(1) Number of pages 42

(2) Date of repair 13-7-1984

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / ~~B.P. No.~~	1553	Press. / Mis.
Dated	24-9-1878	~~197~~ .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Archives 1—5,806—24-2-78.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

1553

1

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

24th September 1878, No. 1,553.

Read the following papers :—

No. 276. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 11th July 1878, No. 1,923.

Read the following letter from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Ponnai, 15th April 1878, No. 106 :—

I REGRET to have to report that, on the night of the 28th ultimo, a cash chest, containing property to the aggregate value of about Rupees 1,000 relating to criminal cases under trial on the file of the Special Deputy Magistrate, Kistnasami Iyer, was carried off from his office-room in the Huzur Cutcherry at Graemspett. No public money has been lost. The whole of the missing property belonged to private parties and was produced by the Police before the Deputy Magistrate in the cases under trial before him.

2. I was engaged in Jamabundi at Poloor on the day of the occurrence. From the enclosed copies of Kistnasawmi Iyer's letter, dated respectively 29th and 30th ultimo, Nos. 38 and 39, the Board will perceive that on the night in question robbers removed from the room, where it was properly secured, the large and solid chest containing the missing property, which was found broken open not far off the cutcherry compound.

3. The Deputy Magistrate's report shows that one of his two Police orderlies, Muthusamy, had charge of the key of his office on the night of the occurrence, and that the key is now missing. The Constable admits having taken charge of the key when the cutcherry was closed in the evening, and says that he left it at home, and that the other Police orderly Subbaroyalu came during his absence and asked his wife for the key, which he then took away with him. Police Constable Subbaroyalu denies altogether having taken the key in question from Muthusamy's house.

4. The door of the office-room where the box was locked up was not broken or injured in any way, and there can be no doubt that it was opened by the key of which Police orderly Muthusamy had charge, and with the connivance and assistance of the orderlies themselves. These men for a length of time have been in the habit of receiving charge at night of the office key, and they, of course, are primarily responsible for its safety.

5. None of the stolen property has been recovered as yet, nor, so far as I am informed, has any clue been discovered as to its whereabouts.

6. I have impressed upon the District Superintendent of Police the necessity for active steps to bring to justice the perpetrators of this daring offence. Major Cox however positively declares that the Police orderlies attached to the Deputy Magistrate's office are not guards, and have nothing to say or do with the custody of the office building or any of the property contained therein, and cannot be held responsible if any thing is stolen or made away with while in their charge. He contends that they are merely detailed to attend the Deputy Magistrate's office while that official is engaged in magisterial inquiries, and that when he closes office every day their duty and responsibility absolutely ceases.

7. With this opinion I am wholly unable to agree. Before the present Police force was organized, it was usual for the peons attached to each officer to discharge Revenue and Magisterial functions indiscriminately, and at night some of the peons used always to remain at the cutcherry to which they belonged and guard the property secured there. The Police force as soon as it came into existence took over all the duties relating to magisterial matters theretofore performed by the Police, or sepoys of the Veteran Battalion, including the guarding of treasuries, jails, and other public buildings, and they have, so far as I am aware, ever since continued to

guard such buildings; at any rate, it is certain that the Revenue peons, whose numbers were enormously reduced in every office throughout the country as soon as the Police force was constituted, ceased to be employed as guards or custodians of property deposited in cutcherries, and unless they are now very largely increased it will be impossible that they undertake such duty hereafter. The Police is a regularly drilled, well armed, and properly equipped body, one of whose special and peculiar duties it is to act as guards. It appears to me to be a preposterous argument that because there are only a few orderlies attached to each office, and they have to be present there during office hours, therefore they cannot be entrusted with the key at night, or be required to guard by their presence the property secured therein. But this is exactly what Major Cox contends. He does not deny that the Deputy Magistrate's orderlies have for a length of time regularly received charge of the office key and thereby assumed charge of the building. It is admitted that between them they now wholly fail to account for the missing key, but nevertheless Major Cox maintains that they are in no way responsible for the removal of the chest containing the stolen property from the cutcherry. If he is right, then, I confess, I do not see how the safety of our cutcherries, records, and other valuable property is to be ensured hereafter, and I trust that the present case will lead to the Government issuing orders distinctly defining the responsibility of the Police in such matters.

8. The Board will recollect that in my letter, No. 653, dated 2nd November 1877, I reported that a box containing Rupees 42 of Government money had been carried off out of a room in my office in which one of my Police orderlies was sleeping at the time and no clue has yet been discovered as to the offenders; and in that case also Major Cox is of opinion that as the Constable in question was only an office orderly he cannot be regarded as a guard to whom the safety of the building was in any way entrusted.

9. I should add that the Deputy Magistrate's office-room, from which the box, the loss of which I am now reporting, was removed, is only a few yards from the treasury guard-room, and it is matter for surprise (supposing that the Police orderlies and guards had no hand in the robbery) that so large a chest, requiring several men to lift, could have been removed from the cutcherry and broken open on a piece of open waste land close by without attracting the attention of any of the Constables on guard.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

LIST of Property stolen from the Special Deputy Magistrate's Office on the night of the 28th March 1878.

Property belonging to Calendar Case No. 25 of 1878.

		RS.	A.	P.
1.	Full Rupees	451	0	0
	Old Arcot Rupees	2	0	0
	Do. half Rupee, one	0	8	0
	Do. quarter Rupees, two	0	8	0
2.	Silver changes	52	6	0
	Copper coins	1	10	10
3.	Two gold pieces and gold earrings (four pieces) and one gold Dotimka			
4.	Five pairs of silver Tayithe			
5.	Silver hollow bangle	2	0	0
6 & 7.	Silver rings, two	0	4	0
8.	Silver touching pieces and gold touching pieces	0	8	0
9.	Touchstone, weights and wax ball	3	0	0
10 & 11.	Red purses	1	8	0
12 & 13.	White purses			
14.	Iron weight			
15.	Iron tool called Patikara	0	1	0
16.	Chisel	0	4	0
17.	Ledger paper book	0	1	0
18.	A purse			
19.	Ragged cloths			
20.	Silver hollow bangles	0	4	0
	Total	515	14	10

1553
2

Property belonging to Calendar Case No. 4 of 1878.

