Revenue (1892) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3658
No 535

DATED 15th August 92

[Despatch Abstract.]

Referring for the opinion of the Hon'ble the Advocate General the record of enquiry connected with
Dr P. Ramachandra Rao

Confidential No 73

18 .

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

To

The Secy. to Govt. M.D.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O	No	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Proceedings, dated 16 July 1892

No. 4358 Mis. Routine. Enclosures.

Subject.

Submitting to Govt. with remarks papers relating to the charges brought against Mr. Rajwadhandra Row, Ag. Sub Collector of Madura.

List of papers submitted to Government with Board's Proceedings dated 16 July 1892 Mevile 4350 A. (Confd)

Transmitted with Encls. 8 to Pub. 29 July.

1. Letter from the Collector of Madura dated 7 June 1892 No 76 with Enclosures as per list.

Encls 86 to Pub. 29 July.

2. Endorsement of the Collector of Madura dated 7 June 1892 No 77 on letter from the acting Sub Collector on leave dated 6 June 1892 No 1

Encls. 87 to 29 July.

3. Mr Michie Smith's Memo dated 21 June 1892.

Encls 88 to 29 July

4. Board's Proceedings dated 22 April 1892 No 20 to (in original)

Encls 89 to 29 July

5. Mr Ramachandra Rao's Do dated 4 January 1892

Encls 90 to 29 July

6. ——— Do ——— letter dated 19 January 1892 No 37.

Encl 91 to 29 July

7. ——— Do ——— dated 3 January 1892

Encl 92 to 29 July

8. ——— Do ——— dated 5 January 1892

Endorsement Encls 93 to 29 July

9. Letter from the Collector of Madura to the Board of Revenue dated 26 December 1891 No 53 with enclosures Encls 1, 2, 9, 10, 17

10. Two photos.

Encl 94 to 29 July

List of enclosures to letter from the Collector of Madura dated 7th June 1892 Confidential No 76.

I. Collector's remarks on the first charge relating to the umbrella; with list of enclosures and enclosures A to M.

Enclosure 9 to 2969 Pub.
** Enclos 10 to 2969 Pub. A to M.
Enclo 11 to do A. Bill for Rs 37-2-
Enclo 12 to do A 1. Anonymous petition dated 1 December 1891.

Enclo 13 to 2969 A 2. } File of letters from Mr Gibson
A 3. }

Encl. 14 to 2969 A 4. Chitta of the Ammayanaya-Kanur Zemindary from 22 October 1889 to 31 May 1890.

Enclo 15 to 2969 B. Statement of the Zemindar of Ammayanayakanur

— 16. to do b. Do — Naraina Maistry

— 17 — do D. Note of Sub Collector dated 16 December 1891.

— 18 — Ditto E. Dindigul Tahsildar's letter dated 21 December 1891.

— 19 — Ditto F. Extract from Mr Wynne's letter $\frac{53}{26-12-91}$

20 — Ditto G. Mr Ramachandra Rao's Statement dated 22 March 1892

21. Ditto H. Do — dated 26 March 1892

J. V. S. Ramaswami Aiyar's Statement dated 26th & 28th March 1892. — Encl 22 to 2969

K. Doraiswami Sevvaigarai's letter - also K. series for the defence. — Encl 23 to 2969

L. Collector's letter to the Ammayyanayakkanur Zemindar dated 21 May 1892. — Encls 24 to 2969

L1. The Zemindar's reply dated 21 May 1892. — Encls 25 to 2969

M. Books of bills &c. — Encls 26 to 2969.

Encls 27 to 29 Part II. Collector's remarks on the 2nd Charge with list of enclosures and enclosures 1 – 34 except 6, 7 & 8.

29 – 6 do (1) Anonymous petition dated 14-12-91

30 – do (2) Ayan Chitta of the Zemindar from 1st June 1890 to 21 March 1891

31. do (3) Private Chitta of the Zemindar of Ammayyanayakkanur from 1st March 1890 to 31 December 1891.

32 – do (4) Extracts from the Zemindar's Chittas taken by the Amzus Sheristadar with translation.

33 – do (5). Extract from Mr Wynne's report 53 16-12-91

34 – do (9). Sub Court clerk Subramania Aiyar's Deposition dated 26 March 1892

35 do (10) Printed Invitation Card dated 10 July 1890.

36 do (11) Letter from Jeya Rao dated 2 July 1890 to Ranga Rao, Manager, Ammayyanayakkanur Zemindary.

37. do (12) Do — do — dated 28 July 1890.

