Archives I - 10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages

(2) Date of repair 15-3-85.

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	612A, Revenue	Press. Mis.
Dated 23rd April 1878		197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

612A
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

23rd April 1878, No. 612-A.

Read the following paper :—

No. 224-A. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd April 1878, No. 902.

Read letter from the Collector of Tanjore, dated 22nd March 1878, No. 778, submitting a report on the conduct of the Deputy Collector, and recommending his dismissal.

With his letter above recorded, the Collector of Tanjore submits the further report on the case of P. Seshagiri Row, Deputy Collector of the Mannargudi Division, called for in G.O., dated 19th February 1878, No. 264, Revenue Department. It will now be forwarded for the orders of Government.

2. After a laborious and protracted inquiry, Mr. Thomas has come to the conclusion that P. Seshagiri Row has—

(1) abused his authority by extorting money on a large systematic scale recently, with a view to early retirement ;

(2) abused his authority by extorting money previously in a criminal case ;

(3) abused his position in a variety of ways which all point in the one direction of having over a long period habitually used his official influence for unjustifiable personal enrichment.

3. Paragraphs 4 to 12 of the report relate to the difficulties besetting any inquiry of this kind, and other special difficulties arising from the circumstances of this particular case. With regard to this the Board will merely observe that they consider that there is great force in much that Mr. Thomas says on the point.

4. In paragraphs 13 to 35 the Collector describes in considerable detail several of the more important cases illustrative of the abuse of authority referred to in the first head of the charge brought against the Deputy Collector. The Board will briefly notice one or two of these :—

(*a*) Sabapathiya Pillay, a young mirassidar, residing about sixteen miles from Mannargudi, deposes on the 3rd March that in the middle of January last a village officer came and told him that the Deputy Collector's magisterial clerk had sent for him, and he accordingly went in to Mannargudi four days afterwards with his Agent Singaravelu Pillay. The clerk told him that the Deputy Collector was going to build a house at Combaconum, that other mirassidars were assisting him, and that he, too, must help, and took him to the Deputy Collector's house and introduced him to the Deputy Collector, leaving the Agent outside. After some conversation the Deputy Collector, through the clerk, asked for Rupees 500. Sabapathiya Pillay pleaded his inability to pay so much, but finally agreed to give 100 pagodas (Rupees 350), and to this the Deputy Collector consented, and allowed him to go on his promising to bring the money in about ten days. Having borrowed Rupees 250 from one Vaithilinga Porian, the deponent returned with his Agent to Mannargudi, and was again introduced by the clerk to the presence of the Deputy Collector who told the clerk to take the money, deponent promising to bring the remainder by-and-by. The clerk took the money in the Deputy Collector's presence. Sabapathiya Pillay's statement is corroborated even to matters of detail by the evidence of the Agent, the cartman, and the lender of the money, but, as might be expected under any circumstances, the magisterial clerk gives no information on the subject.

(b) Allimel Ammal, a widow, who manages the estate of her half-willed sons with the assistance of her elder brother as agent, deposes that the Deputy Collector's peons came five or six times to her house to call her brother during his absence. At last she sent for him, and told him to go to the Deputy Collector's house. On his return he told her the Deputy Collector wanted money to build a house, and as he was a big officer, she consented after making some objections. On his return from another visit to the Deputy Collector, the brother said that Rupees 300 were wanted, and she gave the amount. The brother corroborates her statement, adding further details, and states that he changed the rupees into notes at the shop of one Raman Setty who admits having got the notes for him. A village officer called Theagarai Pillay deposes to going to Allimel Ammal's house with Curnam Pichu Iyen, and hearing him tell Allimel Ammal that the others had given, and must give too, and Pichu Iyen admits that he may have said so, t ugh he had no clear memory of having done so.

The above-mentioned seem to be two most complete cases; but there are others in which mirassidars depose to ving been asked by the Deputy Collector for money. In some of these there is dependent evidence of the transaction having gone further, and if the statemen of these witnesses are to be credited the hesitation of the principals to tell the wh truth can be easily ascribed to some of the causes detailed in paragraphs 4 to 12 f the Collector's report.

