(1) Number of pages 14 pages (7 Sheets).

(2) Date of repair 10.9.1984.

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1701, Revenue. Press.
B.P. No. Mis.

Dated 21st October 1878. 197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled.

Archives I—10,006—19-4-79.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

21st October 1878, No. 1,701.

Read the following paper:—

No. 230. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th August 1878, No. 2,428.

Read the following letter from F. A. NICHOLSON, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector, Ramnad, to H. J. STOKES, Esq., Acting Collector of Madura, dated Madura, 13th July 1878, No. 352:—

I HAVE the honor to report with records (as per list) upon the subject of Board's Proceedings, No. 5,017, dated 17th November 1877, latter portion, viz., the conduct of Narasimha Achari of the Revenue Survey.

2. The grounds for the inquiry were (1) suspicions based upon rumour, (2) a petition admittedly pseudonymous, (3) hints by subordinates, (4) the alleged possession by the Sub-Assistant's wife of a large amount of cash, &c., (5) certain note transactions. I have considered all these points and have endeavoured to obtain something definite from their exceeding vagueness, but without success, while a variety of counter facts and arguments have presented themselves.

3. *First point.*—I doubt very much if rumours were really so current as believed. Mr. Gompertz may have heard this stated by one or two persons, and others also have heard the same, but I do not call this general rumour. Mr. Gompertz only mentions one name, viz., Mr. Fischer. I wrote to that gentleman and asked for information as to complaints and persons; in reply, he informed me (1) that being no longer in charge of the estate he is not in a position to give the required information as to complaints, (2) that not being in Shivaganga he is unable to give me any names. I then wrote to the Zemindari Agent for all papers connected with the various boundary disputes, including all complaints and petitions put in by the ryots. In reply, nine arzis from the Eluvancottai Tahsildar, dated from 13th December 1876 to 6th April 1877, were sent to me, all relating to disputed boundaries. Of these only *one* (Sengi village) contains any allegation of corruption, and that in the vaguest way; the Tahsildar, moreover, who wrote this (Ramasami Iyengar) was a determined opponent of the survey. On receipt of this I sent a peon to call the Munsif, Curnam, and Ambalagar of Sengi, the peon not being informed of the reason of the summons. The Curnam and Ambalagar alone appeared and utterly denied all knowledge of any bribe whatever, or of any complaint of corruption made by them, although I guaranteed their safety. The Zemindari Agent shortly after wrote saying that the Sengi villagers were prepared to support before the Tirupatur Deputy Tahsildar the statement made in the arzi. I directed the Deputy Tahsildar to go to the village *at once* and take depositions and any documents that might be produced; the result merely confirmed the statements taken by myself, and the Deputy Tahsildar has personally informed me, not only that everything was denied even in casual friendly conversation, but that the ryots also said that the Zemindari Tahsildar had not even conversed with them on the subject. This corroborates the statements of the ryots before me that the Tahsildar only once came to the village even at the time of the demarcation dispute. Hence the Zemindari records gave no help, and surely if the rumours were true, or even current, there would be at least some petitions by the aggrieved ryots to the Zemindar or his Tahsildar. I also examined two big Chetties whose villages had been demarcated, viz., Kaliappa Chetty and Muttaya Chetty of Pathur; they, although requested to speak without fear, utterly denied all knowledge (even by hearsay) of such transactions. I have also inquired of the Shivaganga Deputy Tahsildar who went to Tirupatur on business about that time; he says he heard rumours, but cannot tell who told him, or the exact nature of the rumours. The then Tirupatur Deputy Tahsildar Sivaramier does indeed give more

definite information, and mentions the name of the Zemindari Vakil at Tirupatur. As this Vakil is absent I have not examined him, but his information could only be hearsay. With a view to test the rumours still more fully, I have taken the villages named in the pseudonymous petition and sent for the chief ryots to Tirupatur where I examined them yesterday. They, although begged to tell the truth without fear as they would be held blameless, utterly denied all knowledge of any corruption, and this denial I believe genuine as they were evidently taken entirely by surprise. Not only so but two at least of those villages had never had any dispute which would lead to the necessity for corruption, while most of the witnesses had entirely forgotton the names of the survey officials, especially that of Narasimha Achari, which they certainly would not have forgotten had they collected money for him. Moreover, several of these villages are held on lease by the above-named Puthur Muttaya Chetty, and the ryots thus confirm the denial of the Chetty. It is thus clear that the so-called rumours are as untrustworthy as rumours in general.