		RS.	A.	P.
1.	A ruby and a pearl	4	4	0
2.	Four pieces of false diamonds and a green stone and a pearl	0	12	0
3.	Nine copper coins of one and a-half pies each and a small Chinaware weight	0	1	1½
4.	A purse containing 7 Rupees, one Arcot Rupee, one Pondicherry Rupee, and an old silver one-Anna piece	9	1	0
5.	Cash	101	8	0
6.	One Arcot Rupee, one Pondicherry Rupee, and an old silver one-Anna coin	2	1	0
7.	Two pairs of gold Bugadalu, one of which is hung with pearls	22	0	0
8.	A pair of gold Kammalu	14	0	0
9.	A gold necklace (Teega)	14	0	0
10.	A blue stone attached to gold	7	0	0
11.	A gold ring with Umamaleiswara pagoda fixed in it	13	0	0
12.	A gold star pagoda	4	0	0
13.	Cash	21	0	0
14.	A pale blue and a dark blue stones	1	0	3
15.	A pair of bell-metal Talam, a musical instrument	0	4	0
16.	Cash	120	0	0
17.	Two-Anna pieces, thirty-nine, and one old quarter Rupee piece	5	2	0
18.	A pair of gold Kammalu	8	0	0
19.	Do. Bugadalu	6	0	0
20.	Do. Kammalu	10	0	0
21.	A gold Venkateswaraswami pagoda, a ruby, eleven pearls and a touchstone	5	0	0
22.	Cash	71	2	0
23.	Cash (compensation amount)	40	1	6
	Total	479	4	10½
	Grand Total	995	3	8½

CHITTOOR,
30th March 1878.

(Signed) KISTNASAMI IYER,
Deputy Magistrate.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE, Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From KISTNASAMI IYER, Deputy Magistrate on Special Duty, to W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., District Magistrate, North Arcot, dated Chittoor, 29th March 1878, No. 38.

I REGRET to have to report to you that last night my office-room at the Graemspett Cutcherry was broken open and the Treasury-box stolen. The box contained cash, jewels, &c., to the value of about 1,000 Rupees belonging to magisterial cases. The box *alone* was this morning found in a broken state in the open ground not far off from the Cutcherry compound.

2. With the assistance of the Taluq Magistrate Chukravarthy Nynar, I have this morning made prompt local inquiries whereby suspicion goes against the two Police Constables, Muthusamy No. 75 and Subbaroyalu No. 988, who form the Police guard of my office and who ought to have watched it last night. The office-room key, which was admittedly in the possession of one of them, Muthusamy, is not forthcoming, and he has not satisfactorily accounted for its non-production. He says the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, took it from his wife in his absence last night, while Subbaroyalu denies the said allegation.

3. I shall report more fully by to-morrow's post.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From the same Officer, dated Chittoor, 30th March 1878, No. 39.

IN continuation of my letter of yesterday's date, No. 38, I have the honor to report that yesterday morning at about 6-30 A. M. when my Office Masaljee, Munian, went to the office to sweep and clean it, he found the northern door of the room open, and the padlock thereof lying on the ground outside the door unbroken. On entering into the room he found the Treasury box missing. He at once reported the matter to my Head Clerk Regunada Row, who lost no time in bringing me the news, which I received at about 8 A. M.

2. Having immediately sent information of the occurrence to the Station-house Officer and the Police Inspector of Chittoor as well as to the Superintendent of Police in a demi-official letter, I at once proceeded to the spot accompanied by the Taluq Magistrate, Chukravarthy Nynar. On arrival there, information was received that the box in question was lying in a broken state in the open ground outside, and not far off from the Cutcherry compound. Accordingly the broken box was found there emptied of all its contents, consisting of cash, jewels, &c., to the aggregate value of about Rupees 1,000, they being stolen property produced before me in connection with magisterial cases pending inquiry and appeal. A list of the property lost is enclosed. The box in question measures $2\frac{1}{2} \times 1\frac{1}{4} \times 1\frac{1}{2}$ feet; and it could not have been removed by less than two men.

3. From my inquiry the following facts are elicited:—

Constables Muthusamy No. 75, and Subbaroyalu No. 988, form the Police guard of my office. They, more especially Muthusamy, know that the box contained the said property. They attend office during the day, and one of them guards the office at nights by turns. Every evening lamp-oil is given them to keep light in the office at nights. Each of them now charges the other with the night duty of the night in question. Constable Muthusamy, however, admits that he took charge of the office, including the Treasury box, &c., in the evening, and that he shut the door thereof, locked it up and went home with the key; he adds that, during his absence from his house, his wife gave the key in question to the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, in the presence of one Syed Fareed, Head Constable, alleging it was Subbaroyalu's duty to guard the office on the night in question. Muthusamy has two wives, one of whom, though she was with the other the whole night, knows nothing in the matter of the key in question. The statement given by the other wife is unsatisfactory, and in material points contradictory with her husband's and the said Syed Fareed's depositions. The said Constable Muthusamy was seen at the arrack shop at 8 P. M. on the night in question by two witnesses, and he was also seen and spoken to by Beat Constable Kondappa, No. 1,716, *at the door (which had been open) of my office-room after* 10 P. M. *on the same night*. This is not admitted by Muthusamy, and neither he nor the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, admits having at all been to the office on night duty. The said Constable Kondappa, however, first told the Husur Treasury Guard Head Constable, Sheik Husein, that the man he saw as above was *Subbaroyalu*. Before me, however, having seen the men, he swears it was *Muthusamy* and *not* Subbaroyalu that he saw as above, and explains that he did not know the names of those Constables correctly and therefore he gave the wrong name to the Head Constable. Thus against the Constable Muthusamy there is his own admission that he took charge of the office on the evening of the 28th, and that he took home the key thereof, as well as the evidence of two witnesses that he was seen, at about 8 P.M., at the arrack shop at Graemspett, and that of the Beat Constable that he was seen and spoken to by him at the very door (the door being open) of my office-room after 10 P. M. on the night in question. It also appears from the evidence of my Office Masaljee, Munian, that the *night duty of the night in question must have been Muthusamy's*. Against the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, there is only the unsatisfactory and unreliable evidence of one of Muthusamy's wives to the effect that the key of the office-room was delivered to him, Subbaroyalu.

4. From the above, you will see that there are grounds for a very strong suspicion against the Police Constables (especially Muthusamy) who formed the guard of my office, and it is a remarkable fact that the key of the office-room, which Muthusamy admits having taken with him, has not as yet been produced. You are aware that my office is held in one of the rooms attached to the Collector's Cutcherry at Graemspett, and close to it are the Huzur Treasury-room and the Sub-Jail buildings, guarded by a strong Police party.

5. The Police Inspector, Varadachariar, who attended a portion of my inquiry, has taken up the case in his own hands, and I have requested him and the Taluq Magistrate, Chukravarthy Nynar, who was present with me throughout the whole of my inquiry from 9 A. M. to 4. P. M. yesterday, to try their best to have this important case detected as early as possible. I beg to add that I have again addressed the Superintendent of Police on the subject, and request that you will be good enough to write to him on the matter.

6. Copies of depositions taken by me are herewith forwarded.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITHSIDE,
Magistrate.