5. The validity of the second charg namely, that of abusing his authority by extorting money in a criminal case, depe ls upon the amount of credibility to be attached to the evidence of one man and s son, after giving full consideration to the circumstances under which they hav come forward. It is dealt with in paragraphs 37 and 38 of the Collector's repor

6. In support of the third charg abitually using his official influence for unjustifiable personal enrichment, Mr. omas has recorded evidence which goes to show that the Deputy Collector on the ccasion of a "Holi" festival sent his son and nephew round in procession and lected about Rupees 300 in the form of money presents tendered to the children in addition to smaller presents to the dancing girls and musicians; that sup s were sent to him free of charge on the occasion of another festival; and tha was in the habit of obtaining paddy, straw, the use of milch-kine, &c., &c., as d, from the wealthy mirassidars of his division. In some of these cases the evidence is defective, but Mr. Thomas urges, not without reason, that it all points one way, and that its cumulative force is to strengthen the credibility of the major charges.

7. As collateral evidence in support of the charge of receiving bribes Mr. Thomas gives a list of the notes drawn by the Deputy Collector from the different treasuries of the district, from which it appears that he got notes for Rupees 7,660, in addition to notes to the value of Rupees 8,705 drawn on account of pay.

8. P. Seshagiri Row has not yet had an opportunity of cross-examining the witnesses or explaining away the circumstances which seem to tell against him. This, of course, must be afforded him, and the Board cannot support Mr. Thomas's recommendation for his summary dismissal. But, without wishing to prejudge P. Seshagiri Row, the Board have no hesitation in stating their opinion that his immediate suspension, pending further inquiry, is imperative in the interests of public justice. A strong *prima facie* case has been made out against him. If he is innocent, temporary suspension will do him no real harm. If the statements of his

guilt have any truth, he is shown to b ssessed of great influence, and to be unscrupulous to a degree, under whic ircumstances further inquiry without suspension runs serious risk of failing to the truth. Further inquiry, however, is clearly necessary. It is due to the enanted Native Service, of which the Deputy Collector is a member, that the es should be sifted to the bottom, and that if he be innocent, he should be hon acquitted, or if he be guilty that the service, which the Board hope and bel growing in respectability, should be purged of his presence. They look o issues of the case as by no means confined in their importance to the in als already or hereafter to be immediately concerned; their influence will h ar wider range, and may exercise an important effect on the general good ad ation of Tanjore and other districts for years to come.

9. Such being their view of the ca e Board would strongly urge that a special officer be deputed to take up s or all of the specific charges magisterially, as well as to make a general inq into the Deputy Collector's conduct and administration. If Mr. Webster, w e Board believe, is very well qualified for the task, is entrusted with the work y consider that he should be relieved of his general duties, or have some ade special assistance till the case under notice can be disposed of. If Mr. Web services cannot be spared, the Board would recommend the deputation of som er special officer.

(True act.)

(S ned) J. STURROCK,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

---

ril 1878, No. 612-A.

No. 224-B. ORDER THEREON, 23rd

Miscellaneous.

THE Government have before them the papers recorded above the further ort from the Collector and the Board's opinion thereon relative to the rges brought by Mr. H. S. Thomas against Deputy Collector P. Seshagiri Ro

2. The Government concur genera n the view of the case taken by the Board of Revenue, and resolve to direct der Section 6, Act VII of 1857, that P. Seshagiri Row be suspended from offi d required to give such explanation as he may desire after hearing the testim orded against him.

3. Mr. E. F. Webster, the present Co of Tanjore, will personally conduct the further inquiry. He will at once arr r the recorded statements regarding Seshagiri Row being read out to him i e presence of the deponents, and will allow him to put to them any questions ay desire, the questions and answers being taken down. Mr. Webster will hi f carry their examination further if he thinks fit, duly recording it.

4. The Collector will also receive fr e Deputy Collector, in writing, such explanation as he may desire to offer, and urther examine him orally, if he sees reason to do so, recording the result in w . He will forward the whole record to Government, through the Board of Rev e, with his opinion thereon, and the Board will transmit it with their remarks.

5. It is improbable that this fur inquiry will trespass unduly on Mr. Webster's time, but should it prove ot wise and no satisfactory arrangement for the conduct of current business by the r officials of the district be feasible, the Government will be prepared to afford n additional assistance.