38 Encls (13) Letter without signature dated 1 August 1890.

39 Encls (14) File of papers in Jeya Rao's hand-writing.

40 Encls (15) Extract from Railway Registers for July and August 1890.

41. Encls (16) Do — from Railway Ticket Issue Registers for August 1890 of Ammayyanayakkanur.

(17) Extract from Railway Ticket Issue Register of Cuddalore New Town on 11 August 1890 — 42 6 ds

(18) —— Do —— do —— on 10 August 1890. 43 6 ds

(19) District Traffic Superintendent's letter to Mr Gibson dated 7 April 1892. — 44 6 ds

(20) Office Copy of Sub Collector's Travelling Allowance bill for July 1890. — 45 6 ds

(21) Ramu Aiyar's petition against Ramachandra Rao — 46 6 ds

(22) File of Vouchers. — 47 6 ds

(23) Vakil Subramania Aiyar's application for the return of the Zemindari Chitta. — 48 6 ds

(24) The Zemindari's arzi for the return of Chittas — 49 6 ds

(25) Do —— do —— — 50 6 ds

(26) Sundararaja Aiyangar's petition dated 23 December 1891. — 51 6 ds

(27) —— Do —— do —— 30 December 1891 — 52 6 ds

(28) Copy of District Magistrate's order dated 8 January 1892. — 53 6 ds

(29) Sundararaja Aiyangar's petition dated 21 May 1892. — 54 6 ds

(30) Copy of District Magistrate's order dated 23 May 1892 on above. — 55 6 ds

(31) Statement of Shunmugam Pillay dated 7 November 1891. — 56 6 ds

(32) Anonymous petition dated 10 December 1891 to the Sub Collector against Velusami Servai, Taluk Sheristadar — 57 6 ds

(33) —— Do —— against Velusami Servai — 58 6 ds

(34) Original 4 pages in the Zemindari private Chitta. — 59 6 ds

Index No 1 of 1892 III

List of depositions of

(1) Narainu Maistry ✗

62 —— (2) Bommachi Naik ✗

63 —— (3) Muthu Maniagaran

64 —— (4) Muthu Kaman Chetty ✗

65 —— (5) Madhava Rao

66 —— (6) Ranga Roa ✗

67 —— (7) Dorasami Servagar ✗

68 —— (8) Krishna Aiyar

69 —— (9) Virasami Naik

70 —— (10) Jeya Rao

71 —— (11) Sundararaja Aiyangar

72 —— (12) Ramu Aiyar

73 —— (13) Shunmugam Pillay ✗

74 —— (14) Velu Pillai ✗

75 —— (15) Rangasami Naik

76 —— (16) Mangasa Roa

IV List of papers received from Mr Ramachendra Rao

(1) Mr Ramachendra Rao's letter dated 30 May 1892 with printed copy of testimonial

(2) Printed file - Explanation

(3) Exhibits 22-25 & 27-35

V Mr Ramachendra Rao's letter dated 22 March 1892 with an account book kept in pencil

VI Copy of Board's reference on Petition Register 122 of 92

VII Copy of Board's Proceedings dated 2 April 1892 No 20 bo.

VIII Endorsement of the Collector of Madura dated 20th Decr 1891 on Supplemental Remarks submitted by Sub-Collector dated 25 Decr 1891

IX Endorsement of the Collector of Madura dated 29th Decr 1891 on Memo: of Sub-Collector dated 20 Decr 1891.

C. Mayer
Actg Secretary

C no 6432/92

Confidential

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 16 July 1892,

No. 4358 A.

Full Board.

READ ... letter from the Collector of Madura dated 7 June 1892 No 76.

Read also endorsement of the same officer dated 7 June 1892 No 77 on letter from the Acting Sub Collector of Madura, on leave, dated 6 June 1892, No 1.

Resolution.

In Government Order, No 1310, dated 8 March 1892 passed upon Board's Proceedings, No 946, dated 11 February 1892, Mis. Govt. deputed Mr E Gibson, Agt. Fourth Member of the Board, to conduct an enquiry regarding certain charges against Mr Ramachandra Rau, Sub Collector of Madura.

2 These charges were that:—

(a) He accepted a valuable emerald

Grom

from the Zemindar of Ammanaikkanur and

(b) the acceptance two presents of Rs 1000 and Rs 500 respectively, from the same Zemindar.

3 On receipt of these instructions, Mr Gibson proceeded to Madura and commenced the enquiry but - owing to want of power to obtain the appearance of witnesses - was unable to complete it, and, upon the return to duty of Mr Turner, Government directed the latter officer to carry on the investigation (G.O. No 1769 Mis; dated 29 March 1892).