1553 3

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. With reference to paragraph 6 *et seq.* it seems desirable that the responsibilities of Police Orderlies attached to Magistrates' Courts should be defined.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

REFERRED, through the Judicial Department, for the early remarks of the Inspector-General of Police.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Secretary to Government.

5th August 1878.

No. 277. Endorsement of the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 26th August 1878, No. 1,533.

From Colonel W. S. DREVER, C.S.I., Acting Inspector-General of Police, to the Hon. D. F. CARMICHAEL, Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 22nd August 1878, No. 3,730.

WITH reference to your endorsement,* No. 1,384, on the accompanying Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, I have the honor to forward the latest report from the Superintendent of Police, North Arcot, regarding the case in question, with further remarks thereon by Major Hicks, the Deputy Inspector-General of the Range.

* Returned herewith.

2. It appears to me to have been an occurrence which might have been avoided if the Special Deputy Magistrate had placed the box containing the valuables under the Treasury guard instead of entrusting it to his Orderly.

3. The duties of such Orderlies are laid down so far as is possible, with the full sanction of Government, in Police Orders Nos. 634 to 640 of the Departmental Code. It was never intended that these men should be turned into "guards," to do duty day and night, and it is out of the question to expect work of that kind from their very limited numbers.

4. The Departmental Orders Nos. 311 to 318 of the Code embody in ample detail the instructions which have from time to time been issued on the subject of depositing "cash-chests" in Police custody, and these virtually have more force at the head-quarter station of a district, where there is a regular Treasury or other guard, into whose keeping all such articles should be formally given when not required in Court by the Magisterial Officer conducting an investigation.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Major H. W. H. COX, Superintendent of Police, North Arcot, to Major T. K. GUTHRIE, Acting Assistant Inspector-General of Police, dated Chittur, 13th August 1878, No. 762 (through Deputy Inspector-General, Central Range).

I HAVE the honor to return copy of Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 11th July 1878, No. 1,923, and to report, with reference to your endorsement, No. 3,510, dated 9th instant, that none of the property stolen from the Special Deputy Magistrate's office-room in the Collector's Kacheri at Græmespett on the night of the 28th March last has yet been recovered.

2. Constable Mootoosamy, No. 75, who was charged with the theft, and against whom there was a strong suspicion and a small amount of circumstantial evidence, has been discharged by the Taluk Magistrate. I have asked for a copy of his judgment.

3. The key has never been found. Constable Mootoosamy admits having had it in the evening of the 28th March. His allegation that Constable Soobroyloo came and took it from his wife is of doubtful truth.

4. I am not so certain as the District Magistrate is that this key was used to open the lock of the door of the office-room. A key probably had been used, but there are few locks that an expert cannot pick. The dispute about the possession of the key although it excites suspicion is not incompatible with the innocence of both the Constables so far as the theft is concerned. He who should confess possession of it would admit that he had been ordered to sleep at the Kacheri and that he had disobeyed that order, and it is not unnatural that the possession should be denied.

5. In paragraph 9 of his letter, No. 106, dated 15th April 1878, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, the Collector speaks of the chest which was removed from the Kacheri as being so large as to require several men to lift it. I think that two men could have carried it with ease. The box is described in my letter to the Inspector-General of Police, No. 335, dated 2nd April 1878, of which I attach a copy for reference.

6. As regards my opinion about the legitimate duties of Magistrates' Orderlies, which the Collector thinks are unsound, I have only to say that I have been guided by Departmental Orders on the subject.

I AM of opinion that every facility was given for the commission of this theft owing to the very lax system followed and allowed by the higher officials at the Collector's Kacheri at Chittur.

2. Some time in April, and after this case occurred, I went round the Kacheri buildings early one morning and found that no attempt had been made to secure the outer doors or windows. On trying several of the outer doors and windows I found I could easily push them open with my hands, and some of them were kept closed by simply placing small stones against the bottom of the doors or windows. I brought this to the notice of the Treasury Deputy Collector and told him that if the doors and windows were kept properly fastened I could arrange to have the whole of the Kacheri buildings securely guarded.

3. I fully concur with Major Cox in thinking that Magistrates' Orderlies are not detailed for the purpose of mounting guard over boxes containing money and other valuable property, and in the present case I believe the Deputy Magistrate was bound by the rules in force to place the box (that was carried off) inside the Treasury for safe custody during the night. If he had done this, or even if he had ordered his office-room to be locked and sealed when he closed his office for the day and had kept the key himself or given it in charge to his Head Clerk, I think the room would have been properly guarded and this case would not have occurred.

4. Two Constables were furnished to the Deputy Magistrate as Orderlies, and as these men were fully employed during the day it surely cannot be expected that they should also mount guard during the night. It is clear the Deputy Magistrate expected this and left the room to the Constables and other under-subordinates attached to his office to open or shut as they pleased, and I certainly think he ought to be held responsible for not taking any ordinary precaution for the safe custody of such valuable property.

5. Before leaving Chittur I framed fresh rules for the Police guard over the Treasury and Collector's office, copy of which I enclose. If ordinary precaution is now taken to keep the outer doors and windows of the office securely fastened, I think the whole building can be securely guarded by the present Police guard.

6. Every effort has been made to discover the perpetrators of this theft and extra men have been employed on the case, but I regret to say that no clue has been obtained likely to lead to the conviction of the parties concerned.

Ooty,
17th August 1878.

(Signed) F. J. HICKS, Major,
Ag. Dy. Inspr.-Genl., Central Range.

FORWARDED to the Revenue Department with reference to endorsement by that department, dated 5th August 1878.

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Chief Secretary.

1553
9

No. 278. ORDER THEREON, 24th September 1878, No. 1,553.

Miscellaneous.

ON a perusal of these papers, the Government are of opinion that the Special Deputy Magistrate of the North Arcot District, Kistnasami Iyer, was to blame for omitting to take ordinary precautions for the security of the property in question. They desire that the Collector's special attention be directed to the remarks of the Deputy Inspector-General of Police of the Central Range, as to the *practice* of the district in leaving Kacheri doors and windows unsecured at night.

2. Adverting to paragraph 6 *et seq.* of the Collector's letter, the Government are also of opinion that it is altogether unreasonable that Police Orderlies, who have been on duty all day in a Magistrate's Court, should remain on guard at the office all night. The Police Orders, referred to by the Inspector-General of Police, show that this is no part of their duty.

(True Extract.)

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

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

Exd. W. J. Lewis, W. H. French, A. S. Rodgers.

1553
5

No. 1,923.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 11th July 1878.