(True E ct.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

H. S. Thomas v. Dy Collector P. Seshagiri Rau

Revenue Secretariat, Madras, 10 April 1878. 6/28/3

Dear Huddleston,

This paper was to have been brought into Council yesterday but I was not called.

I shewed it to His Grace this morning. He adheres to the views which he has already expressed — after reading Sir W. Robinson's

---

Govt. of (1878) Madras.

REVENUE.

To

The Board of Revenue.

Dated April 23rd.

Recd. Encl.

APRIL.

Nos. 224-A—224-B.

P. Seshagiri Rau, Deputy Collector, Tanjore.—Suspending — from office; requesting him to give such explanations as he may desire after hearing the testimony recorded against him; and directing Mr. E. F. Webster, with certain instructions, to conduct personally a further inquiry into the case, and report the result to Government through the Board.

APRIL.

Nos. 224-A—224-B.

P. Seshagiri Row, Deputy Collector, Tanjore.—Suspending — from office; requesting him to give such explanation as he may desire after hearing the testimony recorded against him; and directing Mr. E. F. Webster, with certain instructions, to conduct personally a further inquiry into the case, and report the result to Government through the Board.

Encl.

---

second note — [illegible] thinks a special Officer sh^d be appointed to conduct the enquiry.

I send herewith Act VII of 1857 (constituting Dy Collectors) & Act XXXVII of 1850 (regulating enquiries into the behaviour of Public servants)

[illegible] s my

[illegible] Geo

[illegible] the adherence to the views which he has already expressed — after reading Sir W. Robinson's

[illegible] [illegible] to
appear [illegible] [illegible]. I think the
plan will be to submit the [illegible]
duty to [illegible] [illegible]
carry on his current duties [illegible]
[illegible] employed. [illegible]
[illegible] in view of calling [illegible]
question of immediate suspension
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

The [illegible] [illegible] approve of this
course. I think it should be
adopted. I consider there is ample
ground for grave suspicion of
the D. C. but if he is found innocent
his suspension will [illegible] injury. [illegible]
[illegible] means necessarily an [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

No. 902

Revenue Depart.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 2d April 1878.

Read letter from the Collector of Tanjore, dated 22d March 1878 No. 778, submitting a report on the conduct of the Deputy Collector, and recommending his dismissal.

With his letter above recorded, the Collector of Tanjore submits the further report on the case of P. Seshagiri Row, Deputy Collector of the Mannargudi Division called for in G.O. dated 19th February 1878 No. 264 R.D. It will now be forwarded for the orders of Government.

2. After a laborious and protracted enquiry Mr. Thomas has

has come to the conclusion that P. Serbogiri Row has:—

I abused his authority by extorting money on a large systematic scale recently with a view to early retirement;

II. abused his authority by extorting money previously in a criminal case;

III abused his position in a variety of ways which all point in the one direction of having over a long period habitually used his official influence for unjustifiable personal enrichment.

3. Paras. 4 to 12 of the report relate to the difficulties besetting any enquiry of

of this kind, and other special difficulties arising from the circumstances of this particular case. With regard to this the Board will merely observe that they consider that there is great force in much that Mr Shanier says on the point.

4. In paras. 13 to 35 the Collector describes in considerable detail several of the more important cases illustrative of the abuse of authority referred to in the first head of the charge brought against the Deputy Collector. The Board will briefly notice two of these:—

(a) Sabapathiya Pillay a young mirassidar residing about 16 miles from Mannargudi deposes on the 3d March that in the middle of January last a village Officer came and told him that the Deputy Collector's Magisterial clerk had sent for him and he accordingly went in to Mannargudi four days afterwards with his agent Singaravelu Pillay. The Clerk told him that the Deputy Collector was going to build a house at Combaconum, that other Mirassidars were assisting him, and that he too must help and took him to the Deputy Collector's house and introduced him to the Deputy Collector leaving the agent outside. After some conversation the Deputy Collector, through the clerk, asked for Rs. 500. Sabapathiya Pillai pleaded his inability to pay so much but finally agreed to give 100 pagodas (Rs. 350) and to this the Deputy Collector consented, and allowed him to go on his promising to bring the money in about ten days. Having borrowed Rs. 250 from one Vaithiliya Porian the deponent returned with his agent to Mannargudi and was again introduced by the clerk to the presence of the Deputy Collector who told the clerk to take the money, deponent promising to bring the remainder bye and bye. The clerk took the money in the Deputy Collector's presence. Sabapathiya Pillai's statement is corroborated even to the matters of detail by the evidence of the agent, the cartman and the lender of the money, but, as might be expected under any circumstances, the magisterial clerk gives no information on the subject.