4 In his letter, No 76, dated 7 June 1892 read at the head of these Proceedings, Mr Turner reports the conclusions at which he has arrived - namely that Mr Ramachandra Row received an umbrella made under the orders of the Zemindar of Ammanaikkanur, that one umbrella was made for the Sub Collector" was paid for out of Zamin funds and that there is "no reliable evidence that any other umbrella was made at the same time for the Zemindar

× × × or that Mr Ramachandra Row paid for the umbrella that he admittedly had made for him - In regard to the second charge, Mr Turner finds that there is no direct evidence that the Zemindar paid Rs 1000 as alleged and that Mr Ramachandra Row is entitled to an acquittal - As to the alleged payment of Rs 500, there is no evidence, and the Collector has dismissed that charge.

5 The evidence regarding the first charge, the receipt of the umbrella - is substantially the same as that reported in Mr Wyane's letter of December 26, recorded in Boards Proceedings, No 946, Miscellaneous, dated 11 February 1892 - That evidence is a × bill dated 14 November 1889, purporting to be made out by one Narrana Maistri (called a tailor in the record) against the Zemindar for an umbrella "for the Sub Collector" costing Rs 37-2- This bill is endorsed for payment by the Zemindar - who admitted his signature thereto before Mr Wyane. The Maistri on December 22nd 1891, told Mr Wyane that he made out the bill A, and that the umbrella was made under the Zemindar's order for the Sub Collector who did not pay for it. This was one

× Enclosure 1 Subenclo: A Note. The refce here and in the subsequent marginal notes is to the enclosures accompanying Mr Turner's first letter read at the head of these Proceedings

one of the witnesses summoned by Mr Gibson at Madura, who kept out of the way and would not appear to give evidence. Mr Turner secured his attendance on the 4th April, when he gave a deposition which differs materially from the statement before Mr Wigram. Mr Turner accounts for this by saying that the witness had been tutored to say he had made two umbrellas, and that he became hopelessly confused as the result of his instructions. In like manner the Zemindar, whom Mr Gibson saw at Ammanaickanur and who is a decrepit old man, has made a different statement before Mr Turner on 4th April 1892, from that which he made to Mr Wigram on 15th December 1891.

6 Mr Ramachandra Row's account of the transaction is that he got an umbrella made by this Maistry and that he paid Rs40 for it. He says Taylor in October 1889, that on the 5th October 1889 he happened to see the Zemindar at Ammanaickanur and noticing among his followers an umbrella which took his fancy, he asked the Police Inspector Doraisawmi Seervagar to get him one like it, and that he paid some Rupees 40 for it to the Maistry and took a receipt which, however, is not forthcoming. About March 24th last, he handed to Mr Gibson an account book, bound in quarto, kept in pencil by his wife he says, which contains an entry of Rs 40 as the price of a Temple Umbrella. This entry is dated November 6, presumably 1889. This account is supported by a letter written by the Police Inspector, Doraisawmi Seervagar, which bears date 29th October 1889 and which purports to have been sent with the umbrella to Dindigul. This letter states the price to be Rs 38. This letter was filed before Mr Turner on April 5th 1892, and the Board agree with the Collector in thinking that, considering this time at which it has been produced, little weight can be given to it.

encls: 7
to encls: K.

7 The Board concur with the Collector in finding that the charge in regard to the umbrella is true; that the Taylor Maistry bill and the Zemindar's endorsement on it showing payment by him are genuine; that there is not a little of reliable evidence to show that the umbrella here referred to was other than the one made for Mr Ramachandra Row;

Ramachandra Row; and that the latter has entirely failed to prove that he ever paid the price therefor. The Board is strengthened in this conclusion by the entries in Mr Ramachandra Row's account book above referred to, which he produced in his defence and which it will now proceed to discuss.

8 Before doing so, however, it begs to draw the attention of Government to the fact that the account book was sealed up by Mr Gibson when handed in to him, that it was not opened by the Collector (vide conclusion of enclosure 1 of his report) and that when it was examined by the Board Mr Gibson's seals were still intact. There can thus be no possible question in this case of any tampering with the record by the gang of conspirators which Mr Ramachandra Row would have Government believe has concocted false charges with a view to his ruin.