Read the following letter from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Ponnai, 15th April 1878, No. 106:—

I REGRET to have to report that, on the night of the 28th ultimo, a cash chest, containing property to the aggregate value of about Rupees 1,000 relating to criminal cases under trial on the file of the Special Deputy Magistrate, Kistnasami Iyer, was carried off from his office-room in the Huzur Cutcherry at Graemspett. No public money has been lost. The whole of the missing property belonged to private parties and was produced by the Police before the Deputy Magistrate in the cases under trial before him.

2. I was engaged in Jamabundi at Poloor on the day of the occurrence. From the enclosed copies of Kistnasawmi Iyer's letter, dated respectively 29th and 30th ultimo, Nos. 38 and 39, the Board will perceive that on the night in question robbers removed from the room, where it was properly secured, the large and solid chest containing the missing property, which was found broken open not far off the cutcherry compound.

3. The Deputy Magistrate's report shows that one of his two Police orderlies, Muthusamy, had charge of the key of his office on the night of the occurrence, and that the key is now missing. The Constable admits having taken charge of the key when the cutcherry was closed in the evening, and says that he left it at home, and that the other Police orderly Subbaroyalu came during his absence and asked his wife for the key, which he then took away with him. Police Constable Subbaroyalu denies altogether having taken the key in question from Muthusamy's house.

4. The door of the office-room where the box was locked up was not broken or injured in any way, and there can be no doubt that it was opened by the key of which Police orderly Muthusamy had charge, and with the connivance and assistance of the orderlies themselves. These men for a length of time have been in the habit of receiving charge at night of the office key, and they, of course, are primarily responsible for its safety.

5. None of the stolen property has been recovered as yet, nor, so far as I am informed, has any clue been discovered as to its whereabouts.

6. I have impressed upon the District Superintendent of Police the necessity for active steps to bring to justice the perpetrators of this daring offence. Major Cox however positively declares that the Police orderlies attached to the Deputy Magistrate's office are not guards, and have nothing to say or do with the custody of the office building or any of the property contained therein, and cannot be held responsible if any thing is stolen or made away with while in their charge. He contends that they are merely detailed to attend the Deputy Magistrate's office while that official is engaged in magisterial inquiries, and that when he closes office every day their duty and responsibility absolutely ceases.

7. With this opinion I am wholly unable to agree. Before the present Police force was organized, it was usual for the peons attached to each officer to discharge Revenue and Magisterial functions indiscriminately, and at night some of the peons used always to remain at the cutcherry to which they belonged and guard the property secured there. The Police force as soon as it came into existence took over all the duties relating to magisterial matters theretofore performed by the Police, or sepoys of the Veteran Battalion, including the guarding of treasuries, jails, and other public buildings, and they have, so far as I am aware, ever since continued to guard such buildings; at any rate, it is certain that the Revenue peons, whose numbers were enormously reduced in every office throughout the country as soon as the Police force was constituted, ceased to be employed as guards or custodians of property deposited in cutcherries, and unless they are now very largely increased it will be

impossible that they undertake such duty hereafter. The Police is a regularly drilled, well armed, and properly equipped body, one of whose special and peculiar duties it is to act as guards. It appears to me to be a preposterous argument that because there are only a few orderlies attached to each office, and they have to be present there during office hours, therefore they cannot be entrusted with the key at night, or be required to guard by their presence the property secured therein. But this is exactly what Major Cox contends. He does not deny that the Deputy Magistrate's orderlies have for a length of time regularly received charge of the office key and thereby assumed charge of the building. It is admitted that between them they now wholly fail to account for the missing key, but nevertheless Major Cox maintains that they are in no way responsible for the removal of the chest containing the stolen property from the cutcherry. If he is right, then, I confess, I do not see how the safety of our cutcherries, records, and other valuable property is to be ensured hereafter, and I trust that the present case will lead to the Government issuing orders distinctly defining the responsibility of the Police in such matters.

8. The Board will recollect that in my letter, No. 653, dated 2nd November 1877, I reported that a box containing Rupees 42 of Government money had been carried off out of a room in my office in which one of my Police orderlies was sleeping at the time and no clue has yet been discovered as to the offenders; and in that case also Major Cox is of opinion that as the Constable in question was only an office orderly he cannot be regarded as a guard to whom the safety of the building was in any way entrusted.

9. I should add that the Deputy Magistrate's office-room, from which the box, the loss of which I am now reporting, was removed, is only a few yards from the treasury guard-room, and it is matter for surprise (supposing that the Police orderlies and guards had no hand in the robbery) that so large a chest, requiring several men to lift, could have been removed from the cutcherry and broken open on a piece of open waste land close by without attracting the attention of any of the Constables on guard.

Enclosure No. 1.

List of Property stolen from the Special Deputy Magistrate's Office on the night of the 28th March 1878.

Property belonging to Calender Case No. 25 of 1878.

		Rs.	A.	P.
1.	Full Rupees	451	0	0
	Old Arcot Rupees	2	0	0
	Do. half Rupee, one	0	8	0
	Do. quarter Rupees, two	0	8	0
2.	Silver changes	52	6	0
	Copper coins	1	16	10
3.	Two gold pieces and gold earrings (four pieces) and one gold Dotimka	...		
4.	Five pairs of silver Tayithe	2	0	0
5.	Silver hollow bangle	0	4	0
6 & 7.	Silver rings, two	0	8	0
8.	Silver touching pieces and gold touching pieces	3	0	0
9.	Touchstone, weights and wax ball	1	8	0
		...		
10 & 11.	Red purses	...		
12 & 13.	White purses	0	1	0
14.	Iron weight	0	4	0
15.	Iron tool called Patikara	0	1	0
16.	Chisel	...		
17.	Ledger paper book	...		
18.	A purse	...		
19.	Ragged cloths	0	4	0
20.	Silver hollow bangles	...		
	Total	515	14	10

Property belonging to Calender Case No. 4 of 1878.

		Rs.	A.	P.
1.	A ruby and a pearl	4	4	0
2.	Four pieces of false diamonds and a green stone and a pearl	0	12	0
3.	Nine copper coins of one and-a-half pies each and a small Chinaware weight	0	1	1½
4.	A purse containing 7 Rupees, one Arcot Rupee, one Pondicherry Rupee, and an old silver one-Anna piece.	9	1	0
5.	Cash	101	8	0
6.	One Arcot Rupee, one Pondicherry Rupee, and an old silver one-Anna coin	2	1	0
7.	Two pairs of gold Bugadalu, one of which is hung with pearls	22	0	0
8.	A pair of gold Kammalu	14	0	0
9.	A gold necklace (Teega)	14	0	0
10.	A blue stone attached to gold	7	0	0
11.	A gold ring with Umamaleiswara pagoda fixed in it	13	0	0
12.	A gold star pagoda	4	0	0
13.	Cash	21	0	0
14.	A pale blue and a dark blue stones	1	0	3
15.	A pair of bell-metal Talam, a musical instrument	0	4	0
16.	Cash	120	0	0
17.	Two-Anna pieces, thirty-nine, and one old quarter Rupee piece	5	2	0
18.	A pair of gold Kammalu	8	0	0
19.	Do. Bugadalu	6	0	0
20.	Do. Kammalu	10	0	0
21.	A gold Venkateswaraswami pagoda, a ruby, eleven pearls and a touchstone	5	0	0
22.	Cash	71	2	0
23.	Cash (compensation amount)	40	1	6
	Total	479	4	10½
	Grand Total	995	3	8½

(Signed) KISTNASAMI IYER,
Deputy Magistrate.