(b) Allimel Ammal a widow who manages the Estate of her half-witted sons with

with the assistance of her elder brother as agent, deposes that the Deputy Collector's peon came five or six times to her house to call her brother during his absence. At last she sent for him, and told him to go to the Deputy Collector's house. On his return he told her the Deputy Collector wanted money to build a house, and as he was a big officer she consented after making some objections. On his return from another visit to the Deputy Collector, the brother said that Rs 300 were wanted and she gave the amount. The brother corroborates her statement, adding further details, and states that he changed the rupees into notes at the shop of one Raman Setty who admits having got the notes for him. A village officer called Thiagaraj Pillai deposes to going to Allimel Ammal's house with Kurnum Pichu Iyer and hearing him tell Allimel Ammal that the others had given and she must give too, and Pichu Iyer admits that he may have said so, though he had no clear memory of having done so.

The abovementioned seem to be the two most complete cases, but there are others in which Mirassidars depose to having been asked by the Deputy Collector for money. In some of these there is independent evidence of the transaction

having gone further, and if the statements of these witnesses, are to be credited the hesitation of the principals to tell the whole truth can be easily ascribed to some of the causes detailed in para 12 of the Collector's report.

5. The validity of the second charge, namely that of abusing his authority by extorting money in a criminal case, depends upon the amount of credibility to be attached to the the amount of credibility to be attached to the evidence of one man and his son, after giving full consideration to the circumstances under which they have come forward. It is dealt with in paras 37 and 38 of the Collector's report.

6. In support of the third charge of habitually using his official influence for unjustifiable personal enrichment Mr Thomas has recorded evidence which goes to show that the Deputy Collector on the occasion of a 'Holi' festival sent his son and nephew round in procession & collected about Rs 300 in the form of money presents tendered to the children in addition to smaller presents to the dancing girls and musicians, that supplies were sent to him

him free of charge on the occasion of another festival and that he was in the habit of obtaining paddy, straw, the use of milch kine &c &c, as required, from the wealthy Mirasidars of his division. In some of these cases the evidence is defective, but Mr. Thomas urged, not without reason, that it all points one way, and that its cumulative force is to strengthen the credibility of the major charges.

7. As collateral evidence in support of the charge of receiving bribes Mr. Thomas gives a list of the m[illegible] by the Deputy Collector from the different Treasuries of the district from which it appears that he got notes for Rupees 7,660, in addition to notes to the value of Rupees 8,705 drawn on account of pay.

8. P. Sheshagiri Row has not yet had an opportunity of cross-examining the witnesses or explaining away the circumstances which seem to tell against him. This of course must be afforded him, and the Board cannot support Mr. Thomas' recommendation for his summary dismissal. But without wishing to prejudge P. Sheshagiri Row, the Board have no hesitation in stating their opinion that his immediate suspension pending further enquiry is imperative in the interests of public justice. A strong *prima facie* case has been made out against him - If he is innocent, temporary suspension will do him no real harm. If the statements of his guilt have any truth, he is shown to be possessed of great influence, and to be unscrupulous to a degree, under which circumstances further enquiry without suspension runs serious risk of failing to elicit the truth - Further enquiry however is clearly necessary - It is due to the uncovenanted Native Service of which the Deputy Collector is a member that the charges should be sifted to the bottom, & that if he be

innocent

-cumstances

innocent he should be honorably acquitted or if he be guilty that the Service, which the Board hope & believe is growing in respectability, should be purged of his presence. They look on the issues of the case as by no means confined in their importance to the individuals already or hereafter to be immediately concerned; their influence will have a far wider range & may exercise an important effect on the general good administration of Tanjore & other districts for years to come.