4. *Second point.*—As the inquiry into this petition seemed defective, I ordered a fresh and careful inquiry. The inquiry and the contents of the petition which is vague and absurd show that it is really pseudonymous; as above stated, I have also examined the chief men from five of the villages; these men denied all knowledge even by hearsay of any corruption as alleged.

5. *Third point.*—These hints are contained in the evidence (H) taken departmentally. I need hardly point out that they are utterly worthless (1) because the only two witnesses grossly contradict one another as to the circumstances of their alleged information, (2) because Subbramania Pillay's evidence is on the face of it *false*, (3) because both of these witnesses (Timmaraju and Subbramania Pillay) are admittedly at enmity with the Sub-Assistant, (4) because it is at best mere hearsay.

6. *Fourth point.*—The Sub-Assistant was in the taluk from October 1876 to August 1877. He was not a poor man when he got these but had long enjoyed good [illegible] be wonderful moreover if in a rich taluk like Kuvavettai swarmwood and so on, especially as he seems to have lived a good deal at Karagoody where there are many rich Chetties. His pay was Rupees 200 per month; in ten months he would receive Rupees 2,000. It would not be surprising then if his wife had a good deal of cash on hand. I can base no argument against the Sub-Assistant on this ground. Those who know how surprising a quantity of cash and jewels is possessed by even very subordinate officials and apparently petty ryots will not wonder at the possession of notable and visible wealth by a person in the comparatively high position of the Sub-Assistant.

7. *Fifth point.*—The only note transactions effected by the Sub-Assistant were to the amount of Rupees 2,710 drawn by the Sub-Assistant as part of his own and establishment pay, and Rupees 670 on his own account. I am unable to see anything suspicious in these petty transactions; the Sub-Assitant gives a very reasonable explanation as to both sets, and up to date I have been unable to find the Stone Contractor to confirm or contradict the Sub-Assistant's statement. I may however adduce two arguments which seem to show that the transactions were *bona fide*, viz., (1) that if the Sub-Assistant were really transferring large sums to Madras by hoondy he would not have been so foolish as to get notes for a small portion of his gains and thus call attention to his doings, (2) that if the notes were really intended to transmit wrongfully gotten coin, he would not have sent his own peons to get the notes, but would have taken his bribes in notes, or get them in some other person's names.

8. As arguments for the Sub-Assistant I may add (1) that in February and again in May 1877 I was on circuit in the taluk and heard no rumours of this sort, nor was any complaint made to me either personally or by tappal, although on the second occasion I purposely went on account of the boundary disputes; (2) that no complaint even by tappal has up to date been sent to me, although it is known that inquiry is going on; (3) that no complaint of the sort was ever made to Mr. Gompertz who was about a month in the taluk investigating these very disputes, and continually in communication with Mr. Eischer, his Tashildars, and the various Chetties and ryots; (4) that when Mr. Gompertz went

up to the taluk (in April I believe) to investigate the disputes, the Sub-Assistant begged very hard for and obtained a few days leave and left Mr. Gompertz to pursue his inquiries in *the Sub-Assistant's absence*; now, if the Sub-Assistant had really up to that time been receiving any bribes right and left and thus causing disputes, would he have allowed Mr. Gompertz to go alone into the taluk with the avowed object of inquiring into the disputes, and would his enemies have allowed the opportunity of Mr. Gompertz' presence and the Sub-Assistant's absence to pass; (5) if I may venture to draw upon my experience of the Zemindari Division, I assert that the favourite charge to invalidate a complaint or a decision is that of bribery; the most reckless charges are made freely if even a temporary advantage can be gained. And though it may be said that the Chetties would be unwilling to come forward lest they should injure other Chetties however hostile, yet, on the other hand, it is clear that these charges if they had any foundation could easily have been made by the Chetties through the ryots in such a way as not even to mention the Chetties.