Chittoor,
30th March 1878.

(True Copy.)
(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Magistrate.

Enclosure No. 2.

From KISTNASAMI IYER, Deputy Magistrate on Special Duty, to W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., District Magistrate, North Arcot, dated Chittoor, 29th March 1878, No. 38.

I regret to have to report to you that last night my office-room at the Graemspett Cutcherry was broken open and the Treasury-box stolen. The box contained cash, jewels, &c., to the value of about 1,000 Rupees belonging to magisterial cases. The box *alone* was this morning found in a broken state in the open ground not far off from the Cutcherry compound.

2. With the assistance of the Taluq Magistrate Chukravarthy Nynar, I have this morning made prompt local inquiries whereby suspicion goes against the two Police Constables, Muthusamy No. 75 and Subbaroyalu No. 988, who form the Police guard of my office and who ought to have watched it last night. The office-room key, which was admittedly in the possession of one of them, Muthusamy, is not forthcoming, and he has not satisfactorily accounted for its non-production. He says the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, took it from his wife in his absence last night, while Subbaroyalu denies the said allegation.

3. I shall report more fully by to-morrow's post.

(True Copy.)
(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From the same Officer, dated Chittoor, 30th March 1878, No. 39.

IN continuation of my letter of yesterday's date, No. 38, I have the honor to report that yesterday morning at about 6-30 A. M. when my Office Masaljee, Munian, went to the office to sweep and clean it, he found the northern door of the room open, and the padlock thereof lying on the ground outside the door unbroken. On entering into the room he found the Treasury box missing. He at once reported the matter to my Head Clerk Regunada Row, who lost no time in bringing me the news, which I received at about 8 A. M.

2. * Having immediately sent information of the occurrence to the Station-house Officer and the Police Inspector of Chittoor as well as to the Superintendent of Police in a demi-official letter, I at once proceeded to the spot accompanied by the Taluq Magistrate, Chukravarthy Nynar. On arrival there, information was received that the box in question was lying in a broken state in the open ground outside, and not far off from the Cutcherry compound. Accordingly the broken box was found there emptied of all its contents, consisting of cash, jewels, &c., to the aggregate value of about Rupees 1,000, they being stolen property produced before me in connection with magisterial cases pending inquiry and appeal. A list of the property lost is enclosed. The box in question measures $2\frac{1}{2} \times 1\frac{3}{4} \times 1\frac{1}{2}$ feet; and it could not have been removed by less than two men.

3. From my inquiry the following facts are elicited :—

Constables Muthusamy No. 75, and Subbaroyalu No. 988, form the Police guard of my office. They, more especially Muthusamy, knew that the box contained the said property. They attend office during the day, and one of them guards the office at nights by turns. Every evening lamp-oil is given them to keep light in the office at nights. Each of them now charges the other with the night duty of the night in question. Constable Muthusamy, however, admits that he took charge of the office, including the Treasury box, &c., in the evening, and that he shut the door thereof, locked it up and went home with the key; he adds that, during his absence from his house, his wife gave the key in question to the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, in the presence of one Syed Fareed, Head Constable, alleging it was Subbaroyalu's duty to guard the office on the night in question. Muthusamy has two wives, one of whom, though she was with the other the whole night, knows nothing in the matter of the key in question. The statement given by the other wife is unsatisfactory, and in material points contradictory with her husband's and the said Syed Fareed's depositions. The said Constable Muthusamy was seen at the arrack shop at 8 P. M. on the night in question by two witnesses, and he was also seen and spoken to by Beat Constable Kondappa, No. 1,719, *at the door* (*which had been open*) *of my office-room after* 10 P. M. *on the same night*. This is not admitted by Muthusamy, and neither he nor the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, admits having at all been to the office on night duty. The said Constable Kondappa, however, first told the Husur Treasury Guard Head Constable, Sheik Husein, that the man he saw as above was *Subbaroyalu*. Before me, however, having seen the men, he swears it was *Muthusamy* and *not* Subbaroyalu that he saw as above, and explains that he did not know the names of those Constables correctly and therefore he gave the wrong name to the Head Constable. Thus against the Constable Muthusamy there is his own admission that he took charge of the office on the evening of the 28th, and that he took home the key thereof, as well as the evidence of two witnesses that he was seen, at about 8 P.M., at the arrack shop at Graemspett, and that of the Beat Constable that he was seen and spoken to by him at the very door (the door being open) of my office-room after 10 P. M. on the night in question. It also appears from the evidence of my Office Masaljee, Munian, that the night duty of the night in question must have been Muthusamy's. Against the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, there is only the unsatisfactory and unreliable evidence of one of Muthusamy's wives to the effect that the key of the office-room was delivered to him, Subbaroyalu.

4. From the above, you will see that there are grounds for a very strong suspicion against the Police Constables (especially Muthusamy) who formed the guard of my office, and it is a remarkable fact that the key of the office-room, which Muthusamy admits having taken with him, has not as yet been produced. You are aware that my office is held in one of the rooms attached to the Collector's Cutcherry at Graemspett, and close to it are the Huzur Treasury-room and the Sub-Jail buildings, guarded by a strong Police party.

5. The Police Inspector, Varadachariar, who attended a portion of my inquiry, has taken up the case in his own hands, and I have requested him and the Taluq Magistrate, Chukravarthy Nynar, who was present with me throughout the whole of my inquiry from 9 A. M. to 4. P. M. yesterday, to try their best to have this important case detected as early as possible. I beg to add that I have again addressed the Superintendent of Police on the subject, and request that you will be good enough to write to him on the matter.

6. Copies of depositions taken by me are herewith forwarded.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Magistrate.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. With reference to paragraph 6 *et seq.* it seems desirable that the responsibilities of Police Orderlies attached to Magistrates' Courts should be defined.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to the Collector of North Arcot.

Exd. W. J. Lewis and W. H. French.

Ap 3283

June 1878. Revenue.

Board of Revenue, MADRAS.

(Judicial)

PROCEEDINGS, 11TH JULY 1878, No. 1,923.

Encl. [illegible]

Received 6 August 78

JULY.