9. Such being their view of the case the Board would strongly urge that a special Officer be deputed to take up some or all of the specific charges magisterially; as well as to make a general enquiry into the Deputy Collector's conduct & administration. If Mr. Webster, who the Board believe is very well qualified for the task, is entrusted with the work, they consider that he should be relieved of his general duties or have some adequate special assistance till the case under notice can be disposed of. If Mr. Webster's Services cannot be spared the Board would recommend the deputation of some other Special officer.

(True Extract)

J Murrock

Ac. Sub Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government R.D.

with origl. letter & its 3 enclosures

to be returned

Emergent

№ 1473.
Revenue 1878 Departt.
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue,
Dated 2 April 1878,
No. 3 — Ex. 1

Enc. 4.

Schd. 6128 20 April 1878

Submitting to Govt.
letter from Collector of
Tanjore reporting on charges
brought against the Dy
Collector P. Ruthziu
Pensr of Mannargudi
Division.

For orders
Ella

For orders
E.M.L.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 1473.

From Board of Revenue 1878.

Dated 2 April

FOR ORDERS.

The Collector charges his Deputy Collector with Extorting money from the Mirasidars of his division in order to enable him to build a house. Some seem to have given money and there are traces of others' successes in the number of notes taken up &c.

I doubt whether the charge of Extortion would lie. No actual threats are proved to have been held out nor was prospect of injury made so imminent as to constitute the crime. I do not therefore think that there is a criminal charge on the facts. Departmentally of course impropriety of conduct

Conduct lies on the 1st Category of Complaints

The Second matter is tainted by mala fides on the part of the Complainant and should not be prosecuted.

The whole of the rest is really conjectural.

This man has not been heard nor have the witnesses been confronted with him

Of course nothing can be done on these proceedings. The question is how to proceed. The Board recommend a Commission

I hesitate about a Commission because I think it will fail. I would remand the case for trial by Mr Forster or Webster, who should confront the witnesses and record explanations.

It does not seem to me that special relief is needed –

4/64 W Robinson

I have no objection

to the Employment of the Special Officer if my Honble Colleagues desire it and can afford the officer. But I have a strong objection to taking the serious step against a man in the position of a Deputy Collector, of suspension from the service unheard and on testimony collected against him in the manner in which this has been gathered – on testimony which when really sifted is found to consist in no small degree of exaggerated inference & conjecture – and all taken behind the man's back.

Mr [illegible] bleats sadly about the impotence of a Collector against a subordinate while in official position, about the special circumstances of impotence which his unconfirmed position entails – but he fails to bear in mind what

an Enormous power
against a subordinate
is trouble is Exercised
when a Collector goes
down to his charge, and
there practically proclaims
himself ready to hear
any malcontent whom
that subordinates official
duty may have raised
against him, behind his
back and under circum-
stances calculated to
raise the strongest feeling
against him. We should
not think of suspending
a Covenanted officer under
similar circumstances.
and least of all when that
officer has been pleading
for weeks at our doors
for fairness of trial,
asking that an impartial
inquiry & an unprejudiced
tribunal may be granted
to him — & pleading in
vain much to my regret.

I must confess that
I have never risen from the
perusal of a Report in which

FOR ORDERS.

I look for calm & impartial
judgment on the facts, with
greater regret than has
occurred to me from the
perusal of Mr Thomas's
paper. The Exordium goes
throughout to raise a pre-
-judgment against the
Defendant — Imagine
calculating what might have
been raised amongst a long
list of wealthy Mirassidars
within the Dy: Collector's influence
and then placing before us some
two or three instances in which
he thinks that influence has
been successful in realising
his theory, then adding to the
force of his prejudgment or
rather diluting it by such
incredible stuff as the 2d case
presents. And asking the Govt.
to dismiss an old officer from
the service on the record which
he has prepared! No native in
the country will feel safe under
such official conduct of a
superior.

I think that it is by no means
improbable that the Dy Collector
has been "sending round
the hat" but even under the
influence of that suspicion
I would give him the benefit
of what I venture to think is
fair play and not suspend him
unheard on testimony (for
it is not evidence) taken behind
his back & unsifted by cross
examination

6/4 [illegible]

6128/13

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 1473

From Board of Revenue

Dated 2nd April 1878.

FOR ORDERS.