9. I have then come to the conclusion that there is no case against the Sub-Assistant, and if I may venture to say so, there was no case for an inquiry under Regulation IX of 1822, which I understand to be a Judicial Regulation for inquiry into actual complaints or well grounded suspicions. In the present case there was really nothing to start from, except a sort of suspicion that some one somewhere or other had at some time or other bribed the Sub-Assistant to an unknown amount. I think the Survey Department should have ascertained something *definite* before transferring the matter for inquiry to this department.

10. I must apologize for the delay in this case which is accounted for (1) by the fact that I found it difficult to start, (2) that in March and April I was too unwell, and in May and June too busy with the additional work of the Special Assistant's office to make a full inquiry.

No. 295.

SUBMITTED to the Board of Revenue with reference to Board's Proceedings, dated 17th November 1877, No. 5,017, and 5th January 1878, Miscellaneous No. 57. Under the circumstances stated, there appears to be no ground for an inquiry under Regulation IX of 1822.

ANDIPATTI, 10th August 1878.

(Signed) H. J. STOKES, Acting Collector.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G.O., dated 18th December 1877, Petition Department.

2. The Board concur with the Collector.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. STURROCK, Acting Sub-Secretary.

Read also G.O., 18th December 1877, No. 1,602, (Petition Department).

No. 231. ORDER THEREON, 21st October 1878, No. 1,701.

Miscellaneous.

THE inquiry held by the Acting Head Assistant Collector shows that there is no case against the Acting Sub-Assistant Narasimha Chari.

2. The petitions from the late Rani will be forwarded to the present Zemindar with the intimation that Government are not prepared to extend the time for appeal as therein desired.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under-Secretary to Government.

[illegible] Superintendent of Revenue Survey.
[illegible] the Petition Department.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 2,428.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 30th August 1878.

Read the following letter from F. A. NICHOLSON, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector, Ramnad, to H. J. STOKES, Esq., Acting Collector of Madura, dated Madura, 13th July 1878, No. 352 :—

I HAVE the honor to report with records (as per list) upon the subject of Board's Proceedings, No. 5,017, dated 17th November 1877, latter portion, viz., the conduct of Narasimha Achari of the Revenue Survey.

2. The grounds for the inquiry were (1) suspicions based upon rumour, (2) a petition admittedly pseudonymous, (3) hints by subordinates, (4) the alleged possession by the Sub-Assistant's wife of a large amount of cash, &c., (5) certain note transactions. I have considered all these points and have endeavoured to obtain something definite from their exceeding vagueness, but without success, while a variety of counter facts and arguments have presented themselves.

