(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 30

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 8/88

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 27.9.88

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

வேலூர் துறை

அரசாணை எண். 101
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 247 — 248

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 15-1-1879 198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண. கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

15th January 1879, No. 101.

Famine Relief.

Read the following paper :—

No. 247. From W. J. H. LEFANU, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector in charge of Salem, to H. S. THOMAS, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 8th January 1879, S.N. No. 7-5,461.

'WITH reference to G.O., 17th October 1877, F.R. No. 2,373, I have the honor to forward for the information of Government copy of a memorandum on the Puvatti Ghât robbery case left by Mr. Longley, and to express my concurrence with his opinion.

2. The man Sooba Row is no longer in Government employ and all three are men of straw, so that there is little probability of any of the missing money being recovered.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Memorandum on the Puvatti Ghât Robbery.

Government Order, No. 2,373, of the 17th October 1877, called for further information on the Puvatti Ghât robbery case, and the further investigation therein called for has elicited the following facts :—

(1.) That on the 28th July 1877, the Royacotta Relief Inspector, Sooba Row, wrote to the Krishnagiri Tahsildar, Prabalanada Pillai, stating that the Village Munsifs of his Circle were not in funds, and that they could not be responsible for the safety of the people without funds; that the Inspector, Sooba Row, had sent an indent on the 25th July, which had not up to the 28th been complied with, and begging that the Sheristadar of the taluk might be authorized to make him (Inspector) an advance. On this yadast the Tahsildar endorsed that "the money should be sent a sufficient time before the fortnight." Still this money was not received; and on the 31st July the Inspector, Sooba Row, appears to have written a second yadast, and despatched it to the taluk by one Royappen, his (Inspector's) *own servant* (this is *important*), and a toty named Vencatan. On receipt of this second yadast, dated 31st, the Tahsildar appears to have written a yadast ordering the Sheristadar to pay Rs. 350 to Royappen on account of Relief Inspector, Sooba Row. This money was given to Royappen about 3 P. M. on the 1st August. Royappen stopped at Krishnagiri that night (the 1st), and started for Royacotta, seventeen miles distant, on the morning of the 2nd August, and appeared before the Police Inspector at the Royacotta Station at 8 A. M. on that day (2nd), stating he had been robbed of certain moneys entrusted to him by the Taluk authorities at Krishnagiri. On the 20th of August, the Inspector of Police reported to the Joint Magistrate the fact of the robbery as told him by Royappen, viz., that Royappen left Krishnagiri on the morning of the 2nd August accompanied by Toty Vencatan; that at Kodagur another person joined them (a stranger apparently) one Kullan; that at about 7-30 A.M. the three were attacked about four miles from Royacotta on the Puvatti Ghât; that the attacking party consisted of about twenty persons, who beat the stranger, Kullan, severely on his head and Royappen also, and snatched the bag of money which the Toty Vencatan was carrying in his cumbly; but no violence was done to him, Vencatan. Some cloths belonging to Royappen and Kullan were carried off by the robbers, who, on being pursued by Royappen, threw down two cloths and a cumbly!! No marks of violence were found on Royappen's person, and the report made by him was altogether suspicious :—(1) because it appears he came quietly through the village without mentioning to any one the fact that he had been robbed, and only began hallowing and crying as he got close to the Police station at the very end of the town; (2) because Royappen and his party stated that they had bawled out when they were attacked, though an inspection of the spot a few hours after, showed that their cries were not heard by persons who were picking up fruit on the road close by the scene of the alleged robbery; (3) because Royappen, a sturdy young man, would hardly, as he appears to have done, have remained a tacit spectator whilst the money was being taken from Vencatan, and that he must have been quiet is probable from the fact that

there were no marks of resistance whatever found on his person. The Police Inspector inferred that no robbery took place, but that the money was made away with by the connivance of all three, Royappen, Vencatan, and Kullan. So much for the Inspector's report of the matter to the Joint Magistrate. The further inquiry has elicited the fact that Kullan was found with his head bleeding on the morning of the 2nd, when the Village Munsif of Royacotta, the Police Inspector, the Relief Inspector, Sooba Row, and Royappen all went to the spot where the robbery was alleged to have taken place, and that blood was found on the spot. From the contradictory statements made by Royappen before the Inspector: (1) his saying he had a knife with him when robbed, then that he sold it, and not being able to say to whom; (2) his not being able to identify a single one of the suspects of Bodinaikanpalli when shown him; (3) the likelihood that twenty men at 7-30 A. M. in broad day-light and with persons working close by would attack three on a public road is highly improbable. I am disposed to reject *in toto* Royappen's story, that he, Kullan and Venkatan were attacked by twenty men and that the Rs. 350 was carried off by those robbers; but that the money was stolen, that Kullan received a crack on the head sufficient perhaps to cause blood to flow, which blood was shown on the ground to the Police Inspector and the Village Munsif of Royacotta, and to Relief Inspector Sooba Row soon after the alleged robbery took place, and that this blow was dealt by Royappen or Venkatan themselves in order to have something to show by way of ill-treatment, I think very likely—and this is the version of the story I am prepared to accept.

