.

6. That the Petitioner now understands that the Board of Revenue have, in their time, submitted the records of the case to the Government, recommending (and that without conclusive and satisfactory evidence in the case) the Petitioner's dismissal from Public Service. Accordingly your Grace's poor Petitioner is obliged to submit for your Grace's patient perusal and favourable consideration in Council a brief account of the nature, extent, yield and tenure of the land in question, and of the unfortunate circumstances that attended the Petitioner in office in 1868.

7. (i) That the bit of land alluded to, is an unirrigated plot classed under wet but entirely dependent on rain for cultivation.

(ii) The area and not the yield of the land (as repeatedly told by the Petitioner to the Acting Principal Assistant Collector) is about 15 garce. In the puttah registered by the Petitioner as Sub-Registrar, it is clearly stated that about 15 garce is the Parimitham of it. Parimitham means area and not the yield, as has been erroneously understood by the Acting Principal Assistant, the Collector and the Board of Revenue. In the district generally, and in the Zemindary tracts in special, the area of lands is given in the denomination of garce and putties instead of in acres and cents. One garce of dry contains, as far as the Peteitioner's knowledge goes, four acres; and of wet only 2 acres. Lands are rated in proportion to the area thus calculated. Accordingly the area of this land which is stated to be about 15 garce is, the Petitioner is well convinced, not more than 20 acres.

(iii) The Petitioner has stated the annual yield of the land to be about 2 garce to the landlord. One garce of wet dependent on rain water may produce one quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) garce at the highest, and one garce of irrigated wet ($\frac{1}{2}$) a garce of grain. Out of this the landlord is to get only a half according to rule, that is, respectively $\frac{1}{8}$ and $\frac{1}{4}$ garce. The table quoted in the margin* is the one by which quantities of grain are measured. The ryot who cultivates the land has deposed that in the last Fusli only 2 garce of grain were given to the landlord.

* 3 Seers make 1 Cunchum.
20 Cunchums 1 Putti.
30 Putties 1 Garce.

NOTE.—A Seer is only $\frac{3}{4}$ of a Madras Seer.

(iv) The land was given by the late Zemindar of Madgole to Padmanabha Achariar the Petitioner's priest on 23rd January 1875, only as a reward for his proficiency in Sanscrit. Such rewards are commonly given by Zemindars. The Puttah for the land was registered, in his name, on 28th January 1875. It has been suspected and alleged that the Petitioner took a great interest in the land and caused the crops to be removed to his house while at Chodaveram on the 10th January 1875, and that he employed his office servants in carrying them. This allegation is an entire falsehood. No witness has deposed to the fact that grain was carried to the Petitioner's house on that date.

Even supposing that there was room for such misconception, it seems entirely unreasonable that your Grace's Petitioner could have taken any interest in the land and much more therefore any active part in the removal of the crops, on the 10th January, before the land had been given to the priest, and *a fortiori* before the puttah had been registered in the name of the priest, on 28th January 1875. This may, to any one seem very unnatural.

(v) In 1868, Major Grove, the then Senior Assistant Collector granted the Petitioner leave of absence for 5 days. The Petitioner availed himself of the leave at the close of an enquiry in a case of theft, which had been preferred to him by the Police. After the expiration of the leave, he referred the case to the Senior Assistant Collector for final disposal and sentence under the orders of the High Court dated 23rd December 1860, the value of the property being above 50 Rupees. The Senior Assistant Collector dismissed the case without conviction. Then the accused in this case preferred a charge against the Police of having forcibly taken bribes from them. The Senior Assistant Collector, thereon, made a remark against the Petitioner for neglect of duty in having delayed the transmission of the records of the case and thus given room for corruption. This was done by the Senior Assistant Collector without the slightest consideration that the Petitioner had then availed himself of the leave granted to him. Major Grove wrote against him to the Collector Mr. Minchin who ordered that the Petitioner should be made Taluq Head Gumastah; and that a Taluq Head Gumastah should take charge of Petitioner's duties, as Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-magistrate of Guzapatinagaram. This order had never come to force. The Petitioner had been at the Collector's office waiting for orders as to his appointment. The Head Gumastah, not having passed the tests qualifying him to act as a Sub-Magistrate had not discharged the duties of Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate of Guzapatinagaram but stuck up to his own appointment. The Petitioner had never drawn pay for these days either as Taluq Head Gumastah, or as Sub-Magistrate but remained nominally suspended. After this period, the Petitioner was appointed Taluq Sheristadar of Golconda under the orders of Mr. Minchin. There the Petitioner did duty well, accordingly Mr. Sewell made him Acting Tahsildar of Golconda and gave him a certificate, that he well deserved to be promoted. In November 1870, (after examining the records relating to the Petitioner's misfortune in 1868) Mr. Melville appointed him permanently to the Sub-Magistracy of Viravully.

8. That the period of the Petitioner's service under Government up to date comes to about 23 years and odd.

9. That accordingly, the Petitioner requests that your Grace will have the goodness in Council to consider the Petitioner's long service under Government, the trifling charge uncorroborated by conclusive evidence brought against him, the private conspiracy antecedent thereto, the unfavourable circumstances he was exposed

to during the investigation by the Acting Principal Assistant Collector and his misconception as to the meaning of terms relating to the area of land and quantity of grain produced ; and to redress the grievances of your Grace's humble Petitioner. The Petitioner further requests that the Acting Principal Assistant Collector's order suspending him from the post of Deputy Tahsildar and Sub-Magistrate of Anakapalli be cancelled, that the Board's recommendation for dismissal may be reversed, and that orders may be passed on this petition along with the proceedings of the Board of Revenue which the Petitioner hears is before Government.

10. In conclusion the Petitioner begs to state that he is ready to submit any further explanation if necessary.

For which act of kindness your Grace's humble Petitioner will, in duty bound,

SHALL EVER PRAY.

23rd June 1876.

N. B. A list of the Petitioner's services is appended

"My present tenants on that land

are

1 Name of Appointment	2 Nature i.e. whether substantive or temporary	3 Substantive appointment if the new appointment be only acting	4 Pay	5 The acting allowance	6 Date of appointment	7 Signature of officer
[illegible] Police in Poola Kimedy taluq	Substantive		12		15th March 1860	
[illegible] Berhampore Tahsildar's office	do		12		15th [illegible] 1862	
Gumastah under the town Submagistrate of Berhampore	do		12		18th March 1863	
Gumastah under the Submagistrate of Ganjam	do		12		23d Sept. 1865	
Submagistrate of [illegible] in Vizagapatam Dist	do		70		22d Nov. 1865	
Submagistrate & Deputy Tahsildar of ~~Vizianagram~~ Gajapati nagaram.	do		70.		21st April 1868	
Taluq Sheristadar in Golconda taluq	do		60		24th July 1868	
Tahsildar of Golconda Taluq	Acting		60	30 at 20 per cent	29th Nov 1869	
Sheristadar in Golgondah Taluq	Substantive		60		7th April 1870	
Sub mag. & dep. Tahsildar of Veeravalli	do.		70		19th Nov. 1870	

N. No
dar
18
of the
abo
of th
rea
Law
sion
the o
Lere
this
prom
suit

The Entries in these columns to be reattested every five years; Each attestation should be carefully ruled off. The Date may be clearly shown.