3. *First point.*—I doubt very much if rumours were really so current as believed. Mr. Gompertz may have heard this stated by one or two persons, and others also have heard the same, but I do not call this general rumour. Mr. Gompertz only mentions one name, viz., Mr. Fischer. I wrote to that gentleman and asked for information as to complaints and persons ; in reply, he informed me (1) that being no longer in charge of the estate he is not in a position to give the required information as to complaints, (2) that not being in Shivaganga he is unable to give me any names. I then wrote to the Zemindari Agent for all papers connected with the various boundary disputes, including all complaints and petitions put in by the ryots. In reply, nine arzis from the Eluvancottai Tahsildar, dated from 13th December 1876 to 6th April 1877, were sent to me, all relating to disputed boundaries. Of these only *one* (Sengi village) contains any allegation of corruption, and that in the vaguest way ; the Tahsildar, moreover, who wrote this (Ramasami Iyengar) was a determined opponent of the survey. On receipt of this I sent a peon to call the Munsif, Curnam, and Ambalagar of Sengi, the peon not being informed of the reason of the summons. The Curnam and Ambalagar alone appeared and utterly denied all knowledge of any bribe whatever, or of any complaint of corruption made by them, although I guaranteed their safety. The Zemindari Agent shortly after wrote saying that the Sengi villagers were prepared to support before the Tirupatur Deputy Tahsildar the statement made in the arzi. I directed the Deputy Tahsildar to go to the village *at once* and take depositions and any documents that might be produced ; the result merely confirmed the statements taken by myself, and the Deputy Tahsildar has personally informed me, not only that everything was denied even in casual friendly conversation, but that the ryots also said that the Zemindari Tahsildar had not even conversed with them on the subject. This corroborates the statements of the ryots before me that the Tahsildar only once came to the village even at the time of the demarcation dispute. Hence the Zemindari records gave no help, and surely if the rumours were true, or even current, there would be at least some petitions by the aggrieved ryots to the Zemindar or his Tahsildar. I also examined two big Chetties whose villages had been demarcated, viz., Kaliappa Chetty and Muttaya Chetty of Puthur ; they, although requested to speak without fear, utterly denied all knowledge (even by hearsay) of such transactions. I have also inquired of the Shivaganga Deputy Tahsildar who went to Tirupatur on business about that time ; he says he heard rumours, but cannot tell who told him, or the exact nature of the rumours. The then Tirupatur Deputy Tahsildar Sivaramier does indeed give more definite information, and mentions the name of the Zemindari Vakil at Tirupatur. As this Vakil is absent I have not examined him, but his information could only be hearsay. With a view to test the rumours still more fully, I have taken the villages named in the pseudonymous petition and sent for the chief ryots to Tirupatur where I examined them yesterday. They, although begged to tell the truth without fear as they would

be held blameless, utterly denied all knowledge of any corruption, and this denial I believe genuine as they were evidently taken entirely by surprise. Not only so but two at least of those villages had never had any dispute which would lead to the necessity for corruption, while most of the witnesses had entirely forgotton the names of the survey officials, especially that of Narasimha Achari, which they certainly would not have forgotten had they collected money for him. Moreover, several of these villages are held on lease by the above-named Puthur Muttaya Chetty, and the ryots thus confirm the denial of the Chetty. It is thus clear that the so-called rumours are as untrustworthy as rumours in general.

4. *Second point.*—As the inquiry into this petition seemed defective, I ordered a fresh and careful inquiry. The inquiry and the contents of the petition which is vague and absurd show that it is really pseudonymous; as above stated I have also examined the chief men from five of the villages; these men denied all knowledge even by hearsay of any corruption as alleged.

5. *Third point.*—These hints are contained in the evidence (H) taken departmentally. I need hardly point out that they are utterly worthless (1) because the only two witnesses grossly contradict one another as to the circumstances of their alleged information, (2) because Subbramania Pillay's evidence is on the face of it *false*, (3) because both of these witnesses (Timmaraju and Subbramania Pillay) are admittedly at enmity with the Sub-Assistant, (4) because it is at best mere hearsay.

6. *Fourth point.*—The Sub-Assistant was in the taluk from October 1876 to August 1877. He was not a poor man when he got these but had long enjoyed good pay. It would not be wonderful moreover if in a rich taluk like Eluvancottai swarming with Chetties, the Sub-Assistant spent very little in supplies such as rice, straw, firewood and so on, especially as he seems to have lived a good deal at Karagoody where there are many rich Chetties. His pay was Rupees 200 per month; in ten months he would receive Rupees 2,000. It would not be surprising then if his wife had a good deal of cash on hand. I can base no argument against the Sub-Assistant on this ground. Those who know how surprising a quantity of cash and jewels is possessed by even very subordinate officials and apparently petty ryots will not wonder at the possession of notable and visible wealth by a person in the comparatively high position of the Sub-Assistant.