9 As above stated, the account book, which is kept in Tamil, but with the entries in Arabic numerals, contains under date 6 November 1899, an entry of expenditure of Rs 40 as the price of a temple umbrella. The Board is convinced that this entry is an interpolation. An examination of the account book will show that, in numerous places, one or two lines are left unwritten on. Advantage has evidently been taken of one of these spaces under date November 6. The very appearance of the entry shows it, the pencil used being different. Then if the page marked H in blue pencil is referred to, it will be found that the total, (Rs 162-9) is there given of the items entered on pages E.F.G & H, from the 6 to the 13 of the month inclusive. The correct total would be Rs 162-3, a difference of 6 pies but this is immaterial. The material point is that if the entry "16$\frac{3}{}$--9" is carefully scrutinized, it will be seen that it was originally "1$\frac{2}{}$2-0-9". The "2" is still distinguishable on careful scrutiny by the naked eye, and anyone can see it, if in a good light, with a magnifying glass. From page G also, especially in a strong side light, the fact that the paper on which the figures "163" now appear, has been tampered with, or at least has been damaged, is quite apparent; and traces of the pressure used are to be seen on pp E & F

10 After having been examined by the Board the account book was shown to Professor Merkie Smith, who has carefully

carefully examined the suspicious entries and the state of the paper, with suitable magnifying glasses and has recorded his opinion thereon in a memorandum dated the 21st ultimo, which is submitted for the information of Government. The Board has also had the suspicious entries photographed. This was first done with the wet plates used in the Survey office for the reproduction of maps, and subsequently with dry plates. The result may be seen by the bromide enlargements enclosed, on the back of each of which the Board has noted the negative from which it is a print.

11 The wet-plate negatives give poor results, being wanting in tone. The dry-plate negatives tell their own story. The alteration of the figures "163" is clear and the different kinds of pencil used in the other cases, apparent. In the case of the Rs 40 entry of the 6th, the Board would direct attention to the "0" in the "40" and to the "0" in the annas column. There are apparently traces, in the bromide enlargement of some previous entries having been covered up by these figures.

12. The Board would further draw the attention of Government to the entry of Rupees 45, also under date 6 November on page A of the account book as a receipt. The Board believes that this originally was Rs 5, and that it has been converted into "45" in order to balance the expenditure entry of Rs 40 above referred to. It will be observed that the "4" is of a different thickness and colour from the "5", and this would explain why the round sum of Rupees 40 is selected as the price of the umbrella, while the Police Inspector referred to in para 6 above, alleges it to have cost Rupees 38. It would of course be easier to alter one column in an account book than several.

13. However that may be, the interpolation of the price of the umbrella in the expenditure ~~ends~~ is, the Board thinks, certain, and the fact that Mr Ramachandra Row has had to support his defence by a fictitious entry shows that defence to be worthless. Moreover, if Government accepts the Board's conclusions as to the character of this entry, it is clear that Mr Ramachandra Row, to clear himself of the umbrella charge, in itself not such a very serious matter has not scrupled to, for he did not keep the umbrella for himself but gave it to a temple, attempt to mislead the authorities who would have to deal with the case, by barefaced forgery. It is for Government to decide whether an officer who is capable of an action of this kind is fit to be retained in a high and responsible position in the public service.

14 The second charge relates to the alleged receipt by Mr Ramachandra Row of two sums from the Zemindar, one of Rs 1000 and one of Rs 500. There is no evidence worth considering as to the present of Rs 500 and this part of the charge may be dismissed. The theory as to the present of Rs 1000 is that the then Manager of

of the Estate- one Runga Row was invited in August 1890 to a Shraad-marriage at the house of Mr Ramachandra Row at New Town, Cuddalore, and that he attended the marriage and took with him from the Zemindar a present of Rs 1000. The evidence upon which this charge rests is altogether documentary. There is no direct oral testimony of any value. The charge was founded upon entries found by Mr Wynne in certain Zemin Accounts as reported in his letter to the Board dated 26th December 1891, para 23 (Boards Pro: 11 February 1892 No 946 Mis:) The Collector there explains how he came by these accounts, namely by applying for them to the Sub Judge, in whose Court they were filed, and what he found therein. Certain extracts from these accounts were taken at the time under Mr Wynne's orders; these were sealed by him and were opened by Mr Gibson at Madura. The entries are, one under date August 15, 1890, "Paid in cash to the Zemindar Rs 1000" and one under August 28th "Amount including Batta & Railway fare 9- current for going to and returning from Perdduppalliam for

(To Mr's letter Confl No 76 (Sub Encls: 4 to Encls: 22.)

for the said Manager and two Servants Muthumanyagaram &c who accompanied him, Rs 20. 2. 0