Name of officer	Caste or Race	Residence	Father's Name	Father's Residence	Date of Birth	Age Years	Age Months	Age Days	Exact Height Feet	Exact Height In.	Personal Marks for identification	Date of Entry	Signature of officer	Signature and designation of the head of the office
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	37	[illegible]	[illegible]	5	3 1/4	Distinct marks of small pox on the face. A scar on the right hand Elbow — Straw colour or bamboo colour.			

1st December 1872.

1 Name of Appointment	2 Nature i.e. whether substantive or acting permanent or temporary	3 Substantive appointment if the appointment be acting only	4 Pay	5 Acting allowance	6 Date of appointment	7 Signature of officer	8 Character of officer	9 Signature & designation of the immediate head of the office	10 Date of termination of appointment	11 Reason of termination i.e. Transfer promotion return of permanent incumbent	12 Signature & designation of the immediate head of the office
Additional Gumasta in the Prl. Asst Collr of [illegible] Ganjam Dist.	Temporary	......	10	---	15th March 1852				16 May 1852	Transfer to another appointment.	
Civil 3d Gumasta in the Princl. Asst Agents Court Ganjam Dist	Acting	...		15	17th May 1852				9th July 1852	Return of permanent incumbent	
Civil Jarabnevis Do Do	Do			10	24th July 1852				23rd August 1852	Do	
Gumastah under the head of Police in Chicacole	Substantive		10		17th January 1853				31st August 1853.	Promotion	
Head of Police in do	Acting		10		1st Sept. 1853				30th Sepr 1853	Return of permanent incumbent.	
Gumastah under the head of police in Chicacole	Substantive		10		1st Octr. 1853				9th Octr 1854	Transfer to another appointment.	
Gumastah under the head of police in Ganjam	do		10		10th Octr. 1854				19th August 1856.	Promotion	
Peishkar in the Ganjam Taluq	do.		20		20th Aug 1856.				10th Feby 1857	Transfer to another appointment.	
Karkoon & Subordinate Police in the northern Condans [illegible] Kimidi	do		12		17th Febr 1857.				17th May 1859	Do.	
Do Do in the Western Khoundons of Chicacole Taluq	Acting		12		18th May 1859.				14th March 1860	Return to permanent appointment	

My present tenants on that land

8 …aracter of Officer	9 Signature & designation of the immediate head of Office	10 Date of termination of appointment	11 Reason of termination i.e. transfer promotion or return of permanent incumbent	12 Signature and designation of the immediate head of office
		14th March 1862	Transfer another appointment.	
		12th March 1863	do.	
		22nd Sept. 1865	do.	
		21st Nov. 1865	do on promotion.	
		20th April 1868	Transfer another appointment	
		23rd July 1868	do.	
		28th Nov 1869	do on promotion	
		6th April 1870	Arrival of permanent incumbent.	
		18th Nov 1870.		

…rasainbanasamy has been Sherista
of the Golgonda Taluq for about
…nths and has been in charge
Tahsildar's work as well for
…t 3 months. (ie) since the death
…t incumbent. I have had no
…n to find fault with him. Since I
been in charge of the subdivi
…. He is fairly up in his work &
…ly drawback to his efficiency
is his bad health owing to the climate of
… I shall be very glad if he get
…on in some place which may
his health better.

(Signed) Henry Sewell
a. p. a. Collr.

"My present tenants on that land

Behara Sannamma of Kottapilli affirms
21-1-76.

About a year ago the late Taluq Magistrate of Viravilli Gajapati Narasimhaswami Guntu gave me a Cowle which I have in my house at home for some land which would yield 12 or 13 garces of paddy in a good year. I gave him a Cadapa in return. I read the Cowle given to me by the late Taluq magistrate. His name did not appear in the Cowle, according to which the land was given to me by one Peddinti Padhmanabhaswami. was ~~then~~ He the Sub Magistrate had the Cowle written by a Brahamin boy (I donot Know who he was) in the Taluq Magistrate's house in Chodavaram. I remarked to the Sub Magistrates who was present that his name did not appear in the Cowle and he told me what does that matter to you? The land has been given to the Priest ([illegible]) take the Cowle. The Cadapa was drawn accordingly in the Priest's name. The land was granted nominaly to the Priest; but the management of it was in the hands of the Sub Magistrate.

My present Tenants on that land

ar

are

Subbavarapu Joginaydu
Kolli Appadu
Kolli Yerukanna
Vepula Naganna
Kolli Joganna.

When they talk in Kotapilli about దొరవారు as holding lands they refer to Padbanabha Sawmi. They rarely mention his name. I do not know him by sight. He may have been present when the Cowle was written. There were 7 or 8 people then whom I did not know.

I know the Priest is related, because the Sub Magistrate spoke so of him to me saying the land had been given to his relative. Previous to the Cowle I had held the land since I was a Child & my father before me under the Vadugula Raja in return for certain services & had a Puttah for it. This Puttah is now in my house. It has never been Cancelled.

I know Narana ~~[illegible]~~ murty of Kottapilli. He used to Cultiva

So about 6 months ago by the Thanadar Chaganti Verabhadrudu under orders from the Gumasta Narsimhaswami. The land is now under the Priest. I am now cultivating it.

I know G[illegible]pola Chittenna of my village. He enjoyed for 10 or 12 years some land in Kottapilli which now is under the Priest. He was turned out of the land about 6 months ago. I now cultivate it.

Last year Peddanna. Kunnaya two of the Sub Magistrate's Peons came when the Crop was being reaped and took away half of the Crops grown in the lands of Mallampilli Akkayya. Iyaturi Virabhayya.
Palakoti Sivayya
Pedapilli Viranna
to the house of the Sub-Magistrate in Chodavaram in bandies. I went with them under orders of the Manager of the estate to the Sub Magistrate. and measured the grain then put it in to the granary. Five or Six peons also came on behalf of the Manager. The Sub Magistrate received the grain at his house in Chodavaram. I saw him there

Ramkishnam
Narasimhaswami

about 7 bandy loads over 2 garces.

They tried to take away my brother Behara Appadu's Crop that day but he and his sons resisted them - His land is a Dumbala Inam. All the villagers in Kottapilli know very well that [illegible] the Sub Magistrate has been holding lands under the Madugula Sarkar; they say upon permanent Cowle.

I saw the Sub Magistrate come twice to my lands last year. The first time he came to examine the land; the second time he looked at the boundries.

I do not know what became of the crop taken to the Sub Magistrate's House.

21-1-76

(Signed) N A Roupell
Ag Prl Asst Collector

Further affirmation this 11-2-76 at Waltair
The writer of the Cowle is the man now present —
(Kalaga Atsanna (Sd) NAR)

Behara Sannamma affirmed

The late Sub Magistrate's house in Chodavaram, was a large one. several people lived separately in different portions - Karri Jagganna and the Priest lived in one portion together. They were separated from the Sub Magistrate by a Court yard; quite distinct. Some of the crop was put in to their portion. The Barik's was not with the bandies when the crop was removed.

When the Cowle was given to me in the Sub Magistrate's house the Priest who, I remember, was then sitting down, never spoke to me about the Cowle - The Sub Magistrate did all this. The Cowle and Cudapa were both written then and there - I should recognize the writer if I saw him. The Priest did not sign the Cowle - Karri Jagganna signed it for him - I am sure the Priest was there, ~~and~~ I noticed his marks & his beard.

(Signed) N A Roupell
Ag Pl Asst Collector

1-2-76

A Narayanna ~~naidu~~ murty of Gogada

Affirms this 24-1-76 at Waltair.