7. *Fifth point.*—The only note transactions effected by the Sub-Assistant were to the amount of Rupees 2,710 drawn by the Sub-Assistant as part of his own and establishment pay, and Rupees 670 on his own account. I am unable to see anything suspicious in these petty transactions; the Sub-Asssitant gives a very reasonable explanation as to both sets, and up to date I have been unable to find the Stone Contractor to confirm or contradict the Sub-Assistant's statement. I may however adduce two arguments which seem to show that the transactions were *bona fide*, viz., (1) that if the Sub-Asssistant were really transferring large sums to Madras by hoondy he would not have been so foolish as to get notes for a small portion of his gains and thus call attention to his doings, (2) that if the notes were really intended to transmit wrongfully gotten coin, he would not have sent his own peons to get the notes, but would have taken his bribes in notes, or get them in some other person's names.

8. As arguments for the Sub-Assistant I may add (1) that in February and again in May 1877 I was on circuit in the taluk and heard no rumours of this sort, nor was any complaint made to me either personally or by tappal, although on the second occasion I purposely went on account of the boundary disputes; (2) that no complaint even by tappal has up to date been sent to me, although it is known that inquiry is going on; (3) that no complaint of the sort was ever made to Mr. Gompertz who was about a month in the taluk investigating these very disputes, and continually in communication with Mr. Fischer, his Tashildars, and the various Chetties and ryots; (4) that when Mr. Gompertz went up to the taluk (in April I believe) to investigate the disputes, the Sub-Assistant begged very hard for and obtained a few days leave and left Mr. Gompertz to pursue his inquiries in *the Sub-Assistant's absence*; now, if the Sub-Assistant had really up to that time been receiving any bribes right and left and thus causing disputes,

he have allowed Mr. Gompertz to go alone into the taluk with the avowed of inquiring into the disputes, and would his enemies have allowed the oppor- of Mr. Gompertz' presence and the Sub-Assistant's absence to pass; (5) if I may e to draw upon my experience of the Zemindari Division, I assert that the ite charge to invalidate a complaint or a decision is that of bribery; the most s charges are made freely if even a temporary advantage can be gained. hough it may be said that the Chetties would be unwilling to come forward ey should injure other Chetties however hostile, yet, on the other hand, it is that these charges if they had any foundation could easily have been made Chetties through the ryots in such a way as not even to mention the Chetties.

I have then come to the conclusion that there is no case against the Sub- nt, and if I may venture to say so, there was no case for an inquiry under tion IX of 1822, which I understand to be a Judicial Regulation for inquiry ctual complaints or well grounded suspicions. In the present case there was nothing to start from, except a sort of suspicion that some one somewhere or ad at some time or other bribed the Sub-Assistant to an unknown amount. I the Survey Department should have ascertained something *definite* before rring the matter for inquiry to this department.

). I must apologize for the delay in this case which is accounted for (1) by t that I found it difficult to start, (2) that in March and April I was too unwell, n May and June too busy with the additional work of the Special Assistant's o make a full inquiry.

No. 293.

SUBMITTED to the Board of Revenue with reference to Board's Proceedings, dated November 1877, No. 5,017, and 5th January 1878, Miscellaneous No. 57.

er the circumstances stated, there appears to be no ground for an inquiry under ulation IX of 1822.

ANDIPATTI, (Signed) H. J. STOKES,
th August 1878. Acting Collector.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G.O., dated 18th December 1877, etition Department.

2. The Board concur with the Collector.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Acting Sub-Secretary.

the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Collector of Madura.
" " Superintendent, Revenue Survey.

W. J. Lewis.

Ext. d. 18-2-79: 1502 Revenue Department

— " 10-1-78: —

— " 19-6-77: 1502

Rev. Cons. 23-11-76: 1780

— " 21-9-76: 1312.

Act. 28 of 60.

No 4134

1878.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Dated August 30th.

Printed September 12th.

Read. 18

PROCEEDINGS, 30TH AUGUST 1878, No. 2,428.

Dup. 30/9/78.

AUGUST.

No. 2,428.

