

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 30
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 8/88
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 27.9-88

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

வெளியு துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	<u>101</u>	அச்சகம் பலவகை
247-248		
நாள் :	<u>15-1-1879</u>	198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

15th January 1879, No. 101.

Famine Relief.

Read the following paper:—

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

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

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

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Memorandum on the Puvatti Ghât Robbery.

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

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

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

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

SALEM,
2nd January 1879.

(Signed) C. T. LONGLEY,
Collector.

No. 213.

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

Miscellaneous.

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

(True Extract.)

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

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

E. J. W. H. French.

S. R. 5461

Salim Collector's office
Salim 8th January 1877

From
The Collector
of Salim

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Madras.

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

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

Received
G.O. of 1877
REVENUE.

THE COLLECTOR OF SALIM.

Salim 8th January 1877.

JANUARY
1877.

NO. 2373.

NO. 2373.

For the Collector of Salim, Madras.
I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours obedient servant,
The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
Madras.

101
- 9

little probability of any of the missing
money being recovered.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant

By Sub-Collector
In charge.

Memo on the Pawnee Stick Robbery.

G. O. No 2373 of the 17th October 1877 called for further information on the Pawnee stick Robbery case, and the further investigation therein called for has elicited the following facts:-

(1) That on the 28th July 1877, the Royanottah Police Inspector Socha Ross wrote to the Washington Tahiltah, Pa. Calamada Pillay, stating that the Village Munniffe of his Circle were not in funds, and that they could not be responsible for the safety of

Jan 23 78 911-1007

To Secy of War

Wm. D. Lusk

In Charge

To Mr. A. J. G. 11/17/77

The Secretary to

Revenue Dept

Albany

Oct 8th } Albany 1877

5461

Submitting Report

on the Pawnee Stick

Robbery case by

Wm. D. Lusk

Nov 24 77

of the people without funds,
that the Inspector Sooka Row
had sent an incident on the
25th July which had not yet
to the 28th been completed with,
and begging that the Christ-
mas of the Taluk might be
authorized to make him (In-
spector) an advance. On this
Gadud the Tahildar enclosed
that "the money should be
sent a sufficient time before
the festival". Still the money
was not received, and on the
31st July the Inspector Sooka
Row appears to have written
a 2nd Gadud, and dispatched
it to the Taluk by one Royappa,
his (Inspector's) own servant
(this is important), and a
boy named Venkatar.

Sp

An periph of this second
Gadud, dated 31st, the Tahildar
appears to have written a
Gadud ordering the Christadar
to pay Rs 350 to Royappa on
account of Relief Inspector
Sooka Row. This money was
given to Royappa about 3 P.M.
on the 1st August. Royappa
stopped at Thiruvangur that
night (the 1st), and started
for Royasol, 17 miles distant,
on the morning of the 2nd
August, and appeared before the
Police Inspector at the Royasol
Station at 8 A.M. on that
day (2nd), stating he had been
robbed of certain moneys
entrusted to him by the Taluk
authorities at Thiruvangur.
On

On the 20th of August the
Inspector of Police reported to
the Joint Magistrate the facts
of the Robbery as told him
by Rayappa: Viz. that
Rayappa left Madhavpur on the
morning of the 2nd August
accompanied by Taly Venkataray
that at Kodagur another person
joined them (a stranger apparently)
one Bullam, that at about
7 1/2 AM the three were attacked
about 4 miles from Rayacotta
on the Pambly Road, that
the attacking party consisted
of about 20 persons, who
beat the stranger Bullam
severely on his head and
Rayappa also, and snatched
the bag of money, which
the

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

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

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

The Police Inspector, inferred that no robbery took place, but that the money was made away with by the connivance of all three, Royappa, Venkatan and Kullam. So much for the Inspector's report of the matter to the Joint Magistrate. The further enquiry has elicited the fact that Kullam was found with his head bleeding on the morning of the 2nd when the Village Headman of Royappa, the Police Inspector, the Relief Inspector Suba Rao and Royappa all went to the spot where the robbery was alleged to have taken place, and that blood was found

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

101
and that the Rs. 350 ¹⁰¹ was
carried off by these robbers—
but that the money was
stolen, that Kullam received a
crack on the head, sufficient
perhaps to cause blood to
flow, which blood was shown
on the ground to the Police
Inspectors and the Village Man-
siff of Royastan and P.
Philip Inspectors took place
soon after the alleged robbery
took place - and that this
blow was dealt by Royappa
or Vincentians themselves in
order to have something to
show by way of ill-treatment
I think very likely - and
this is the version of
the story, I am prepared

to accept.