The late Taluq Magistrate of Veravilli holds land in Kottapilli - So all the villagers say - Behara Sunnamma told me last year he held lands under him (the Taluq Magistrate) About a year ago the crop on land held by me in Kottapilli was cut as usual by my tenants Behara Sunnamma, Sabbavarapu Joginaidu and Kolli Akkayya. They held the land under me on condition of giving me half the out turn - I had held the land for two years past under certain villagers of Kottapilli in virtue of the Puttah now filed - The whole of the crop last year as soon as reaped was carried away by the three Ryots or landies - Just as they were removing the paddy 6 Peons from Madugula and 6 from Chodavaram came up ~~and~~ said that Piddenti Pudbhanabhswami had obtained - Puttah for the land and that they must not remove the Crop - Karri Jugganna a Vakeel of Pudbhanabhaswami said the same. I and Ivaturi Vireshayya and Mallampilli Akkayya were there & remonstrated ~~and~~ the Crops was taken away The Kept in Sabbavarapu Jogunaidu's house, where it was to be Kept in deposit pending the settlement of the dispute. It is ~~there~~ there now. I complained to the late Taluq Magistrate who referred me to the Munsiff's Court.

I do not Know Piddinti Padmanabha swami by sight nor do I Know where he lives. They say he is the late Sub Magistrate's Priest. They said he lived with him. I Know Hari Juggamma use to live with the late Sub Magistrate. I have seen him at the late Sub Magistrate's house. The rumour is that my land as well as other land has been given on Puttah to the late Sub Magistrate Nyapati Narasimhaswami Puntulu. I do not Know how far this is true. The late Sub Magistrate never told me to give up my lands when the Madugula Manager and Lakshmaji Puntulu were present or at any other time.

At the time the Crop on my land was removed to be Kept in deposit, the Crops on the lands of Bebara Sunnamma. Mallumpilli Akkayya, Ivaturi Verishayya Gungla Kurti Sanyasi. were also removed to be Kept in deposit for the same reason. None of us dare touch our Crops.

The value of the Crop removed from my Maniam was about 80 Rs. It was mixed up with the Crops of others and stored in the houses of various people in Kottapilli. No one has taken away my land as yet from me or my ryots. I Know Rallupilli Narayudu. He is Sanadar. He does the Samutdar's work.

I do not Know Regulapilli Narayudu. R[illegible]pilli Narayudu does not cultivate [illegible] lands.

Vizagapatam
24-1-76

M. A. Roupell
Ag Pl Asst Collector

Ivaturi Veerayya of Gógada
Affirms this 24.1.76 at Vizagapatam
For about 14 years I enjoyed a Inamam
in Kottapilli close to others belonging to
Mallumpilli Akkayya, Narayana ~~Sastu~~ murty
and others - Last year I had one tenant
Kolli Akkayya, who cultivate on condi-
-tion of paying me half the produce.
Last year the Madugula Manager and
Mukhtyar & Karri Juganna came with
Peons, none of the Peons had badges - and
Took away the hole of the crop grown on my
Manam patta less than 2 garces and als
the crops of many others - Narayana ~~Naidu~~ murty
Mallumpilli Akkayya and Behara
Sunnamma's Ryots &c. They told us the land
had been given on Puttah to a Vishnavit
Priest Piddinti Padmanabhasawmi by
name. I do not know where my crop wa
taken. I received none of it. I have ne
seen the Priest I do not know where he
lives. I have seen Karri Jugganna a
the house of the late Talug magistrate
Chodavaram. People were saying that
all this was done on account of the Talug

Magistrate to whom ~~[illegible]~~ in penalty the land had been granted - The Crop raised this year on my land has been piled in heaps on the threshing floor by Sabbavarapu Joginaidu & Kolli Appadu - These ryots were put in by Bekara Sunnamma who now holds a Cowle for the land - I have been turned out of my land since last year.

The Madugula Manager Parankusam Narasimhaswami Puntulu married the daughter of the Sub Magistrate's elder brother

(Signed) W A Roupell
Ag Prl Asst Collr

24-1-76

Gorrepotti Chittenna of Kottapilli

Affirms this 25-1-76

Bekara Sunnamma holds land under the late Sub Magistrate of Viravilli in Kottapilli - He has held this land since the time when last years crops ripened - I know this because every one says so. Bekara Sunnamma told me so when last year's crop ripened. He some times said he held the land under the late Sub Magistrate and some times he said he held it under the Priest - I donot know the Priest's name or who he is or where he lives. Some time the villagers say the Priest has the land, & some times that the late Sub Magistrate has the land - I do not know where the Sub Magistrate is - I do not know his name -

The name of the land held by the Sub Magistrate is auction site (వేలంస్థలం) which includes the holdings of 13 Inamdars, including my self.

Last year all of us were turned out of our lands, when the Crop was on the ground, as the land was wanted for the Priest.

So the Manager said who came there.

I paid the Manager Rs 50 to leave me in possession of my Inam. I never paid Rs 50 or anything to the late Taluq Magistrate on that account.

Last year the Crop on my land and on the lands of others in Auction Site was taken away in bandies to Chodavarum to the house where the late Sub Magistrate lodged. I went with the bandies crying & at Chodavarum spoke to the Sub Magistrate telling him his brother in law the Manager had taken 50 Rs from me & that he (Sub Magistrate) had then taken my Crop. He said he would request the Madugula Raja to give me some other land in lieu of mine. They were then putting the Crop in to a granary in the Sub-Magistrate's house. I saw them doing so. 10 or 12 bandy loads were taken to Chodavarum.

(Signed) N A Roupell
Ag P.L. Asst Collector

25-1-76

Peddapulli Veranna of Kottapilli
Affirms this 29.1.76

I held from the villagers a Maneam for Service in Kottapulli. Last year I was turned out of it by the Manager of the Madugula Raja. I heard it was to be given to a Priest. I know nothing about this. I have never seen the late Veravilli Taluq Magistrate anywhere. I never heard that he enjoyed any land in Kottapulli. I never heard that the Priest had any land there. I do not know his name. I have never seen him. I do not know, I have never seen Kari Juggauna. I have always lived in my village

(Signed) N A Roupell
Ag P.L. Asst Collector

29.1.76

Bollara Appadu of Kottapalli affirms this 29-1-76

I know the late Talluri Magistrate of Viravilli now in Ankapalli held land in Kottapalli on perpetual cowle from the Madugula Rajah. All the Kottapalli villagers say so. The land he holds is called "auction site". My land forms half of "auction site". I refused to give up my land and have always continued to enjoy it. It is a Dammahala Inam. The Madugula Manager told me the land was wanted for a Priest. I do not remember his name exactly. It was I think Padmanathachalu. I saw him last year after the cowle above mentioned had been drawn out. I saw him at Madugula. I hear he lives at Ramathirthalu. In auction site the other holders are Kolli Akkayya

Do. Appadu
Do. Jogamma
Subbavarapu Yerrayya
Gullepalli Seethamma
Nollivulsa Chenchayya

These all cultivate under my younger brother

Behara Samamma. Last year these same ryots cultivated these same lands under

Mallampulli Akkayya
Jmtoru Viresayya
Palakoteti Sivayya
Peddapulli Viramma
V. Narayana Murty.

These men were all turned out of there manyams by the Manager last year for the Priest.

They say that Padmanabhacharyalu is late Taluq Magistrate's private Priest. I do not know in what house in Chodavaram the Priest lives.

