

(1) Number of pages 14
(2) Date of repair 24.12.85
(3) Initials of the Referecer lwg

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	520	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	7-5-1880	197.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

520
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

7th May 1880, No. 520.

READ THE FOLLOWING PAPERS :—

No. 42. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 19th February 1879, Miscellaneous No. 1,741.

Read the following :—

Duplicate copy of endorsement on Petition of D. PATTABHI RAMAYYA, Vernacular Head Clerk of the Kistna Collector's Office, referred to in Board's Official Memorandum, No. 601, dated 9th May 1879.

SUBMITTED for the favorable consideration of the Board of Revenue and Government.

2. In awarding punishment to the several officials, I believe the Board and Government were not aware that D. Pattabhi Ramayya has already suffered more severely than any of the others by deprivation of the posts of Tahsildar of the Nandigama Taluk and Deputy Tahsildar of the Nuzvid Division and degradation to that of Revenue Head Clerk.

3. In a pecuniary point of view alone he has been very heavily mulcted already.

4. I shall be glad, therefore, if the Board can recommend the remission of the further penalty of three months' suspension from his present post.

MASULIPATAM,
21st January 1879.

(Signed) J. G. HORSFALL,
Collector.

THE Collector will inform the petitioner that the Board see no reason to reopen his case.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 43. Petition from D. PATTABHI RAMAYYA, Vernacular Head Clerk in the Collector's Office, Kistna District, to His Grace the Most Noble the Governor in Council, Madras, dated Masulipatam, 4th February 1880.

ABSTRACT.—Restoration to the post of Tahsildar.

No. 44. ORDER THEREON, 7th May 1880, No. 520.

Miscellaneous.

THE Government gather from this petition and the Collector's letter to the Board, recommending the punishment of suspension being remitted in petitioner's case, that D. Pattabhi Ramayya had been degraded to the post of Vernacular Head Clerk in the Collector's Office to which the Board thought he had merely reverted* as his permanent appointment as punishment for want of care when acting Tahsildar.

* Paragraph 11 of Board's Proceedings in G.O., 12th October 1878, No. 1,656.

2. If this be so, the Board's disposal of the case might properly be reconsidered by them, but without encouraging petitioner in any expectations of again rising to the post of Tahsildar, for which Mr. Leman considered him "utterly unfit."

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue, with Petition.

Exd. W. H. French.

80 Copies.

Rev. Dep. Secy

20/3

Mis. no 1741

(Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
27th 19th Feb 1880)

Recd the following:—

Duplicate Copy of endorsement on Petition of D. Pattabhi Ramayya, 1st clerk of the Krishna Collector's Office, referred to in 1880 off. memo: no. 600 of 9th May 79.

Submitted for the favourable consideration of the Board of Revenue and Government.

2. In awarding punishment to the several officials I believe the Board and Govt. were not aware that D. Pattabhi Ramayya has already suffered more severely than any of the others by deprivation of the posts of Tahsildar of the Nandigama Taluk, and Deputy Tahsildar of the River Division & degradation to that of Revenue Head clerk.

3. In a pecuniary point of view alone he has been very heavily mulcted already.

4. I think he feels therefore if the Board can recommend the remission of the further penalty of three months' suspension from his present post -
Krishna District, Collector's Office
at Masulipatam, 21st Jan 1880
Sd/- J. H. Atkinson
Collector

(True copy)

Krishna Collectorate
Masulipatam } Sd/- J. H. Atkinson
24th May 1880 } Asst. Secy to Collector.

The collector will inform the Petr. that the Board see no reason to reopen his case.

(True copy & forward)

To The Collr. Krishna Dist.

(True copy)

Sd/- L. B. Campbell
Acting Sub-Secretary

L. B. Jeff
Acting Sub-Secretary

Govt. of (1880) 21st Feb 1880.

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated May 7th.

Printed 12th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 7th May 1880, No. 520.

MAY.
Nos. 42-44.