Now as to the question of responsibility for the loss of the money, I think it is undoubtedly with Looku Rood, the Relief Inspector. The money was sent by his own man Rayappan, accompanied by a Loh. The late Joint Magistrate, Mr. Wilkinson, considered that the Sahibdar Probala. Munda Pillay should be held responsible, because no mention of Rayappan's name was made in the Gadnet of the 31st; but unfortunately this Gadnet is not forthcoming, and on this

101
10

It is

the Sahibdar's petition for his defence, viz: that the money was sent by Relief Inspector Looku Rood own man Rayappan, and that the Sahibdar had nothing whatever to do with sending Rayappan. This being so, and repeating, as I do, the story of the robbery by 20 men, I consider that the late Relief Inspector Looku Rood Rayappan and Thakuram must be held responsible generally for the money. I firmly believe that it was a plan among them to get the money and

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

2.1.79 1/2 by C. J. Langley
Salem 3 C. J.

1
Lime cages,

Microscopic.

By: Subcollector

Salem }
8th January 1899 }

C. J.

10/11

101
No. 290.

Letter from the Asy. Sub-collector
in charge of Salem
dated 8th January 1879

The facts of the
case are these:

In July last a Relief
Inspector sent a Beggar
working in the district of Salem,
was in need of money.
and applied to the Sub-
collector who passed a
not receipt order.
On the 23rd July Sub-collector
again applied to the
Talukdar by a letter
sent by his own servant
Ragappa in which
he desired that the
money might be paid
to the latter. The
Talukdar thereupon
ordered the Sherikadar
to pay the money
which was done on the
1st August at 2 p.m.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

By Sub-collector in charge
to the Secretary to Government
Revenue Dept. No. 5461
dated 8th January 1879

Recd 15th Jan 1879
Encl in 13 No 247

No 290/79

Memo and the
Dumatti Photostation

to be taken to Royapett
to Relief Inspector
Aruba Row. On
the morning of the 2nd
Royappen appeared
before the ^{at Royapett} Police Inspector
stated a tale of robbery
which the Inspector
believed false. Mr.
Wilkinson, however,
did not hold this opinion
and thought further
surgery had brought
out that one of Royappen's
two companions
was hit on the head
it seems probable
that this was done by
Royappen with a
view to creating
evidence.

Mr Longley's view
is that the case was
false - in this & the
present Joint Mag.
Aruba agrees.

Rejecting then the
tale of robbery, the
question is who is to
make good the money,
whether the Collector,
the Tahildar,
the Sheristadar
or Laobahaw the Inspector.
As the Sheristadar paid
the money under the
express order of his
immediate superior,
it is submitted that
he is cleared.

In his letter record -
40.17.18.1871 No 2373
rd in the ~~file~~

Mr. Wilkinson observes,
with regard to permission
to Relief Inspector,
"It is impossible for the
Police to be
spared as their services
are required in the Home
machine and we
are not permitted to
entertain any additional
settlement."

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

the purpose, it is
respectfully sub-
mitted that they
cannot be justly
held responsible for
loss, but the Collector
must be, for the
words used show
that he need must
have been brought
to his notice.
If the subordinate
officials are held
held responsible, it
is submitted that
the Sahibdar cannot.
No indenting office,
and by the practice
of the District, it
was Sooka Row's
duty to have him-
self come for the
money: in fact

Any other arrangement
would be quite in-
convenient, under
the Collector's orders,
considering the large
numbers of Relief
Inspectors and the
limited & over worked
Salary Establishments,
by sending his own
servant and asking
that the money should
be paid him & make
himself responsible - this is
the general official
understanding.
In law the pay-
ment to Rozapen
was a payment to
Sacharow.
Sacharow may
or may not, have
got some of the money
there -

The answer is
simple -
I know in
myself

What day
H. S. 79

there is nothing to
show he did. If
he is to be held re-
sponsible, it is not
admitted that the Acting
Collector should be
directed to procure
the money from him
by all legal means.
It would be well
spent in making it
as unpleasant as
possible for him.
The Acting Collector
states that he is a
more man of straw.

H. S. 79

Peace Dept

Receipt

For the

No 101 Nov 24-28
P.O.

Highway the Civil. Service
late received
that the Highway Inspector Laska
New is responsible for the loss
money lost and order to
direct that the H. P. O.
take all legal means to recover
the money from him without
delay -

15.1.79 15 Jan 1879

4 Collectors of Salaries
13 bands of Receipts
4 Field Dept
5 Accounts General
6

80

see fo. on Ch. 6133 1/2

B. Nos 247 & 248

C. 14/1/79 R. 15/1/79