(+ Sub encls: 2 + encls: 2 Board's Encls)

1.5 The private chittah from which these extracts had been taken had formed its way back to Ammanaicktaur by the time Mr Gibson arrived at Madura and when it was sent to him by the Zemindar, the sheet on which the Pudu-palliam entry appeared, had been removed and a fresh one interpolated. Those persons who thought thus to get rid of evidence did not happen to know that copies had been kept by Brow- that copies had been sent by the Collector- Mr Ramachandra Row insinuates that the entries quoted above are forgeries by the Collector's Sheristadar, and that Mr Wynne was hoodwinked by the latter when this account was first examined. Those who know Mr Wynne will be able to appreciate the latter suggestion and as regards the Sheristadar, the Board wish to record its decided opinion that the imputations made against him by Mr Ramachandra Row are gratuitous slanders, for which there is no foundation whatever. The Sheristadar gave his evidence before Mr Gibson in a perfectly straight-forward manner, though with some timidity, and even reluctance- The Board is satisfied that, throughout the enquiry, Mr Rama-sawmi Ayyar, the Sheristadar, has simply

of a simply done his duty, and that it has been an unpleasant task to him. It is also quite at satisfied that these entries in the accounts existed, as reported by Mr Wynne, and that the account books were tampered with subsequently.

15 The Zemin accounts then showed a debit as on the 9th August 1890 of Rs 20-3-0 for the railway fare &c of the Manager — at that time one Ranga Row and two others to and from Pudupollium. On 2nd August 10 one second and two third class tickets were issued from Annamanaickanur to Cuddalore, New Town for the 11 August — 1 second and 2 third class tickets were issued from New Town to Annamanaickanur. The cost for the double journey for 1 second class was Rs 8-2-0 and for 2 third class was Rs 8-4-0 This would be within the amount of Rs 20-3-0 shewn in the account, which, however, includes batta. The Manager Ranga Row denies that he went to Cuddalore. This was to be expected in the circumstances. The thread marriage ceremonies began on the 3rd August, and Mr Ramachandra Row returned to Dindigul by a train which left Cuddalore on August 10-

17 Connected with this marriage feast are certain letters from one Seya Row

(10th witness) a first cousin of Mr Ramachandra Row. This witness admits that he wrote the two letters to the Annamanaickanur Manager — one dated 2nd July 1890 from Kodaikanal, informing him that Mr Ramachandra Row was about to visit Annamanaickanur and one dated 28 July 1890 from Pudupollium, asking the Manager to send, between the 3rd and 5th August, to the care of one Gopalachari, New Town, Cuddalore, certain vegetables. In connection with this letter the Board observes that one of the enclosures to the Collector's report is a statement of the parcels register of Annamanaickanur Railway Station which shows that, between the 31st July and 5th August, no less than six parcels of fruit, flowers and vegetables were sent (prepaid carriage amounting to Rs 6-2-0) from that station to Cuddalore New Town, of which five were consigned to Seya Row and one (sent on August 1st) to Gopalchariar mentioned above. Nothing is said, either by the Collector or by Mr Ramachandra Row, about the letter above referred to — but Seya Row admits writing to Annamanaickanur for flowers &c. A third letter dated Pudupollium August 1st 1890, Seya Row says he did not

Encls: 2
Sub Encls 15.

* This was sent by the Zamin Headclerk Krishna Aiyangar

Witness 8 see deposition encls: 3 Sub encls: 8

Enc. 2. Sub. Enc. 13.

5 witnesses before Mr Turner who absconded during Mr Ribeiro's visit. The Collr only promised his attendance on 5th inst 28. His deposition will be formed in 2 encls: 2 (Sub 2 nos: 6)

* Encl 2 Sub encl: 16 " " " 18 ** " " " 17

Encl: 3 sub encl: 6

Enc: 2. Sub. Enc. 18.

10th

not wrote. It is not addressed to anyone and it is not signed. It insists upon the addressee coming to the marriage and acknowledges the receipt of vegetables. The Collector thinks it is in Seya Row's handwriting. The Board agrees with him and notices that the paper is the same as that of the letter of July 25th which Seya Row admits to be his. The number of water lines on each page is the same viz. 23. The Board may mention that all these letters were sent to Mr Gibson anonymously when he was at Madura. They were probably sent by the same person who forwarded the bill for the umbrella to Mr Wynne. The purveyor of these papers is supposed to be one Sundararaja Aiyangar formerly a servant of the Zemindar. He is referred to in the Collector's letter No 77 dated 7th June 1892.