D. Pattabhi Ramayya—Vernacular Head Clerk, Collector's Office, Krishna District.—Remarks with reference to the petition and the Collector's letter to the Board of Revenue, that the Board's disposal of the case of — might properly be reconsidered by them, but without encouraging petitioner in any expectations of again rising to the post of Tahsildar, for which Mr. Leven considered him "entirely unfit."

most important time of business in the year and that he used his best endeavours in discharging his duties with care and attention; that he also petitioned the Board on 4th January 1878, but it does not seem to have been taken into consideration by them when passing their decision in the matter, & that the petition has not been returned to him with an endorsement; that on the receipt of orders of Govt directing his suspension he made a representation to the Collectors, who forwarded it for the favourable consideration of the Board of Revenue, but they declined to reverse the case; that it will be seen that of the three persons, the permanent Subaltern, the Assistant, & the petitioner, who

Prps in p. 1206-
 P. No. 1856 the
 Board talked,
 Pet. having
 "reverted to the
 post of Vernacular
 N. clerk in the
 Collec. office" & as
 though it had
 been his post-
 before he acted
 as Subaltern, in
 further int- from
 Mr. J. J. J. J. J.
 it will appear that
 Pet. had been acting
 (apparently) as
 Subaltern in the
 Nandigarwa taluk
 should permanently
 (apparently) the
 post of Deputy
 Subaltern of
 Nandigarwa and
 had been
 degraded to the
 post of Vernacular

were alleged to have been guilty of carelessness, he has been subjected to the habeas the punishment which the other two were under degraded term is not clear & the action, if that of the collector, was irregular but as there was degradation his punishment was greater than that of the Board. At the same time in consideration of his suspension he was not required to pay up and portion of the money embuzzled thro: his carelessness.

Prays, therefore, that Govt may cancel Petition & remove him from his post, order the payment of the arrears of his salary and restore him to the post of Subaltern from which he has been removed.

The penalty is severely sufficient in amount

Submitted that while it is unavoidable to grant the specific request preferred it will not be unreasonable to instruct the Collector and the Board that if Petition can be restored to the grade of Subaltern no objection would be raised by Govt

21/10/76: 1511
 12-10-78: 1516
 7-12-78: 2995
 28-11-78: 1732
 27-2-79: 290

Revenue, 1880, 2/2,
 Petition to the Department.

11/13/1880

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Paper No. 30, 3 or 1-550.

From D. Pattabhi Ramayya

Occupation: Treasurer and clerk
in the Civil office

Village

Taluk: Masulipatam

District: Madras

Dated: 10th February 1880

Received: 12th February 1880

By: [Signature]

ABSTRACT.

Restoration to the
 post of Sahibdar

and

I did not myself have
 been disposed to open the case.

The petition in question
 has been received from
 the petition of Tahsildar
 for which he has been
 declared totally unfit.
 He has not been in
 consideration of his
 suspension (specifically)
 has called on to catch
 up the accounts of the
 office of the Tahsildar
 clerk is more than one
 day done - He has not
 applied to his being allowed
 to go to Madras to
 see the accounts of the
 Tahsildar place - I did not myself have
 been disposed to open the case.

I have not myself have
 been disposed to open the case.

Recd. Petition
 30/2/80.

— also Board
 order: B. No. 16th July
 1880: 1740.

The Board
 has been referred
 to the Board,
 recommending
 that the petitioner
 be suspended being
 admitted in the
 case, that
 Pattabhi Ramayya
 had been referred
 to the Board
 and clerk in the
 collector's office to
 which the Board
 directed he had
 already been referred.

I have not myself have
 been disposed to open the case.

As his person
= great a spirit
as prominent
for want of care
when doing
Salaridar.

~~1. His disapproval
the Petitioners
and that his
confidence~~

~~2. They would
therefore support
the Board the
second edition of
the case.~~
last edition of the
expectations of a
dist. the part of
Salaridar for
which he is
considered him
"utterly unfit"

If this be so, the
highest of the case
his right property be
determined by them
but without

Yours
Lal
18/11/13
petitioners

L.O.
D. Petalio Ramo
case

PRINT
17-8-80

Quinn's Report
Cecilia's & William's
J. 1880

C. S. 5. 26
114 (200)