As soon as the House breaking case at Isukapulli occurred a few months ago, I was sent for to Madugula by the Rajah's manager Vasantharam Narasimhaswamy Pantulu. My lands had been attached three months before and were then given back to me. As soon as the enquiry and trial of the Isukapulli case was over the manager sent for me again and asked me what I had said in my deposition. The Manager said "The land was given to the Priest "on perpetual Cowle. How came you to tell "the acting Asst. Magistrate that the land "which is used by the people was enjoyed by "the Taluq Magistrate." I replied ~~that~~ it is quite true that I told the Acting Asst. Magistrate what people are in the habit of saying. He then got angry and threatened to zuft my lands again. All the villagers are well aware that there was much ill feeling between the late Taluq Magistrate and the late Police Inspector. My land was attached simply because the manager did not like me.

The crops on other lands (not mine) part of "auction site" were forcibly taken away last year to Chodavaram. I saw this. The Manager and Karri Jagganna (the Priest's Vakil they said) came there with some peons. The people said ~~the~~ two of the peons there were Sub-magistrate's peons. They had no badges. I do not know where the crops were taken in Chodavaram. Last January (1875) ~~within~~ I saw the priest in Chodavaram at the House of a Vishnavite.

The manager sent for me after the trial of the Isukapulli case and said

said he had heard I had made incorrect statements about their late Sub Magistrate's enjoying lands

22-1-76

(sd) A W B Roupell
Ag Hd Asst Collector

Kolli Yorakamah Annaiyya of Kotta Palli affirmed deposes this 7-10-75 at Waltair

I know the Submagistrate of Viravalli hold land under the Madugula Rajah. He has held since last year I pointed out boundaries of the land last year. to the peons sent by the Madugula Sircar to put the Sub magistrate in possession of the land His present tenants are

Kolli Appadu.
Sab-bavarapu Josi Naidu.
I myself
only three of us.

Vonkadu Annamalattyadu } did not cultivate land
Sanguli Sadu ——— } under the Sub Magistrate
They have manium

We pay no rent in money We give half the produce I have never paid him any of the produce I do not know who cultivated the land last year. I saw the Sub magistrate's peons driving off bandies of grain last year from this land. The Barikies and the Submagistrate's peons were with the bandies In a good year the crop of the land cultivated by us three mentioned above will be 20 garces worth from Rs 20 to 30 each. I cultivated the land because Behara Appadu's brother Sanianna told me to do so. I never spoke to the Sub Magistrate

Magistrate about it. Samamma told me to cultivate it under him. He said the Submagistrate had had the field beds made last year.

K. Akkayya Kt Jagannath Yerrayya M Chendulgadu G Sitamma are not cultivating the Submagistrate's land this year.

7-10-75 (sd) N. B. Roupell
as [illegible] Magt

6 Behara Appadu of Kottapalli
affirmed deposes this 7-10-75 at Waltair

I know the submagistrate holds a perpetual cowle from the Madugula Circar for land in Kottapalli yielding 8 garces of grain. I know that last year he got the grain threshed and took away the grain. I do not know how much. I saw the grain taken away. His tenants are:

Kolli Akkayya
Kolli Appadu
Josiadu
Subbavarapu Yerrayya
Mollumulsa Chinnigadu
Gullapulli Seshamma

The land they cultivate adjoin mine.

(sd) N. B. Roupell

Kirti Peddanna of Chodavaram
affirms this 8-2-76 at Waltair

A year ago the shroff of Kottapalli gave these cadjan leaves to me and taken Ramayya in Kottapalli I recognize these leaves as two of them only are written upon and the rest are blank and one is torn. We took them to Kt Jaggannaharm in Chodavaram. I went with Ramayya that day at his request.

I know that these cadjan leaves referred to the Bhajam or auction site in Kottapalli which is held by a Priest Peddinti Padmanabha ~~Acharlu~~ swami

I did not see the late Taluq Magistrate at Chodavaram when I took the cadjan leaves there with Ramayya I have never been a Batta Peon in his office I do not know where the Landlord's "Bhajam" or "auction site" last year was taken.

People do not say that "auction site" is held by the late Taluq Magistrate whose name I do not know

They say it is held by the Priest

I was with Ramayya all the time

he was in Kottapalli. The day we brought the letter to the Thanedar I left the village with him for Chodavaram.

I did not see the Bhagam or "auction site" measured that day.

I did not accompany the grain that day when taken away to Chodavaram. I did not see it taken away.

(sd) N. A. Roapell
Ag. P. A. Collr

Sakhiri Ramayya of Chodavaram
affirms this 8-2-76 at Waltair.

Last year I was a Batta peon in the Taluq Cutcherry at Chodavaram under Gajapati Narasimhaswamy Pantulu late Taluq Magistrate there. The shroffs of Kottapalli gave me and Peddanna last year some cadjan leaves like those now shewn to me, purporting to be a list of the "Bhagam" or "auction site" due to the Rust Peddinti Padmanabhaswami. I cannot read. The shroff gave me the list on account of Kari Jagganna. I took it to the latter in Chodavaram. He threw it away.

He (K. Jagganna) had told me that morning to take a letter to the Thanedar Kasanti Virabhadrudu and said that I was to bring back the "auction site" Bhagam if the Thanedar gave it to me. I did not bring any grain. I only brought the list.

The next day I saw the grain brought by ryots to K. Jagganna's house in Chodavaram. I saw it put into some godowns for Jagganna. I did not see any

any part into the submagistrate's part of the house or godowns. I saw Behara Samanna at the Ameen's Katcheri which forms part of the large house in which the Sub-Magistrate and K Jaggannah and others lived. He (B Samanna) told me he had delivered the grain to Jaggannah. I don't remember seeing the late Taluq Magistrate there that day.

I was Batta Peon in the Taluq Magistrate's Office at Chodavaram for about 10 years.

I don't know that any portion of the auction site" *Bhagam* was brought away for the late Taluq Magistrate. None was given to me on his own account. I was not present when the *Bhagam* was taken from "auction site" to Chodavaram. I did not accompany the bandies. Kiriti Peddannah has every now and then for a month or so at a time been Batta Peon in the Taluq Magistrate's office at Chodavaram. I don't remember whether

Cadjan leaves from the Shroff

I saw the Bhagam measured on the threshing floor in "auction site". The day I got these cadjan leaves the grain was not removed that day to Chodavaram. It was never delivered to me. I don't know why the Shroff wrote that it was delivered to me as Magistrate's peon.

(Signed) A W Campbell
Ag Asst Collr

8-2-76.

Karri Jaggannah of Sri Kurmum of Chicacole Talug, Ganjam District affirms this 11-2-76 at Waltair

I gave on behalf of Peddinti Padmanabha Swami to Behara Sannamma the cowle now shown to me.— I gave it in my house in Chodavarum.— B. Sannamma was there. The late Talug Magistrate was not there. I am sure of this. I am the Mukhtyar of Peddinti Pedmanabha Swami, who is the Priest of the late Talug Magistrate (Gnayapati Narasimha Swami Puntulu) and of others.—

The auction Site " mentioned in the cowle was given by the Madugula Serkar to Peddinti Padmanabha Swami. It was not given to the late Talug Magistrate

11-2-76.