Now as to the question of responsibility for the loss of the money, I think it lies undoubtedly with Sooba Row, the Relief Inspector. The money was sent by his own man Royappen accompanied by a toty. The late Joint Magistrate, Mr. Wilkinson, considered that the Tahsildar, Prabalanada Pillai, should be held responsible, because no mention of Royappen's name was made in the yadast of the 31st; but unfortunately this yadast is not forthcoming, and on this the Tahsildar relies for his defence, viz., that the money was sent by Relief Inspector Sooba Row's own man Royappen, and that the Tahsildar had nothing whatever to do with sending Royappen. This being so, and rejecting, as I do, the story of the robbery by twenty men, I consider that the late Relief Inspector Sooba Row, Royappen, and Venkatan, must be held responsible severally for the money. I firmly believe that it was a plan among them to get the money, and that the story about the twenty men was a trumped up one.

SALEM,
2nd January 1879.

(Signed) C. T. LONGLEY,
Collector.

No. 248. ORDER THEREON, 15th January 1879, No. 101.

Miscellaneous.

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council considers that the late Royacotta Relief Inspector, Sooba Row, is responsible for the money lost, and resolves to direct that the Acting Collector take all legal means to recover the money from him without delay.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Addl. Under-Secy. to Govt.

To the Collector of Salem.
" the Board of Revenue.
" the Financial Department.
" the Accountant-General.

Ed. W. H. French.

Original

Govt. of Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF SALEM.

&c. &c. &c.

Dated January 1878.

Printed 1878.

Book.

Page.

G.O. 18th January 1879, No. 161.

FAMINE RELIEF.

INDIAN.

No. 217-213.

Public Office Pattern Forms (Condensing Size) Rule, Executive Order No. 1 dated 1st January 1878. Sold by the Superintendent, Government Press, Madras, and by the Collectors of Land Revenue in the Districts. Price 1 Rupee per 100 Forms. Postage extra.

Public Office Pattern Forms (Condensing Size) Rule, Executive Order No. 1 dated 1st January 1878. Sold by the Superintendent, Government Press, Madras, and by the Collectors of Land Revenue in the Districts. Price 1 Rupee per 100 Forms. Postage extra.

Misc. No. 2373 of 1877

F.R.

P.R. on Cho. 1/33/80

1/11 No. 7/5461

Salem Collector's office
Salem 8th January 1879

Encl. 1.

From

The Collector
of Salem

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. 17th October 1877, F.R. No 2373, I have the honor to forward, for the information of Government, copy of a memo on the Privatte ghât Robbery case left by Mr. Longley and to express my concurrence with his opinion.

2. The Iman Subba Row is no longer in Government employ and all three are men of straw; so that there is

little probability of any of the missing money being recovered.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Illegible

Sub-Collector
In charge.

101

Memo on the Parantheg Ghat Robbery.

G.C. No 2373 of the 17th October 1877 called for further information on the Parantheg Ghat Robbery case; and the further investigation therein called for has elicited the following facts.

1) That on the 28th July 1877, the Boy accused Rabia Inspector Sooka Roy wrote to the Pishwa Ghuzy Tahsildar, Pratabnagar Pillay, stating that the Village Munsiffs of his Circle were not in funds, and that they could not be responsible for the safety of

Memo 23 Jd 9/12-1877

From Rev. Mly Sec. No. 298
Thro My Sub Collector
In charge
To Revy Dy 15 Jany 78
The Secretary to
Government
Revenue Deptt
Madras

Dated 8th
Recd 11th } January 1878
Revy Dy No. 54 78
Encl 1

Submitting Report on the Parantheg Ghat Robbery case left by Mr. Longley.

Ans 23 Jan 78

of the people without funds
that the Inspector Sastha has
had task an incident on the
25th July which had not up
to the 29th been complied with,
and hoping that the Thanis-
dar of the Taluq might be
authorised to make him (Ins-
pector) an advance. On this
Gadnat the Tahsildar endorsed
that "the money should be
"sent at sufficient time before
"the fortnight". Still the money
was not received, and on the
31st July the Inspector Sastha
Row appears to have written
a 2nd Gadnat, and despatched
it to the Taluq by one Boyappa,
this (Inspectors) own servant
(this is important), and a
toty named Venkatan.