18 This evidence does not in the Board's opinion, amount to proof that the Manager of the Ammanaickanur Zemindar attended the thread marriage at New Town; but, unless Government is prepared to believe that the debit in the Zemindari Account Book which Mr Wynne saw was made up for the occasion, there is very strong reason to suspect that he went, though it does not follow that he took with

him

Rs 1000, or that having done so, has paid that sum to Mr Ramachandra Row. If, however, the Sub Collector knew that his cousin Seya Row, in his capacity of Master of the Ceremonies, was procuring supplies from the Zemindar in the manner and to the extent which he evidently did (and it is very hard to believe that Mr Ramachandra Row did not know what was going on) the Board considers that his conduct in that matter deserves severe condemnation. The Ammanaickanur Zemindari is within his division and his position as Sub Collector has been abused for the purpose of levying supplies from the Zemindar to save his own pocket.

19 Seya Row, who figures above as the writer of the letters to the Manager of the Zemindari, was put into an appointment as Pound Fund clerk in the Tirumangalam Taluq. He was removed from that appointment under Board's Proceedings, No 2060 Dis+ dated 2nd April 1892, in favor of one G Venkataswami Row, whom the Board considered to be entitled to the post. The Collector's letter

in

+ Subt in original

in the Boards Proceedings quoted, states all that is known about what Venkatswami Row described as a "private arrangement" between the Sub Collector and Deputy Collector Tillaiayagam Pillay to provide for one another's relatives.

2a The Board agrees with the Collector in considering there is no ground whatever for believing in any conspiracy against Mr Ramachandra Row. No doubt as an official he has displeased some people in the district in which he served and some of the documentary evidence produced against him has been furnished by some one who owes him a grudge, but the question is not as to the motive of the evidence but whether it is true.

2b Mr Ramachandra Row's attitude towards the late Collector Mr Wynne, calls, the Board thinks, for special notice. It will be remembered that in para 6 of Govt order dated 8 March 1892 No 1310, Government fully concurred with the Board as to the impropriety of the reference to Mr Wynne in Mr Ramachandra Row's letters of explanation and said that

that his conduct in this respect would be subsequently dealt with. The Board now think it well to remind His Excellency the Governor in Council that, in Mr Ramachandra Row's demi-official letter of 4 January 1892, to the Secretary to the Board, he says "this gumastah (a dismissed servant of the Ammanai Nattar Devasthanam) charged with theft of papers, went to Mr Wynne's house during the holidays and applied for a transfer of his case from the file of the Nallacottah Sub Magistrate. The District Magistrate first refused. The dismissed gumastah was then made to make over an interlineation in an account of 1890, so as to raise

a

a suspicion that a sum of Rs 1000 received by the Zemindar, was for payment to the Sub Collector. After he did this, the District Magistrate sent orders to the Nellacotta Sub Magistrate to stay proceedings against the Gumasta who stands charged by the Police with theft!" Is it right to plot against me and persecute me in this manner?"

The underlining of these words is Mr Ramachandra Row's

Mr Ramachandra Row's official letter to the Board, No 37, dated 19 January

January 1892, is also a most improper one, in that it charges Mr Wynne with having "acted in the most objectionable and malicious manner," and censures Mr Ramachandra Row's letter, dated 3rd January 1892, is again a most extraordinarily insolent production.

22 It will be remembered that in Board's Proceedings, dated 11 February 1892, No 946, the Board represented to Government that the case against Mr Ramachandra Row was not ripe for a formal enquiry under Act XXXVII of 1850, and that a further preliminary departmental enquiry should be held before putting him formally on his defence. It also drew the serious attention of Government to the allegation of general misconduct made by the Acting Collector Mr Wynne, which was borne out by information which had reached the Board otherwise, and suggested that this allegation should be carefully examined and reported on. The Government, however, did not accept these proposals of the Board, while at the same time it exonerated the Tahsildar in respect to the matter

31

a sug
of M
Jemind
to the
he d
Mag
the
to d
the
charg
they
plot
pers
mar
offic
M

matter of the Jammabandi supplies,
dismissed two Revenue Inspectors
who had given evidence damaging
to Mr Ramachandra Row, and
almost simultaneously removed
Mr Wynne from the office of
Collector. Evidence which would
otherwise have been forthcoming
was consequently unobtainable
Moreover, Mr Gibson's enquiries were
restricted to two isolated incidents
one of which (the umbrella case)
was at the outset of a comparat-
-ively trivial character, while the
other (the charge of obtaining Rs 1500) was from its
very nature most difficult to
prove. The Board is therefore
compelled to look very narrowly
at, and judge very strictly of,
Mr Ramachandra Row's honesty
and fitness for his post on a
view of matters in themselves
comparatively small. It is in
this view that the Board
considers that the systematic
despatch

12 R

despatch of articles from Annamanaick-
-anur by rail to Cuddalore for use
at the thread ceremony at his house
is a matter which cannot be overlooked
in the formation of its opinion. It was
a gross irregularity and it cannot be
excluded in determining whether
Mr Ramachandra Row was a man
likely to be capable of the commission
of the two offences which formed the
immediate subject of the investigation.