Signed/ N. A. Roupell
Ag. Principal Asst. Collec

Kalaga Latsanna of Chodavaram affirms this 11-2-76 at Waltair

I wrote the Cowle now shown to me in Karri Jagganna's house in Chodavaram last year. I remember the circumstance well. Several people were present. — 7 or 8

I do not know whether Peddinti Padmanabha Swami was there. Behara Sanyasi (= Sannamma) was there. I know the late Taluq Magistrate Gnayapati Narasimha Swami Pantulu. He was not present when this Cowle was written. I am sure of this. I do not know where he was. Behara Sanyasi did not speak to the late Taluq Magistrate on that occasion saying that the name of the latter was not entered in the Cowle. The Taluq Magistrate lived separately from Karri Jagganna.

11-2-76.

Signed/ N. A. Roupell
Ag Principal Asst Collector

Statement of Gnyapati Narasimha Swami Puntulu Deputy Tahsildar and Submagistrate of Anakapilli taken this 31-1-76 at Vizagapatam.

I have never held any lands in Kottapilli in Viravilli Talug under the Madugula Sirkar. The name of my private Priest is Poddinti Padmanabha Swami. He has for the past year held land under th Madugula Sirkar. It is called "Auction Sit He holds it on permanent Cowle. He is not related to me. He never lived with me but use to come and see me occasionally at Chodava when I was Deputy Tahsildar there. I do n know the name of any one of my Priest's tena

I do not know whether he has few or many tenants. One of them came before me in my Office last year to register a Cadapah. I do not remember his name. His family name was "Behara" I do not remember whether his own name was "Sannammah" or not. It may have been. I do not know that my Priest ever gave a cowle to any of his tenants in my house at Chodavaram.

I do not know that he ever visited "Aucti Site". He was with me for three days wh he obtained the land, this was a year he obtained permanent Cowle for it. He was also with me once again in May I think for 6 days about.

I do not know what became of the Crops grown last year on "Auction Site". I never received any "rice crop" into my house or the Godowns attached to it last year. Part of this house in which I live is occupied by other people. I heard that last year my Priest's agent Karri Jagganna, who sometimes lives in a portion of this house, brought some grain there on Bandies. He has 2 rooms in the house. He stored it there. I did not see this. I was away touring in the Taluq. I do not know that the manager of the Madugula estate a Behara Sannamma or peons brought the grain there. I never received any at my house. None was ever put into my portion of the house. I have never seen this Cowle, now shown to me, before. I never had this written in my portion of the house at Chodavaram and I never gave ~~it~~ to Behara Sannammah. I never gave it to Behara Sannammah the land referred to in this Cowle. He never objected to me that my name was not entered in this Cowle.

I know Kalagala Latsanna of Chodavaram. I know he can write. This Cowle is in his handwriting which I recognize. I never got this Cowle written by him in my house.

I have never been to and never seen "Auction Site".

The manager of Madugula Parankusam Narasimha Swami Puntulu married my elder broth daughter. She is the sister of Ramadasu Puntulu the present Collector's Sheristadar.

I know Behara Appadu. I saw him when I enquired into a house-breaking case, whic occurred a few months ago at Tsutkapilli. I had never seen him before. I do not know i he holds any land in "Auction Site" or elsewhere

I have a sort of recollection of the

names
Narayana Murti
Ivatini Veerabhyya
Mallampilli Akkayya
Pidipilli Veeranna
Gorrepotu Chittenna

now they are mentioned to me.

I think I remember that some of them, I do not know who formerly held a portion of "Auction Site and received Compensatio for having to vacate it when the permanent Cowle was given to my Priest. a deed or two to that effect I think Came before me for registration after the permanent Cowle was registered

No one has ever complained to me tha he was injured in the matter of any land "Auction Site" No one has ever told me he was wrongfully dispossessed of land the

I.

I have heard that "Auction Site" was jirayiti land before the Cowle was given to my Priest. I do not know anything certain about it.

I declare that I never held any land in my Priest's name in Kottapilli or elsewhere. These reports against me have been circulated against me at first through ill-feeling on the part of the late Police Inspector of the Viravilli Range & lately through Narasaraz who was formerly Madugula Manager & who cherishes spite against my Kinsman the present Manager.

[illegible]

Signed/ N. A. Roupell
Ag. Prinl. Asstt. Collector

31-1-76.

[illegible]

[illegible] 15 [illegible]

[illegible] 240 [illegible]

1 [illegible]

[illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible]

3 [illegible]

[illegible]

4 [illegible]

[illegible] 1875 [illegible] 23 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1875 [illegible]

[illegible] 3-4 [illegible]

28 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

28-1-75

[illegible]

[illegible] 27 [illegible] 1 [illegible] 31 [illegible] 29 [illegible] 1875 [illegible]

[illegible]

Entries on the 1st page.

On the 3rd day / Tuesday / of the bright fortnight of Pushya month Year Bhava. Paddy delivered by Thánádár through Bhara Appadu on account of Circar Share

	Putties
due from Yivaturi Virasayya & Mallampilli Akkayya	21
Half Share of Vajjanam Paddy, delivered by Gorrepoti Chittenna on account of Arikerevula Narayana Murti on 8th day (Saturday) Bright fortnight Month Magham Year Bhava	

Entries on the 2nd page.

Paddy delivered by Magistrate's peon Sakuru Kannayya and village Servants and others, to Bhara Appadu and Sanyasayya on Tuesday, the third day of the bright fortnight of Pushya month Bhava Year.

	Putties
Paddy measured by Kolli Akkayya a tenant of Yivaturi Virasayya and Mallampilli Akkayya	21
Do by Gorrepoti Chittenna, a tenant of Arikerevula Narayana Murti on Saturday the 8th day of the bright fortnight of Magham	6½

	Putties
Paddy measured by Kolli Payidetalli's son Appadu, a tenant of Palakoti Sivayya on the 9th Idem Sunday	13-13
Do by Bandaru Appadu, a tenant of Behara Appudu	4-"
Do by Behara Sannayya in person	" 19
Do by Sabbavarapu Yerrayya, a tenant of Kóduru appili Setti on the 11th Idem Tuesday	2-16
Do by Kolli Sannyasi, a tenant of Pedapilli Virappa	4-9
Do by Duggu Dandayya of Kanupudi Sentrerappa	2-"
Paddy measured by Kolichina Payidetalli's Son Appadu	2-3
Total G	1-27-10

Entries on the last page

Paddy appropriated by Behara Sannasayya to himself on 11th bright fortnight, Magham month - Bhava year	"-12
	Rs - as - p
Amount paid in cash to Sub-Magistrate's peons	1-8-"

(True Translation)

Signed N. A. Roupell
Ag Pl Asst Collector

(True Copy)

H Goodrich
Ag Dl Magistrate

Go 25th July/76 No 1002

Enclosures
as per list
attached

No 53

Pl Asst Collector's Office
Camp Waltair
25th February 1876

From,

N. A. Ronpell Esquire
Ag. Pl Asst Collector

To

H. St. A. Goodrich Esquire
Ag Collector

Sir,

I have the honour to submit the further report alluded to in para 3 of my letter No. X dated 22nd Ultimo, the main facts of which are to be found in the depositions made by the villagers of Kottapalli, and a statement taken from the late Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate of Viravilli –

2. In the village of Kottapalli there is a plot of land called "Auction site" (Bero 2 acres) for which in January 1875 a Putta was found granted by the late Madugula Rajah to one Peddinti Padmanabha charlu. This Putta was registered at Madugula on 28th January 1875. I have by

J. D   lease as shows conclusively that he by me true copy thereof from which it seems that the auction site lands, 15 garces, were granted at a Kattubadi of Rs 7½. This would represent about 30 acres and a total annual outturn, excluding straw, of Rupees 450 worth of paddy.