No. 1,923.

Property—relating to Criminal cases under trial on the file of the Special Deputy Magistrate of North Arcot District.—Submitting to Government letter from Collector reporting the theft of —, and stating that the responsibilities of Police Orderlies attached to Magistrates' Courts should be defined.

Ap 1884

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.

Referred, 14 March, for the opinion of the Collector of North Arcot.

Referred, 3 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 March, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 April, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 May, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 June, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 July, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 August, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 September, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 October, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 November, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 December, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 19 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 20 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 21 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 22 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 23 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 24 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 25 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 26 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 27 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 28 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 29 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 30 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 31 January, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 1 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 2 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 3 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 4 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 5 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 6 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 7 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 8 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 9 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 10 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 11 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 12 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 13 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 14 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 15 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 16 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 17 February, for the opinion of the Inspector General of Police.

Referred, 18 February, for the opinion of the

impossible that they undertake such duty hereafter. The Police is a regularly drilled, well armed, and properly equipped body, one of whose special and peculiar duties it is to act as guards. It appears to me to be a preposterous argument that because there are only a few orderlies attached to each office, and they have to be present there during office hours, therefore they cannot be entrusted with the key at night, or be required to guard by their presence the property secured therein. But this is exactly what Major Cox contends. He does not deny that the Deputy Magistrate's orderlies have for a length of time regularly received charge of the office key and thereby assumed charge of the building. It is admitted that between them they now wholly fail to account for the missing key, but nevertheless Major Cox maintains that they are in no way responsible for the removal of the chest containing the stolen property from the cutcherry. If he is right, then, I confess, I do not see how the safety of our cutcherries, records, and other valuable property is to be ensured hereafter, and I trust that the present case will lead to the Government issuing orders distinctly defining the responsibility of the Police in such matters.

8. The Board will recollect that in my letter, No. 653, dated 2nd November 1877, I reported that a box containing Rupees 42 of Government money had been carried off out of a room in my office in which one of my Police orderlies was sleeping at the time and no clue has yet been discovered as to the offenders; and in that case also Major Cox is of opinion that as the Constable in question was only an office orderly he cannot be regarded as a guard to whom the safety of the building was in any way entrusted.

9. I should add that the Deputy Magistrate's office-room, from which the box, the loss of which I am now reporting, was removed, is only a few yards from the treasury guard-room, and it is matter for surprise (supposing that the Police orderlies and guards had no hand in the robbery) that so large a chest, requiring several men to lift, could have been removed from the cutcherry and broken open on a piece of open waste land close by without attracting the attention of any of the Constables on guard.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

List of Property stolen from the Special Deputy Magistrate's Office on the night of the 28th March 1878.

Property belonging to Calender Case No. 25 of 1878.

		RS.	A.	P.
1.	Full Rupees	451	0	0
	Old Arcot Rupees	2	0	0
	Do. half Rupee, one	0	8	0
	Do. quarter Rupees, two	0	8	0
2.	Silver changes	52	6	0
	Copper coins	1	16	10
3.	Two gold pieces and gold earrings (four pieces) and one gold Dotimka	...		
4.	Five pairs of silver Tayithe	2	0	0
5.	Silver hollow bangle	0	4	0
6 & 7.	Silver rings, two	0	8	0
8.	Silver touching pieces and gold touching pieces	3	0	0
9.	Touchstone, weights and wax ball	1	8	0
10 & 11.	Red purses	...		
12 & 13.	White purses	0	1	0
14.	Iron weight	0	4	0
15.	Iron tool called Patikara	0	1	0
16.	Chisel	...		
17.	Ledger paper book	...		
18.	A purse	...		
19.	Ragged cloths	0	4	0
20.	Silver hollow bangles	...		
	Total	515	14	10

Property belonging to Calender Case No. 4 of 1878.

		RS.	A.	P.
1.	A ruby and a pearl	4	4	0
2.	Four pieces of false diamonds and a green stone and a pearl	0	12	0
3.	Nine copper coins of one and-a-half pies each and a small Chinaware weight	0	1	1½
4.	A purse containing 7 Rupees, one Arcot Rupee, one Pondicherry Rupee, and an old silver one-Anna piece	9	1	0
5.	Cash	101	8	0
6.	One Arcot Rupee, one Pondicherry Rupee, and an old silver one-Anna coin	2	1	0
7.	Two pairs of gold Bugadalu, one of which is hung with pearls	22	0	0
8.	A pair of gold Kammalu	14	0	0
9.	A gold necklace (Teega)	14	0	0
10.	A blue stone attached to gold	7	0	0
11.	A gold ring with Umamaleiswara pagoda fixed in it	13	0	0
12.	A gold star pagoda	4	0	0
13.	Cash	21	0	0
14.	A pale blue and a dark blue stones	1	0	3
15.	A pair of bell-metal Talam, a musical instrument	0	4	0
16.	Cash	120	0	0
17.	Two-Anna pieces, thirty-nine, and one old quarter Rupee piece	5	2	0
18.	A pair of gold Kammalu	8	0	0
19.	Do. Bugadalu	6	0	0
20.	Do. Kammalu	10	0	0
21.	A gold Venkateswaraswami pagoda, a ruby, eleven pearls and a touchstone	5	0	0
22.	Cash	71	2	0
23.	Cash (compensation amount)	40	1	6
	Total	479	4	10½

CHITTOOR,
30th March 1878.

(Signed) KISTNASAMI IYER,
Deputy Magistrate.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From KISTNASAMI IYER, Deputy Magistrate on Special Duty, to W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., District Magistrate, North Arcot, dated Chittoor, 29th March 1878, No. 38.

I REGRET to have to report to you that last night my office-room at the Graemepett Cutcherry was broken open and the Treasury-box stolen. The box contained cash, jewels, &c., to the value of about 1,000 Rupees belonging to magisterial cases. The box *alone* was this morning found in a broken state in the open ground not far off from the Cutcherry compound.

2. With the assistance of the Taluq Magistrate Chukravarthy Nynar, I have this morning made prompt local inquiries whereby suspicion goes against the two Police Constables, Muthusamy No. 75 and Subbaroyalu No. 988, who form the Police guard of my office and who ought to have watched it last night. The office-room key, which was admittedly in the possession of one of them, Muthusamy, is not forthcoming, and he has not satisfactorily accounted for its non-production. He says the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, took it from his wife in his absence last night, while Subbaroyalu denies the said allegation.

3. I shall report more fully by to-morrow's post.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Magistrate.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From the same Officer, dated Chittoor, 30th March 1878, No. 39.