23 Then there is the account book.
Its date, the circumstances attending
its tardy appearance on the record,
and the more than suspicious character
of the entries in it, which are material
to this matter, are very much against
Mr Ramachandra Row

24 Again the Board cannot leave
out of consideration, the abominable
charge of fabricating false evidence
which he made against Mr Wynne, nor his,
to the Board's mind, purposeful misbeha-
-viour and insolence when writing to
and of that officer.

There is nothing objectionable in Collector's letter to Mr Wynne qua

32

payment of the amount due (Rs 31 - 2 - 0 [illegible] including Rs 6 — — already paid) from the Zemindari funds and (3) on the depositions of Narayana Naicker the Zemindar Jammanaickamma, the former of whom admitted that he had made an umbrella for Mr. Ramachendra Rao by the Zemindar's orders, that the Bill A was in his handwriting, that he had made an umbrella & that Mr Ramachendra Rao did not pay him for the umbrella, while the latter acknowledged that the signature to the Bill was his though he did not remember giving the umbrella.

The enquiry commenced by Mr Gibson and finished by Mr. Turner the following witnesses have been examined & [illegible] than given evidence bearing on the charge:-

Narayana Naicker
the Zemindar
Muthu Kaman Chetty - Zemindar's Shroff
Renga Rao - Ex Manager of the Zemindar
Doraisamy Sevagaran - Ex Police Inspector
Shanmuga Pillai } Sub Collectorate Peons
[illegible] Pillai }

× Others have been examined by Mr. Sundaraya, Srinivasa, Ramier but have given no material evidence on this charge.
Rll
3

Narayana Naicker

Why not by R. Rao? Why?

Narayana Naicker says that the Bill A is in his handwriting & genuine. He on place he says that the Zemindar gave him an order for an umbrella for the Sub-Collector - that the Police Inspector Doraisamy Sevagarao gave him a letter & take to the Sub Collector with the umbrella - that he took the umbrella & the Sub Collector who granted a certain deposit - that afterwards received the deposit for the umbrella by the Zemindar & the money spent. In cross-examination by Mr Ramachandra Rao he becomes confused & says that the Police Inspector gave him an order to make an umbrella, & made after the Zemindar had told him to make one, that he delivered the umbrella through the Police Inspector to the Sub Collector and that the Inspector paid him Rs 10/- and odd spent.

(3)

assuming as Mr. Turner does, in his remarks that this witness has been granted on by Mr Ramachendra Rao's, and his attempt to make he made

that [illegible] his similar umbrellas, the first of which Mr Ramachandra Rao refused to accept which

was subsequently purchased for the Palace offered for by the Zemindar while the Second was accepted of the Sub Collector offered for by him, is, it is submitted a complete failure of the way in which he contradicts himself seems to justify the influence that he has been successfully exerted to go back from his original statement to Mr. Wynne.

The Zemindar now says that the Sub Collector saw his umbrella & said that he wanted one like it, and that the Zemindar, gave it to him. He does not remember that Narayana Swamy gave an umbrella. His memory does not seem to be very clear as to what happened, but he appears to the point that he presented an umbrella to the Sub Collector (vide the portions of his deposition (Sub Enclosure No 2 & Enclosure No 3 underlined in violet pencil.) He does not appear to have any recollection

FOR ORDERS.

The Zemindar

X this to be remarked, however, that he says that Mr. R. Rao his own old umbrella there other, not, as all the other witnesses say, that Narayana Swamy was ordered to make a similar one. Rly

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No.

From

Dated 18 .