3. It is alleged and has evidently been the common talk of the village that this land was in reality granted to the late Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate Nyayapati Narasimha swami pantulu, and that the latter held it in the name of P. Padmanabha charlu who is his private priest.

4. The evidence obtained may be conveniently divided into two heads.

The 1st, referring to the part played by the Submagistrate in the grant of a cowle to the 1st witness.

The 2nd, referring to the removal of a portion (the landlord's share) of the crops of some of the holdings in 'auction site' early last year to the Sub Magistrate's house in Chodavaram and to its storage there.

5. As regards the 1st head, the evidence of

of 1st Witness Behara Sannamma (or Sanyasi) is explicit. He states that he went to the Submagistrate's house in Chodavaram about a year ago to get a cowle for his holding in 'auction site' that the Submagistrate was there and gave him a cowle (which he produced) that the Submagistrate had this cowle and the corresponding Kadapa, written by a Brahmin and identified by witness as 11th Witness; that, upon perusing the cowle, witness remarked that the Submagistrate's name was not entered in it, but that of Peddinti Padmanabha Charlu; that the Submagistrate said in answer to this remark "What does that matter to you? The land has been given to the Priest. Take the cowle;" that he noticed the Priest was there by his marks and heard; that the Priest did not sign the cowle which was attested by

x 10th Witness

K. Jaggannah, Priest's agent; that the Priest never spoke to him (witness) about the cowle, but that the Submagistrate did all this. Witness adds that the land was granted nominally to the Priest, but that the management of it was in the hands of the Submagistrate, and that "all the villagers in Kottapalli know very well that

J. O   case as shows conclusively that he by me true copy thereof from which it seems that the auction site lands, 15 garces, were granted at a Kattubadi of Rs 7½. This would represent about 30 acres and a total annual outturn, excluding straw, of Rupees 450 worth of paddy.

3. It is alleged and has evidently been the common talk of the village that this land was in reality granted to the late Deputy Tahsildar and Taluq Magistrate Nyayapati Narasimha swami Pantulu, and that the latter held it in the name of P. Padmanabha Charlu who is his private priest.

4. The evidence obtained may be conveniently divided into two heads.

The 1st, referring to the part played by the Submagistrate in the grant of a cowle to the 1st witness.

The 2nd referring to the removal of a portion (the land lord's share) of the crops of some of the holdings in "auction site" early last year to the Sub Magistrate's house in Chodavaram and to its storage there.

5. As regards the 1st head, the evidence

of

of 1st Witness Behara Sannamma (or Sanyasi) is explicit. He states that he went to the Submagistrate's house in Chodavaram about a year ago to get a cowle for his holding in "auction site" and that the Submagistrate was there and gave him a cowle (which he produced); that the Submagistrate had this cowle and the corresponding Kadapa, written by a Brahmin lad identified by witness as 11th Witness; that, upon perusing the cowle, witness remarked that the Submagistrate's name was not entered in it, but that of Peddinti Padmanabha Charlu; that the Submagistrate said in answer to this remark "What does that matter to you? The land has been given to the Priest. Take the cowle"; that he noticed the Priest was there by his marks and heard; that the Priest did not sign the cowle which was attested by K. Jaggannah, Priest's Agent; that the Priest never spoke to him (witness) about the cowle, but that the Submagistrate did all this. Witness adds that the land was granted nominally to the Priest, but that the management of it was in the hands of the Submagistrate, and that "all the villagers in Kottapalli know very well that

×10th Witness

J. 8 cease as shows conclusively that he

"that the late Submagistrate has been
'holding lands under the Madugula
'Sirkar."

6. The Submagistrate, the Muk'tyar[x] and the writer[x] of the cowle all deny the truth of 1st witness's statement, saying the cowle was not given in the Submagistrate's house but in that of the Muk'tyar; that the Submagistrate was not present; and that the latter never had any thing to do with the land in question. x 10th Witness x 11th Witness

7. There is no direct evidence in support of 1st Witness's statement, though it appears from the depositions of several witnesses[x] that the Submagistrate is commonly spoken of as the holder of "Auction site." x 2nd 3rd 4th 6th and 7th witnesses

8. Upon the subject of the 2nd head of the evidence, 1st witness again speaks explicitly. He says that a year ago at harvest time the crops of 4[x] individuals named (and ascertained to be past and present holders of portions of "auction site") and of others, were removed to the Submagistrate's house at Chodavaram; that two of the Submagistrate's peons (named) (x) came and took it away in bandies; that witness accompanied the bandies under orders from the manager to the Submagistrate's house; that the Submagistrate received the grain at his house in Chodavaram; that witness saw him there and measured the grain at the Submagistrate's house and stored it there. 4th Witness says they were then (i.e. the day the grain was taken in bandies to Chodavaram) putting the grain into the Submagistrate's house. I saw them doing so." x 3rd and 8th Witness and 2 others; 8th and 9th Wit

9. The Submagistrate in his statement denies ever having received any rice crop at his house in Chodavaram last year. He says he heard that his Priest's Muk'tyar[x] had some grain brought and stored there, but that he (Submagistrate) did not see this as he was then away from Head Quarters, touring in the Taluq. x 10th Wit

10 The Muk'tyar[x] states the grain was brought to him for the Priest and was stored in his house and not in the Submagistrate's. x 10th Wit

11. It is gathered from the statements enclosed

lease as shows conclusively that he

inclosed, that at the time of the issue of the Puttah to the Priest by the Madugula Rajah's Manager, the lands of "Auction site" were enjoyed by several individuals. Into the nature of their tenure it is unnecessary to enquire, but the enclosures show that some of the occupants were very summarily dealt with, being ousted forthwith; while the crops of all, sometimes in their entirety, sometimes the landlord's half share merely, were removed from the lands and conveyed to different places.

12. It would be only natural to expect that such high handed proceedings would have called forth complaints from the sufferers but the Submagistrate says no complaint was ever received by him.

13. In contradiction of this statement 4th witness deposes that he had given the Madugula Manager Rupees 50 for the privilege of being left in possession of his property and that when the crop was carried away, he (4th wit) went with the Bandies to the Submagistrate's house at Chodavaram and there complained to the Submagistrate, who said "he would request the Madugula Manager Rajah to

to give some other land to witness in lieu of that taken away. 2nd Witness too says he complained to the Submagistrate about the spoliation of his property and was referred by the latter to the Dt Munsiff's Court.

14. It should be mentioned that the house or rather building occupied by the Submagistrate consisted of several separate portions. The Submagistrate and the Punk'tyar declare that the grain was placed in the portion occupied by the Priest and in the granaries appertaining thereto. Similarly there might be confusion in the minds of the witnesses in regard to the real tenant of that portion of the building in which the cowle and Madaha of 1st witness were drawn up. But 1st witness says he is well aware that the Submagistrate's house was divided into two separate portions and that the portion occupied by the Priest and his Punk'tyar were severed by a Courtyard from that in the tenancy of the Submagistrate. & 10th Wit

15. The statements of the two peons of the Submagistrate named by 1st witness were given with caution and differ sufficiently to prove that the one or the other, 8th & 9th Wit

or

case as shows conclusively that he

or both, were influenced more by motives of fancied expediency than of truth.