Narasimha Achari of the Revenue Survey.—Submitting to Government letter from Collector of Madura reporting on the conduct of — in connection with demarcation in Shivaganga Zemindari, and stating that there appears to be no ground for an inquiry under Regulation IX of 1822.

No 1701-21 Aug. 1878

C 4-10-78
D 7-10-78
E 7-10-78
F 21-10-78

Petition

No 1502 of 1877 Dt. 17th May 1877

Recd 19th ——

From Srimuthoo Muthoo Ve-
=rayar Rajunada Rani Kat-
=ama nachiar, Zemindar-
=ni of Shivaganga, Madura
Distt. thro' Bashyam Iyen-
=gar

States that the Dy Super-
=intendent of Revenue Survey
and Demarcation on the re-
=port of the Demarcation-
=Inspector, based on a Sum-
=mary and desultory enquiry,
passed, without giving any no-
=tice to petitioner, the accom-
=panying decision on the 7th
December 1876, whereby a con-
=siderable extent of wet, dry
& waste lands forming a por-
=tion of the Zemindary Ayan
village

1502

Forwarded

H.C. Ad. Sub. Rev:
Survey Reported
very fully on these
complaints & matters
thro' the Board
vide their Rep:
17 Nov: 77 No 5717.
He then recommended
an inquiry into
the conduct of an
Inspector in his
Depart. who had
apparently lead to
do visit the demarca-
=tion complained
of by the Zemindar.
This was ordered
& the result is now
reported in Boards
Rep: 28th Aug: 78 No 2428
Ke

1701/5

Govt. of Madras.

REVENUE.

To BOARD OF REVENUE.

&c. &c.

Dated October, 21st.

Read 29th.

Ditto.

G.O. 2nd Oct. 1878, No. 1700

OCTOBER.

Nos. 230-231.

Abstract Order of the Revenue Survey Department.—Observing that the inquiry made does not show that there is no case against the petitioner, and ordering the petition from the late Rani to be forwarded to the present Zemindar with the intimation that Government are not prepared to accept the offer as therein stated.

village of Pukkudy, has been unjustly transferred to the Shermadanam Iruvan village of Idayangudoo and Alathipattoo and the Cowl village of Sekkanendal Kettai Kendal the area of which has thus been increased almost threefold, as compared with the extent therefor, as entered in the Inam Jamabundy account of Fusli 1211, and with the Cowl Puttah; that the said officer failed to inform the petitioner or any other officials of the said decision; which was, however brought to her notice at the end of January last by some of the Inamdars in whose favor the decision was passed; that by that time the period allowed to prefer an appeal to the Dt. Court passed away.

Prays

Read a petition & Collr who conducted the investigation into the above charge preferred in which opinion there is no case & recommends the Collector & Board concur.

These petitions were ordered to lie over until the Report came in.

The Asst. Revenue Surveyor reported that no proper inquiry was held as to boundaries &c & that the petitioners, who have the law perfectly, delayed to apply for copies of the decisions. It is not known what the present Petitioner may desire. The Survey Report decides by no means all unfavourable to

prays, therefore, that she may be permitted to prefer the appeal within one month from the date on which sanction for the purpose may be accorded to her.

Adds that similar orders may be passed regarding the decisions about the boundary disputes of other villages, specified in the petitions, B. C. D. E & F herewith submitted

With Reports embodied in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue D/ 17th November 1877 No 5,017 & 30th August 1878 No 2,428 respectively.

The Petitioners promptly like the peoples of this District submit to the decisions against them, but they humbly pray that the Board will be pleased to extend the time of appeal to the Dt. Court.

Recd 1901

the Estate & the Petitioners may not be debarred of their right of appeal against those decisions. If Petitioners for Govt. to say (when these petitions are sent to them, as apparent they should be,) whether they will be prepared to extend the time of appeal to the Dt. Court.

Sd

Govt will interfere with the course of the Law - The time for appeal has passed & no good ground for extension is made out

G W M

Ab 4104