On receipt of this second
Gadnat, dated 31st, the Tahsildar
appears to have written a
Gadnat ordering the Thanisdar
to pay Rs 350 to Boyappa on
account of Relief Inspector
Sastha Row. This money was
given to Boyappa about 3 Pm.
on the 1st August. Boyappa
despatched at 9 Pm. that night (the 1st) and
for Boyacottai, 17 miles distant,
on the morning of the 2nd
August, and appeared before the
Police Inspector at the Boyacotta
Station at 8 Am. on that
day (2nd), stating he had been
robbed of certain moneys
entrusted to him by the Taluq
authorities at Thirucheng.

On

On the 20th of August the
Inspector of Police reported to
the Joint Magistrate the facts
of the Robbery as told him
by Boyappan: Viz: that
Boyappan left Thalagiry on the
morning of the 2nd August
accompanied by Toby Venkatam
that at Pudagiri another person
joined them (a stranger apparently)
one Pallan; that at about
7½ Com. the three were attacked
about 4 miles from Boyanetta
on the Pambly Ghat; that
the attacking party consisted
of about 20 persons, who
beat the stranger Pallan
severely on his head and
Boyappan also, and snatched
the bag of money, which
the

the Toby Venkatam was carrying
in his cumbly; but no violence
was done to him Venkatam.
Some clothes belonging to Boyappan
and Pallan were carried off
by the robbers, who, on being
pursued by Boyappan, threw
down 2 clothes and a cumbly!!
No marks of violence were
found on Boyappan's person, and
the report made by him was
altogether suspicious (1), because
it appears he came quietly
thro' the village without
mentioning to any one the fact
that he had been robbed,
and only began hollowing
and crying as he got close
to the Police Station at
the very End of the Town;

(2) because Royappen and his party stated that they had crawled out when they were attacked, this an inspection of the spot a few hours after, showed that these cries were not heard by persons who were picking up fruit on the road close by the scene of the alleged robbery;

(3) because Royappen, a sturdy young man would hardly, as he appears to have done have remained a tacit spectator whilst the money was being taken from Vencatan, and that he must have been quiet is probable from the fact that there were no marks of resistance whatever found on his person.

The Police Inspector reported that no robbery took place, but that the money was made away with by the connivance of all three, Royappen Vencatan and Kullan. So much for the Inspector's report of the matter to the Joint Magistrate. The further Enquiry has Elicited the fact that Kullan was found with his head bleeding on the morning of the 2nd when the Village Munsiff of Royacotta the Police Inspector, the Relief Inspector Sooba Row and Royappen all went to the spot where the robbery was alleged to have taken place, and that blood was found

on the spot. From the
contradictory statements made
by Royappen before the Inspector
(1) His saying he had a
knife with him when robbed,
then that he sold it, and
not being able to say to
whom (2) His not being able
to identify a single one of
the suspects of Bodinaikanpatti
when shown him (3) the
likelihood that 20 men at
7.30 Am. in broad daylight
and with persons working
close by would attack
three on a public road
is highly improbable, I
am disposed to reject in
toto Royappen's story that
he Kullan and Varadan
were attacked by 20 men

and that the Rs. 356 was
carried off by three robbers
but that the money was
stolen, that Kullan received a
crack on the head, sufficient
perhaps to cause blood to
flow, which blood was shown
on the ground to the Police
Inspector and the Village Head
-siff of Royapettah and to
Police Inspector Cooke Road
soon after the alleged robbery
took place - and that this
blow was dealt by Royappan
or Varadan themselves in
order to have something to
show by way of ill-treatment
I think very likely - and
this is the version of
the story I am prepared

to accept.

As to the question of responsibility for the loss of the money, I think it has undoubtedly with Sadler Rao, the Relief Inspector. The money was sent by his own man Rayappen, accompanied by a Sahib. The late Joint Magistrate, Mr Wilkinson, considered that the Talukdars Prabhakara Pillay should be held responsible, because no mention of Rayappen's name was made in the Yadast of the 31st; but unfortunately this Yadast is not forthcoming, and on

the

101
10

this the Talukdars petition for his defence; viz: that the money was sent by Relief Inspector Sadler Rao's own man Rayappen, and that the Talukdars had nothing whatever to do with sending Rayappen. This being so, and repeating as before the story of the robbery by 20 men, I consider that the late Relief Inspector Sadler Rao Rayappen and Venkatarao must be held responsible primarily for the money. I firmly believe that it was a plan among them to get the money and

that the story about
the 2 men was a
trumped up one.