8th witness produced some memos written on cadjan leaves true translation of which is forwarded as well as the originals. These memos, witness says, were given to him and 9th witness by the Shroff of Kottapulli and were taken by them to the Priest's Agent (10th witness) in Chodavaram. Witness says he was never a batta peon in the Sub-Magistrate's Office, and he does not know where the landlord's share last year on "auction site" was taken. He denies that people say that "auction site" is held by the late Submagistrate whose name he does not know. Witness was with 9th witness all the time the latter was in Kottapulli which village he left in 9th witness' company. Witness did not see the "Bhagam" on "auction site" measured that day; He did not accompany the grain that day when taken away to Chodavaram. He did not see it taken away.

16. 9th witness says that last year he was the Submagistrate's Batta peon; that the morning of the day he and 8th

8th witness received the [illegible] J. L. Jaggannath (10th witness and agent of the Priest) had told him to take a letter to the Thanedar and bring back any "Bhagam" he gave. Witness brought no grain that day, but saw some brought the following day. Witness did not see any put into the Submagistrate's part of the house. Witness does not know that any portion was brought away for the Submagistrate. None was so given to witness, who did not accompany the bandies from Kottapulli. Witness has every now and then for a month or so at a time been Sub magistrate's Batta Peon. Witness saw the "Bhagam" measured on the threshing floor in "auction site" the day he got the cadjans. Witness does not know why the Shroff wrote that the grain was delivered by witness as Sub magistrate's peon."

17. It would seem from the entries on the cadjans that on the third day of the bright fortnight of Pushya, Bhava year (corresponding with 10th January 1875) certain shares of grain raised by the occupants of portions of "auction site" were delivered by Magistrate's peon, Sakkura Ramayya and

case as shows conclusively that he

and by the Thanedar to 1st Witness and his brother (6th witness)

A portion of the cadjan containing some writing has been torn off. On one page is the entry "amount paid in cash to Magistrate's peons 1-8-0".

18. I have just ascertained upon reference to the Sub Magistrate's diary that he was at Chodavaram from 1st to 20th January 1875, an entry to that effect being made for each day, including the 10th January '75. This is a most important discovery when considered with reference to his explanation that when the grain was brought to Hari Jagannath's (10th witness) house in Chodavaram, he (Submagistrate) was touring in the Taluq. The latter assertion is thus proved to be untrue and the statements of the 2nd and 4th witnesses that they saw the Submagistrate at his house at Chodavaram as well as their description of what then took place derive corresponding confirmation.

19. The presence of the Submagistrate

on

on the spot at the time when coupled with the part played by the "Submagistrate's peon Sakuru Ramayya", and the amount paid in cash to Submagistrate's peons "1-8-0" as evidenced by the cadjan memos. appear to be very suspicious circumstances.

20. 6th Witness, brother of 1st witness, says he did not go to Chodavaram with the grain which he states was taken there; though one of the cadjan entries would point to his having received charge of some from the Thanedar. 6th Witness and his sons appear to have played a very independent part and to have retained their lands and crops in the general spoliation.

21. The remarks of 6th witness as to his being sent for upon two occasions by the Madugula Manager deserve attention. This witness's lands (part of "auction site") had been under attachment by the Manager for three months when a serious case of house breaking occurred in the village of Tsukkapalli in the Viravilli Taluq, and not far from

Kottapalli

case as shows conclusively that

Kottapulli in the month of August last. In the course of the enquiry into that case, and subsequently, it transpired that there was strong ill feeling between the Submagistrate and the Police. The explanation given by the latter was that the late Madugula Rajah and his Manager used frequently to endeavour to persuade the Police to make improper use of their powers and authority and that, upon refusal, the Police thereby incurred the ill will of the Madugula authorities and similarly made an enemy of the Sub-magistrate, who is connected with the ~~Submagistrate~~ manager. 6th Witness was one of the witnesses in the House breaking case. The release of his lands from attachment and their restoration to him by the manager *before* witness came before me to give evidence in that case and the earnest enquiries of the Manager *after* the case was decided, as to the information tendered by 6th Witness as to the Sub-Magistrate's holding land in Kottapulli would seem

to

to indicate an attempt on the manager's part to satisfy and please witness as well as the Manager's anxiety at the Submagistrate having been mentioned as a holder of lands in Kottapalli. The Manager may have feared lest the Police would bring this matter to notice.

22. The statement referred to by 6th Witness is enclosed. On the reverse of the same paper is the statement of the village Munsiff,x both to the effect that the Submagistrate held lands in Kottapulli. The Munsiff proved himself a very unsatisfactory witness in the House breaking case and has since verbally retracted his former deposition (enclosed); since in fact he came to know that the Submagistrate's conduct in holding lands was objectionable. In the 1st instance I was under the impression that there was no good reason for suspecting the Sub-Magistrate, as the Pattah for the land was in the name of another. Later I found that the rumours of the enjoyment of the lands by the Submagistrate were very prevalent

x 7th Witness

and

1 ... lease as shows conclusively that he

and thought they might have some foundation in fact. The Sub Magistrate as you are aware was then transferred to Anakapalli.

23. The Madugula Manager married the Submagistrates niece who is the sister of the Sheristadar of your Office. It seems too that the daughter of the Manager is shortly to be married to the Sub Magistrate's son.

24. This will sufficiently explain the reluctance evinced by most of the witnesses in speaking out before me. They feared to offend Govt Officials no less than the Madugula Manager.

25. I must advert to one matter very clearly established in the enclosures namely, viz, the personal interest taken by the Manager in the delivery of the "auction site" Lands to the Patta holder. The Manager, the Thanedar and the Madugula peons as well as two batta peons of the Sub Magistrate, all took an active part, all being present on the spot in securing for the Priest the Lands and landlord's share (if not more) of the crops even of that

harvest

harvest. All this active interest on the part of the Manager would be intelligible if exercised in behalf of his connection, the Sub-Magistrate. It cannot be supposed that the Manager would so exert himself in the case of every fresh issue or transfer of a Patta, and no satisfactory reason has been given for his taking so much personal trouble on account of the Priest, or for the services of the Submagistrate's peons being employed in favor of the latter.

26. The Priest appears to have been a purely absentee Landlord no one having once seen him on the Land. Indeed he is known to but few from all accounts, and it would seem that he but rarely visited Chodavaram. The Submagistrate too appears to have kept away from the Land, one witness only (1st) deposing to having seen him there. This witness states that the Submagistrate came upon two occasions and inspected the Land once before the grant of the Patta.

27. The Sub Magistrate says these

reports.

lease as shows conclusively that he

reports against him have been circulated through the instrumentality of the Police and of the late Madugula Manager. It is not shewn that the latter had any thing to do with these proceedings. The matter was, it is true, first brought to notice by the Police and ~~that~~ they and the Sub Magistrate were upon ill terms is not open to doubt. But no explanation has been furnished by the Sub-magistrate for the confirmation and detailed account by the witnesses of the report of the Police. There is no stated reason why the ryots should share the ill feeling of the Police against the Sub-magistrate, unless indeed they felt they had been injured by him in the matter of their lands, and in this case, their ill feeling would only be additional testimony to the truth of their story. For reasons already given (para 24) they had strong ground for submitting to the appropriation of their lands without complaint to the authorities, but when summoned and questioned, they with the exception of 5th Witness (who was evidently determined to say nothing he could keep to himself) explained and corroborated the report of the Police.