IN continuation of my letter of yesterday's date, No. 38, I have the honor to report that yesterday morning at about 6-30 A. M. when my Office Masaljee, Munian, went to the office to sweep and clean it, he found the northern door of the room open, and the padlock thereof lying on the ground outside the door unbroken. On entering into the room he found the Treasury box missing. He at once reported the matter to my Head Clerk Regunada Row, who lost no time in bringing me the news, which I received at about 8 A. M.

2. Having immediately sent information of the occurrence to the Station-house Officer and the Police Inspector of Chittoor as well as to the Superintendent of Police in a demi-official letter, I at once proceeded to the spot accompanied by the Taluq Magistrate, Chukravarthy Nynar. On arrival there, information was received that the box in question was lying in a broken state in the open ground outside, and not far off from the Cutcherry compound. Accordingly the broken box was found there emptied of all its contents, consisting of cash, jewels, &c., to the aggregate value of about Rupees 1,000, they being stolen property produced before me in connection with magisterial cases pending inquiry and appeal. A list of the property lost is enclosed. The box in question measures $2\frac{1}{2} \times 1\frac{3}{4} \times 1\frac{1}{2}$ feet; and it could not have been removed by less than two men.

3. From my inquiry the following facts are elicited :—

Constables Muthusamy No. 75, and Subbaroyalu No. 988, form the Police guard of my office. They, more especially Muthusamy, knew that the box contained the said property. They attend office during the day, and one of them guards the office at nights by turns. Every evening lamp-oil is given them to keep light in the office at nights. Each of them now charges the other with the night duty of the night in question. Constable Muthusamy, however, admits that he took charge of the office, including the Treasury box, &c., in the evening, and that he shut the door thereof, locked it up and went home with the key; he adds that, during his absence from his house, his wife gave the key in question to the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, in the presence of one Syed Fareed, Head Constable, alleging it was Subbaroyalu's duty to guard the office on the night in question. Muthusamy has two wives, one of whom, though she was with the other the whole night, knows nothing in the matter of the key in question. The statement given by the other wife is unsatisfactory, and in material points contradictory with her husband's and the said Syed Fareed's depositions. The said Constable Muthusamy was [illegible] by two witnesses, and he was also *of my office-room after 10 P. M. on the same night.* This is not admitted by Muthusamy, neither he nor the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, admits having at all been to the office on night duty. The said Constable Kondappa, however, first told the Husur Treasury Guard Head Constable, Sheik Husein, that the man he saw as above was *Subbaroyalu.* Before me, however, having seen the men, he swears it was *Muthusamy* and *not* Subbaroyalu that he saw as above, and explains that he did not know the names of those Constables correctly and therefore he gave the wrong name to the Head Constable. Thus against the Constable Muthusamy there is his own admission that he took charge of the office on the evening of the 28th, and that he took home the key thereof, as well as the evidence of two witnesses that he was seen, at about 8 P. M., at the arrack shop at Graemspett, and that of the Beat Constable that he was seen and spoken to by him at the very door (the door being open) of my office-room after 10 P. M. on the night in question. It also appears from the evidence of my Office Masaljee, Munian, that the night duty of the night in question must have been Muthusamy's. Against the other Constable, Subbaroyalu, there is only the unsatisfactory and unreliable evidence of one of Muthusamy's wives to the effect that the key of the office-room was delivered to him, Subbaroyalu.

4. From the above, you will see that there are grounds for a very strong suspicion against the Police Constables (especially Muthusamy) who formed the guard of my office, and it is a remarkable fact that the key of the office-room, which Muthusamy admits having taken with him, has not as yet been produced. You are aware that my office is held in one of the rooms attached to the Collector's Cutcherry at Graemspett, and close to it are the Husur Treasury-room and the Sub-Jail buildings, guarded by a strong Police party.

5. The Police Inspector, Varadachariar, who attended a portion of my inquiry, has taken up the case in his own hands, and I have requested him and the Taluq Magistrate, Chukravarthy Nynar, who was present with me throughout the whole of my inquiry from 9 A. M. to 4. P. M. yesterday, to try their best to have this important case detected as early as possible. I beg to add that I have again addressed the Superintendent of Police on the subject, and request that you will be good enough to write to him on the matter.

6. Copies of depositions taken by me are herewith forwarded.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE.
Magistrate.

1553/10

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. With reference to paragraph 6 *et seq.* it seems desirable that the responsibilities of Police Orderlies attached to Magistrates' Courts should be defined.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to the Collector of North Arcot.

Exd. W. J. Lewis and W. H. French.

1553/12

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 3283.

1553/11

From Board of Revenue

Dated 11th July ——— 1878.

FOR ORDERS.

I submit for the Magistrate's & the responsibility of the Police of such a Surprise at the Contents of this letter to entertain not direct-ed immediate removal from the Service of the Constables suspected with but too much reason, of not already done the Magistrate-

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

1878.

Proceedings, 11th JULY 1878, No. 1283.

Copy submitted.

Secretary.

Read and recorded.

Dated 20th July 1878.

Secretary.

JULY.
No. 1283.

1553
12

No. 3255

FOR ORDERS.

C29-7-75 Rc 29-7-75
R 31-7-75
Rc 1-8-75
R 5-8-75

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 3755

From Inspector General of Police
Dated 22 August 1875.

FOR ORDERS.

Also the fracture of the Dept^t in Camp Kadiri does windows unsecured at night will be noticed

I cannot in thinking that the D^t Mag: was to blame for not taking ordinary precaution for the security of the property. I also think that it is altogether unreasonable to

Inform has failed to detect the Offenders who broke the Jail but has been & I think is now in possession of the property with the Dept Mag for failing to take ordinary precaution

H/S
By Insp^r Genl

1553
14

Rica ordres the Workmen
to work but 8 houres
day in a
day in any
English Ft & Russian
is found on the
Pain all night.

2. Rica order
that this is to
Lieut Pettindorf

No 1538

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 24th September
1875

FOR ORDERS.

Alleged Police Cases
in Guindy Cantonments

C10-9-75
R16-9-75

Read Proceedings
of Bd Rev. dated 16th
July 1875 No 1323 submit-
ting letter from Collector
of North Arcot reporting
the theft of property relating
to Criminal cases undertried
on the file of the Special
Dy: Magistrate and stating
that the responsibilities of
Police Orderlies attached to
Magistrates' Courts should
be defined.

Read also letter from
the Ag: Insp.r Genl of Police
No 722 Augst 75 No 3430 -
offering remarks regarding
the case of theft referred to
in the above Proceedings

—

On a perusal of
these papers, the Govt are
of opinion that the Special

Deputy

Deputy Magistrate of
the North Arcot District,
Kistnasami Iyer, has a
claim for omitting to
take ordinary pre-
cautions for the security
of the property in ques-
tion. They desire
that the Collector's
special attention be
directed to the remarks
of the Deputy Inspector
General of Police of the
Central Range, as to the
practice of the district
in leaving Kacheri in-
doors and windows
unsecured at night.