2.1.79 Salem

I am Sir
Your obed. Servt
C. I. Langley
C. I.

Lieut Colonel
Commanding
Salem

S. McCrea.
Lieut. & Adjt.
Salem
8th January 79

No. 790.

Letter from the Ag. Sub. Collector in charge of Salem dated 8th January No. 5/61

The facts of the case are these.

On 3rd July last a Relief Petn. [illegible] Ryotwar [illegible] Taluk of Salem [illegible] and applied to the Sub Collr. of the Taluk who passed an order. On the 3rd July Soobaroya again applied to the Tahsildar by a letter sent by his own servant Rayappen in which he desired that the money might be paid to the latter. The Tahsildar thereupon ordered the Shanbadar to pay the money which was done on the 3rd August at 3 p.m.

to

I Rect. Enclt. In a letter from the Ag. Sub Collector in charge to the Secretary to Government Revenue dated 8th January 1862

Rec'd 10/1/62 any/19
Encd in 13 Rec 24

Rec 25/1/62.

Inserno on the Pencil. Photo Robery

to be taken to Royaccotta
to Relief Inspector
Sarbakan. On
the morning of the 2nd
Royappen appeared
before the Talaie Inspector
at Royaccotta
& told a tale of robbery
which the Inspector
believed false. Mr.
Wilkinson, however,
did not take the opinion
and thought further
enquiry should be made
out that one of Royappens
two companions
was hit on the head
it seems probable
that this was done by
Royappen with a
view to creating
evidence.
Mr Longley's report
is that the case was
false - in this the
present Joint Magis
strate agrees.

Rejecting them, the
tale of robbery, the
question is who is to
make good the money,
whether the Collector,
the Tahsildar,
the Sheristadar
or Sarbakan the Inspector.
As the Sheristadar paid
the money under the
express orders of his
immediate superior,
it is submitted that
he is cleared.
In his letter record-
ed in the G.O. 17th Oct. 1877 No 7373
Mr Wilkinson observes,
with regard to remittances
to Relief Inspectors
"It is impossible for the
"Talaiy peons to take
"spare as their services
"are required in the Rice
"fields and are
"not permitted to
"entertain any additional
"establishment

"establishment by
"whom the money could
"be taken. The Inspector
"sends a man for money
"and the Subsidiary authorities
"have no option but
"to entrust him with
"the money." Govern
-ment authorized the
Collector to appoint
any establishment
needed for relief operations. If the subordi-
nate officials were
not permitted to
Entertain establish
-ments for the purpose
of executing remittances
of this Kind - an
important public
duty, so important
that after this case
a "good Police guard"
was appointed for

the

the purpose, it is
respectfully sub-
mitted that they
cannot be justly
held responsible for
loss, but the Collector
must be, for the
words used shew
that the need must
have been brought
to his notice.
If the subordinate
officials are to be
held responsible, it
is submitted that
the Subsidiar cannot.
As indenting officer,
and by the practice
of the District, it
was Lobo Row's
duty to have him
self come for the
money: in fact
any

any other arrangement
seems to be quite im-
practicable, under
the Collector's orders,
considering the large
number of relief
Inspectors and the
limited number
employed at establishments,
Sooba Row
by sending his own
servant and asking
that the money should
be paid him. He
made himself res-
ponsible - this is
the general official
understanding -
In law the pay-
ment to Rogappen
was a payment to
Sooba Row.
Sooba Row may,
or may not, have
got some of the money
there

The case is very
simple -
I. Now is
responsible

Yes
Collector
Without delay
KH 15/

there is nothing to
show he did. If
he is to be held res-
ponsible, it is sub-
mitted that the Acting
Collector should be
directed to recover
the money from him
by all legal means.
Money would be well
spent in making it
as unpleasant as
possible for him.
The Acting Collector
states that he is a
most man of straw.

GJ
4.1.79

Revenue Dept.

Urgent

For the Press

No. 101 G.C. Vol. 247-248

Sir I beg the Govt. Considers
late Vexatious
that the Relief Inspector Lahore
Rawn is responsible for the
Journey lost and returns to
direct that the Dy Collr
take all legal measures to secure
the Money from him without
delay — GL

15.1.79. 15 Jan 79

Desp. 21 Jany
4 Collector of Lahore
13 Board of Revenue
4 Finl. Depts
5 Accountant General
6.
80

Rec'd 30. on Chl 6133/80.

B Vols 247 & 248
C. 15/1/79 R. 15/1/79