28. In the face of such documents as the Patta and cowle and Kadapa, all of which refer to the Revt as Pattadar, it would be impossible otherwise than upon confession to establish conclusively the complicity of the Submagistrate. To my mind however, in spite of the evidence of these documents, the case against the submagistrate is not at all satisfactorily cleared up in his favor but gives good ground for suspecting the honesty of his conduct.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servt
(signed) A P Roupell
Ag Hd Asst Collector

(True Copy)

H Goodrich
Ag Collector

G.O 25 July/76 No 1002

Circ

K.D

10/48

Case agst. a Sub Magistrate

Procs. Bd Rev. d/8 June/76
No 1504.

I conceive there is nothing in this case.

It is very common in these northern Zamindaries for the Zamindar, instead of giving a man a salary, to assign him his — the Zamindar's — rent, or share of the produce — in certain lands; and when the Zamindar dismisses the servant so paid, he issues an order in January, when they get in the great Rice harvest, attaching the heretofore alienated crops.

That the Zamindar shd., in dispensing with the services of a retainer, make a benefaction of the man's salary to a distinguished Priest, is of course quite probable.

It is not denied that this assignment to the Priest was duly registered; the lease given by this Priest's agent to a tenant was also registered; but this tenant is now produced to day & that the Sub Magistrate took such a part in the negociations about the lease as shows conclusively that he &

Entirely agree with the judgment of the Local Officers & of the Board in this case. The calm review of the Bd is a sound judicial paper.

I think the defence characteristic of the man who is evidently one of suspicious antecedents.

As some time has elapsed & the man was not as it were completely condoned I would recommend that a formal & strict prohibition agst. his employment in any Zamindari management.

I do not think that the Office note laid before the Memb. of Govt. is in form or spirit such a paper as assists a judgt. on the case

W. 15/7

J. B.

I have carefully read the record of this case and I do not think the evidence is sufficient to convict Nursimaswamy Pantulu of corruption & to justify his dismissal after 23 years service —

There is no doubt that the land in question was registered in the Priest's name. The fact that he was the Sub Tahsildar's priest & that the Sub-Tahsildar was connected by marriage with the Mudgole manager — has given rise to these suspicions and accusations. I would direct the transfer of the Nursimaswamy Pantulu to some other district.

I may remark that

not the Priest — who, by the way, is also Priest to the Sub Magistrate, was the real landlord.

On the other hand the Priest's agent, the ostensible lessor, and the Notary who wrote out the docts., deny ~~that~~ the Sub Mag. was present. The Sub Mag. & the Agent lived in the same house, but it is admitted to consist of several separate portions.

II. It appears from the evidence that the Zamindar's Steward, apprehending some disturbance at the summary determination of the old tenants' interests in the land — carried off the crop, with a considerable gathering at his heels; & it seems that two of the Sub Magistrate's peons were there.

Each Sub Mag. has 2 peons in ordinary 3 & had they been there, it wd. have looked very ugly — but it seems they were batta peons — men employed in every public office to serve summonses as cases may arise — Their time is never fully occupied, & they may well have been engaged on this job without the Magistrate's sanction.

The person who actually employed

[illegible] important

the case, allows that the evidence has broken down, & says that "it would be impossible otherwise than upon confession to establish conclusively the complicity of the Sub Magistrate" — & he concludes "To my mind however, in spite of the Existence of these documents. the case agt. the Sub Mag. is not at all satisfactorily cleared up in his favor. but gives good ground for suspecting the honesty of his conduct" —

I think that a case must be much more clearly established than this, to justify dismissal

R.S.E.
20. 7. 76

to H.E. the Govr.

In his petition he explains that in Mudgole the area of land is stated in garce. "Parimitham" is what is registered in the Pattah. i.e 'area' — [illegible] and he then explains the probable return from the land in question

KLC

authorising the Head Revenue man of the locality to collect the Zamindar's share from these lands — The Zamindar's share had just been alienated to the Priest, the peons are directed to take the order & hand it over to the Priest's Agent. They do so, & he, as the payee of the order, sends them with it to the Head Revenue man, with instructions to bring what they get from that functionary.

As the Agent & the Sub Mag. lived in one house, the grain is of course placed in the premises.

2. Now, there is nothing in all this; but it is urged that the Sub Mag. has made ~~three~~ gross misstatements. 3

1st is — that in his petition to the Bd. he speaks of the land as yielding 2 garces of paddy; whereas the Lease shows it to be 15.

Surely the suspicious thing wd. be if he had shown a correct knowledge of the extent of lands — He has left the taluk for another & only one Witness can be found to show ~~that~~ he was ever on the land.

2d. that he states he was not at his headquarters when any grain was delivered at the house — whereas his Diary shows ~~that~~ he was there at the time. What he deposes is "I heard "the Priest's agent had stored some grain "in his part of the house. I did not see

[illegible] away touring in the taluk."

He merely means that having being away from headquarters, he was not in the town at the time the grain was being put into the house. He may have been in the town during the same day.

But what, after all, is the significance suggested? He admits ~~that~~ he & the agent live in the same house, ~~that~~ the agent did receive the grain into it.

Had he really been the owner of the grain — he wd have taken care to consign it miles away, or sell it straight off, before it reached his house at all.

3rd — that he has told fibs about a previous depredation — There is nothing to show that the Sub Magte knew Mr Munchi's judgment — As he was put out of his post for 6 weeks only & then restored — he may well decline to consider it a condign punishment — Besides, what does his colouring of the affair affect the present case, 7 years after?

3. It will be seen by the dates that on the mere petition of his accusers — two days before the 1st wit was examined, the Sub Magte was suspended from office. He was examined himself some days after the inquiry commenced, wh went on some days after — nor was he present while the witnesses were examined! Such an inquiry is a nullity — & it seems fair to issue a Circular, not to suspend an officer (except in cases of outrageous accusations) till his defence is taken — It shows

---

No 1002

d/ 25 July 1876

R. D

Read Procs Bd Rev. No 1504

d/ 8th June/76

It appears here ~~that~~ the Collr & the Principal Asst are convinced ~~that~~ the tenure of the Zamindar's priest is merely nominal, & ~~that~~ the real grantee of the Zamindar's benefaction is the Deputy Tahsildar, N. Narasimhaswámi Pantulu. The Bd of Revenue state that they are forced to the same conclusion, and they recommend the dismissal of the accused from the public service.

2. His Grace the G. in C. has carefully read the record of this case, and fails to discover sufficient grounds for convicting the Deputy Tahsildar of corruption, or for justifying his dismissal, after a service of 23 yrs.

3. There is no doubt that the land in question was registered in the Priest's name, nor is the Deputy Tahsildar's connection with the negociations for leasing it to the present tenant by any means established. The fact that the

Priest of the Zamindar is also the Deputy Tahsildar's priest, that his agent & the Dy. Tahr. occupied the same house, & that the Dy. Tahr. is connected by marriage with the Manager of the Zamindary, appear to have given rise to the suspicions & accusations wh. are made the foundation of the case.

3. It is observed that the Deputy Tahsildar has already been transferred from his late charge to another; and, adverting to the want of confidence with which he is now regarded by the local officers, founded on his alleged proceedings in the Madgole Zamindary, and on a previous occasion when he was temporarily degraded, the G. in C. is of opinion ~~that~~ he shd. be now transferred to another district, or, if no present opportunity offers for such transfer, be reduced from the grade of Deputy Tahsildar to the next rank.

4. The irregularity of procedure on the part of the Principal Asst. in conducting the examn. in the absence of the accused has no doubt attracted the attention of the Bd. of Rev.

14 To the Board of Rev. 7 Day
to the Accountant General