[illegible] to [illegible]
[illegible]

There is very strong
ground for suspecting
[illegible] misconduct
of a grave character
& ample for suspending
the Dep. Coll. at once
What should be
[illegible] done

I sh. have thought
myself that it wd
be better in a case
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

The Collector claims
to [illegible] the Dep. Coll. with extorting
money from the Mirassi-
dars of his division in
order to enable him to buy
a house — Some seems
to have been given — money & there
are traces of others in excess in
the number of notes taken
up &c.

I don't [illegible] the
charge of extortion or the
actual threats are
proved or injury made to
[illegible] or [illegible]
I do not
think that there is a Crim-
inal charge on the
facts — departmental
of course impropriety
of conduct lies on the
[illegible] the record [illegible]

is tainted [illegible]

be prosecuted ~~at~~ & the
~~the~~ rest is really conjectural –

This man has not been heard nor have the witnesses been confronted with him

Of course nothing can be done on these proceedings the question is how to proceed – The B.O. recommend a Commission

I hesitate abt a Commission because I think it will fail I would remand the case for trial & Mr Joseph Webster should confront the witnesses & record explanation

It does not seem to me that special delay is needed

2/4 ~~at~~ Robinson

I concur in opinion that Mr Webster be directed to confront

& have sent some Special Officer to investigate it – who was well conversant with vernacular – rather than place it [illegible] the Collector – especially if as I imagine it the case come to trial it would come before the Collector –

The investigation sh[oul]d be promptly carried out

I have no objection to the employment of a Special Officer – if the Bd. Coll: desire it & can afford the office

But I have a strong objection to taking the ~~the~~ serious step against a man in the position of a Dep. Coll. of suspension from the service – unheard & on ~~[illegible]~~ testimony collected against him in the manner in which this has been ~~collected~~ gathered – on testimony which ~~[illegible]~~ sifted is found to consist in no small degree of exaggerated inference & conjecture – and all taken behind the man's back –

Mr Thomas dwells lately on the impotence of a Collector against a subordinate which is [illegible] the official position, about the official incumbent: of impotence which his unconfirmed position entails But he fails to bear in mind what an enormous power agst a subordinate in trouble is by in cases when a Coll. goes down to his camp & there practically by declaring himself ready to hear any malcontent who has subordinates' special duty may have raised against him, behind his back & under circumstances calculated to raise the strongest feeling against him – I do not think of suspending a covenanted officer under similar circumstances ~~[illegible]~~ & I [illegible] of all that the officer has been placed

the witnesses & the D.C. & record his explan[atio]n to their state[men]ts. It sh[oul]d be recorded at the time in his presence & an opportunity to be afforded him to ask further questions. ~~[illegible]~~ Mr Webster sh[oul]d report the result with his opinion

I think the Dy Coll. sh[oul]d be suspended at once till further orders –

There is ample ground for suspicion of his conduct for weeks at our door for fairness of trial, asking that an impartial inquiry & an unprejudiced tribunal may be granted them — & pleading in vain much to my regret.

I must confess that I have never risen from the perusal of a Report in which I look for calm & impartial judgment on the facts, with greater regret than has occurred to me from the perusal of Mr. Thomas' paper. The exordium ~~is altar~~ ~~[illegible]~~ goes throughout to raise a prejudgment against the Defendant — imagine calamity what might have been raised amongst a long list of wealthy Mirasdars within the Depy. Collr.'s influence & then placing before us some two or three instances in which he thinks that influence has been successful in realizing his theory then adding to the force of this prejudgment [illegible] or rather discrediting it — I find incredible stuff in the 2nd case presented of asking the Govt. to dismiss ~~[illegible]~~ an old officer for the reason in the record which he has prepared!

FOR ORDERS.

I think this is a letter ought to [illegible] into the act constituting the office of Dy Collr.

No native in the country will feel safe under such official conduct of a Superior.

I think that it is of no use improbable that the Depy. Collr. has been "sending round the hat" & has been even under the influence of that suspicion, I would give him the benefit of what I venture to think is "fair play" & not condemn him unheard on testimony which is not evidence taken behind his back & unsupported (except 5/4

W Robi

Rec 20.0 Ap 78.
C. 3rd Apl. B.R. 6 - A.C. 6 - R 9/4/78
C. 16-4-78 R. 20-4-78 R. 20. 13-4-78

G. O.

Read

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue d/2 April 1878 No. 902.