2 Adverting to paras
6 et seq. of the Collector's
letter

letter, the Govt are
also of opinion that
it is altogether un-
reasonable that Police
Subordinates, who have
been on duty all day
in a Magistrates Court,
should remain on guard
at or on the office all
night. The Police
orders, referred to by
the Insp.r Genl: of
Police, show that this is
no part of their duty.

1553/16

14 To the Board of Revenue and copy
6 the Inspector General of Police
5 the Judicial Dept

No 4

No 962

N. Arcot
District Police Office
Chittoor, 13th August 78.

From,

The Superintendent of Police
N. Arcot

To,

The Asstt Inspector Genl of Police
Madras

Sir,

Through Dy Inspr Genl
CR

I have the honour to return copy of Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 11th July 1878 No 1923 and to report with reference to your Endorsement No 3510 dated 9th instant that none of the property stolen from the Special Deputy Magistrate's Office Room in the Collector's Cutcherry at Cudempett on the night of 28th March last has yet been recovered.

Constable Mootoosamy No 75 who was charged with the theft and against whom there was a strong suspicion and a small amount of circumstantial evidence has been discharged by the Taluq Magistrate. I have asked for a Copy of his judgement.

The key has never been found. Constable Mootoosamy

Mallooswamy admits having had it in the evening of 28th March. His allegation that Constable Soobrayloo came and took it from his wife is of doubtful truth.

I am not so certain as the District Magistrate is, that this key was used to open the locks of the door of the office room. A key probably had been used but there are few locks that an expert cannot pick. The dispute about the possession of the key although it excites suspicion is not incompatible with the innocence of both the Constables so far as the theft is concerned. He who should confess possession of it would admit that he had been ordered to sleep at the Cutcherry and that he had disobeyed that order and it is not unnatural that the possession should be denied.

In Para 9 of his letter No. 106 dated 15th April 1878 to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue the Collector speaks of the chest which was removed from the Cutcherry as being so large as to require several men to lift it. I think that 2 men could have carried it with ease. The box is described in my letter to the Inspector

Inspector General of Police No. 335 dated 22nd April 1878 of which I attach a copy for reference. 15/4/78

As regards my opinion about the legitimate duties of Magistrates Orderlies which the Collector thinks are unsound I have only to say that I have been guided by Departmental orders on the subject.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt Servant

Major
Superintendent of Police

DB I am of opinion that every facility was given for the consumption of this theft owing to the very lax system followed & allowed by the higher officials to the Collectors Cutcherry all Chittoor.

Sometime in April & after this case occurred I went round the Cutcherry buildings early one morning & found that no attempt had been made to secure the outer doors & windows. On trying several of the outer doors & windows I found I could easily push them open with my hands & some of them were kept closed by simply placing small stones against the bottom of the doors & windows. I brought this to the notice of the treasury Dy Collector & told him that if the doors & windows were kept properly fastened I could always be sure of the whole of the Cutcherry buildings properly guarded.

I fully concur with Mr. Cox in thinking that Magistrates orderlies are not detailed for the purpose of mounting guard over boxes

1553
19

containing money & other valuable property & in the present case I believe the Dy Magistrate was bound by the rules in force to place the box that was carried off, inside the Treasury for safe custody during the night. If he had done this & even if he had ordered his Office Room to be locked & sealed when he closed his Office for the day & had kept the key himself or given it in charge to his Head Clerk, I think the room would have been properly guarded & this case would not have occurred.

Two Constables were furnished to the Dy Magistrate as orderlies & as these men were fully employed during the day, it surely cannot be expected that they should also mount guard during the night. It is clear the Dy Magistrate expected this & left the room to the Constables & other under subordinates attached to his Office, to open & shut as they pleased & I certainly think he ought to be held responsible for not taking any ordinary precautions for the safe custody of such valuable property.

Before leaving Chilton I framed fresh rules for the Police guard over the Treasury & Collectors office, copy of which I enclose. If ordinary precaution is now taken to keep the outer doors & windows of the Office securely fastened I think the whole building can be securely guarded by the present Police guard.

Every effort has been made to discover the perpetrators of this theft & extra men have been employed in the case, but I regret to say that no clue has been obtained likely to lead to the conviction of the parties concerned.

Camp Gooty
17th Augt 78

J Hicks
Ag D. I. G.
Central Range

No. 3730

Office of the Inspector General of Police,
Ootacamund, 22d August 1878.

1552
20

From

ag.
The Inspector General of Police,

To

The Chief Secretary to Government of
Fort St. George.
Ootacamund.

Sir,

Enclosure One

x returned herewith.

With reference to your x Endorsement
№ 1384 on the accompanying Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue, I have the honor
to forward the latest report from the
Superintendent of Police North Arcot,
regarding the case in question, with
further remarks thereon by Major Hicks
the Deputy Inspector General of the Range.

2 It appears to me to have been
an occurrence which might have been
avoided

1878 Sept 4
Enclosure

In a letter from the
Acting Inspector General
of Police dated Ootacamund
2nd August 1878 № 3730.

From
The Superintendent of Police
North Arcot

Dated 13th August 1878 № 762

Regarding certain case
of theft in the North Arcot
District.

1 Petn 2 Sept/78

avoided if the Special Deputy Magistrate had placed the Box containing the valuables under the Treasury Guard instead of entrusting it to his orderly.

3. The duties of such orderlies are laid down so far as is possible, with the full sanction of Government, in Police Orders nos 634 to 640 of the Departmental Code. It was never intended that these men should be turned into "Guards," to do duty day and night, and it is out of the question to expect work of that kind from their very limited numbers.

4. The Departmental Orders Nos 311 to 318 of the Code, embody in ample detail the instructions which have from time to time issued on the subject of depositing "Cash Chests" in Police Custody, and these virtually have more force at

at the Head Quarter station of a District, where there is a regular Treasury or other guard, into whose keeping all such articles should be formally given when not required in Court, by the magisterial Officer conducting an investigation.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obed.t Servant,

Ag. Inspector General of Police.

Revenue 1878 Sept
No 3755.

June 1878. Dept.

(Property)

From

The Inspector General

of Police,

To

The Chief Secretary

to Government,

of Fort St. George.

Dated 22nd August 1878. Cotacamund

No 230

Offers remarks regarding certain case of theft in the North Arcot District — submitting the latest report from the Superintendent

For Collector.

No 1533

Forwarded to the Revenue Department with reference to the endorsement by the Inspector General of Police dated 24th August 1878.

By Command of
H. E. the Governor in Council
C. Chief Secretary.

No 277

E 19-9-78
R 16-9-78