---

1. The Government have before them in the papers recorded above the further report from the Collector and the Board's opinion thereon relative to the charges brought by Mr. H. S. Thomas against Deputy Collector P. Seshagiri Rau.

2. His Grace the G. in C. considers that there is strong ground for suspecting extensive misconduct of a grave character

Seen 16/4

This Draft is in the sense of the resolution of the Majority & this I do not and concurring generally in the recommendations which the Board have made, resolves to direct the immediate suspension of V. Seshagiri Rau and to entrust to Mr E. F. Webster the duty of enquiring into this officer's conduct and administration.

3. Mr Webster will take up such of the cases adverted to in the preliminary report as may seem best calculated to test the correctness of the view which Mr Thomas had formed. It is not the wish of Government at present that any magisterial enquiry should be made. The necessity of such proceedings will be considered when the Collector's report — which should be forwarded through the Revenue Board is received.

4 As this investigation (to be conducted in the spirit of Act XXXVII of 1850) will necessarily occupy much of Mr Webster's time he will arrange for the conduct of current business, as far as possible by the Sub Collector & other District Officers. If extra

Agree, I do so as all others
prefer one: in order to
save time
18/4

The general tenor of the [illegible] by Honble Member implies that a deputy enquiry is not intended but it is submitted that unless the investigation is conducted either on [illegible] charges or unless a commissioner appointed formally with reference to Act 37 of 1850, the witnesses could be solemnly affirmed.

In the case of V. Venkachellam [illegible] (C.O. 6 March 1869 No. 394) a formal investigation was not ordered [illegible] appointment of a [illegible] district [illegible] charge. If the Act is to be brought into operation [illegible] be prosecuted.

The draft is left here —

assistance is ab-
solutely necessary
he will address
Government -

CHM

The Board of Rev
with three enclo-
sures - (dep [illegible]
[illegible]

prima facie is after
hearing the Dy Collr. to
instruct Mr. Webster to
cause the recorded stat.
to be read out to the D.C.
in the presence of the Defendant
& to allow the D.C. to put any
further questions to them
he may desire. & to himself
carry this exam. further
if he thinks fit. to receive
from the D.C. such
explanation in writing
as he may desire to
submit. to exam: him
orally if he sees reason
to do so. & to forward
the whole record to Govt.
with his opinion.

On receipt of this the Govt.
will decide as to further
action. 16 Apr. 78

c. 12: apl /78. R 13. R.O. 15: R.C. 23-4-78.
C. 16-4-78 R. 23-4-78

I think it well to note that
Act 37 of 50 Sec. 25 expressly reserves the
power of Govt. to remove any public servant
without ordering a Commn. — that the power of
Dy Collrs. & Magts. in Madras was not curtailed till
7 years later by Act 7 of 57 & that its
concluding sec. expressly contemplates
summary disposal of such cases
as the present.

Emergent

This draft is not in
accordance with my order
of the course best to
be adopted. I do not
contemplate proceedings
under Act 37 of 50.
but under Sec. 5. Act 7
of 57. and that I would
purpose to do at the

No 612a

R.D.

612A / 18

Pros: Madras Govt.
Under date the 23d April 1878

Read the following
Pros: of the Bd. of Rev:
of 2nd April 1878 No.
902 regarding Deputy
Collr. Seshagiri Rau

4.78

The Govt. have
before them in the
papers recorded
above the further
report from the Collr.
and the Bd.'s opinion
thereon relative to the
charges brought by
Mr H. S. Thomas
against Dy. Collector
P. Seshagiri Rau

2. The Govt. concur
generally in the view
of

4.
will forward the
whole record to Govt.
through the Bd. of Rev
with his opinion
thereon — The Bd. will transmit it with
remarks.

5. It is improba-
ble that this ~~com-~~ further
~~pletion of the~~ enquiry
already held will
trespass unduly
on Mr. Webster's
time but should it
prove otherwise and
no satisfactory ar-
rangement for the
conduct of current
business by the
other officials of
the District be fea-
sible the Govt.
will be prepared
to afford him
add.

---

additional ass

Ind. Copy to the Board of Rev on 2d April

6/21

Suspension of the
C.Mr Seshagiri
Rao –

12/4219

a B
224 – 224

c. 23-4-78.