FOR ORDERS.

towards Mr Ramachendra Rao for he denies that he gave any money or that any of his establishment made his bread marriage & Cuddalore ~~[illegible]~~ Mr. Ramachendra Rao ~~[illegible]~~ Renga Rao

Renga Rao

The Ex manager Renga Rao supports Mr Ramachendra Rao's defence namely that two umbrellas of the same pattern were made for by Narayana Swamy, the first of which was rejected by Mr Ramachendra Rao & purchased & paid for by the Zemindar for the use of the Palace on the presentation of Mr R. Rao which the Zemindar accepted & paid for by Mr R. Rao the Bill A, this witness declares that the reading of the bill

"The cost of the umbella
might for the Sub Collector"
is an interpolation, as it
was not there when the bill was
presented, but his statement
on that point is contradicted
by Narayana Swamy who
says at the head of the bill
has every appearance of being
genuine as the ink is faded
exactly resembles that in
which the first part of the
bill is written. Mr. Ivens says, in his remarks, a probable explanation of the alterations made at the end of the Bill.
It will be seen, on reference
to Mr 2nd. charge against
Mr Ramachandra Rao (namely
that he received Rs 1000 from
the Zemindar on the occasion
of the Thread marriage) that
the witness Ranga Rao has
apparently deliberately perjured
himself by stating ~~that the~~
~~was not to Pattanpalayam~~
~~but to Madras~~ and that the entries at page
80 of the Zemindar's Agent
Chittah (Bound book B)
has not been tampered with;
for this is clear from the reverse side
of the Counterfoil of the said
page taken under Mr. Wigram's
orders by the Huzur Shirastadar.

× Sub Enclosure No 4
of Enclosure No. 2

Jonathan Kandan Chetty

(2) the old one which the Zemindar originally
had and the new above mentioned which
is alleged to have been purchased from
the Madras by Ranga

that the said Chittah originally
contained a debit of the
Expenses of the witness' journey
to Pattanpalayam, and that
the original entry has been
destroyed and the present
entry regarding his expenses
for journey to Madura
has been fraudulently
interpolated. This fact is,
as submitted, quite enough
to utterly discredit Ranga
Rao's evidence
Witness Muthukaruppan
Chetty also swears that
the entry on Page 80 of
the Agent Chittah is genuine
He supports Mr. Ramachandra
Rao's version of the umbrella
incident and says that the
first the two umbrellas made
by Narayana Swamy, the
which the Bill A relates,
is now in the Palace - This
a significant fact that when
Mr. Ivens went and asked
the Zemindar about the two
umbrellas × alleged to be in
the Palace must be sent to him,
the Zemindar sent no umbrellas
but explained that the main

who kept the key of the room containing the umbrellas had gone away. Mr. Turner's letter (Document No L in Enclosure No I) was written on 21st May last, but no umbrellas had been sent to him up to the date on which he sent his report - June 7th. The witness Muttukaruppan Chetty is a subordinate servant in the employ of the Zemindar and he has not scrupled to perjure himself about the Entry at page 80 of the Agra Chittah, it may be inferred that the rest of his evidence is not worthy of credit.

Ex P Sri Inspector Doraisami Servaigaran

Ex P Sri Inspector Doraisamy Servaigaran

The defence is that the witness an umbrella of Karuppan Gounden for Mr. Ramachendra Rao, but when the umbrella was ready he sent a letter alongwith it to Mr Ramachendra Rao by Karuppan Gounden (1) that the latter two or three days afterwards that Mr Ramachendra Rao had refused to take the first umbrella

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No.

From

Dated 18 ..

FOR ORDERS.

and that he (Karuppan Gounden) had been obliged to make another for him. The Inspector says that he never saw the second umbrella and he contradicts Karuppan Gounden's statement about the alleged payment through him. This, it is submitted, is improbable that when the Inspector took the trouble to send a letter to Mr Ramachendra Rao with the first umbrella, he failed to send a reply to the effect that the umbrella did not give satisfaction, and it seems also improbable that he is alleged to have the Inspector, who has specially Commissioned to get the umbrella made, should have had nothing whatever to do with the second umbrella or shared then any of the consult-

told abruptly Karaya
Maistry. The Inspector
particularly asked
Ramachandra Rao, in
the Cellr pendency of the
Cellr, whether he
wanted his opinion
on the answer
should have been sent to him
on the subject - The Cellr
mentions the sum of Rs 38/-
as having been collected
the price of the umbrella
whereas both the Maistry
& M. Ramachendra Rao, this Peon Vela Pillai
mention Rs 40/- as the
price paid.

Krishnaswamy

Witness Krishnaswamy is a head
Clerk under the Zemindar
his testi is a very suppressi
the defence but contradicts
all the other witnesses by
saying that Renga Rao told
him that the Police Inspector
disapproved of the first
umbrella that he therefore
purchased it for the Palace
Peon Ghanniya Pillai says
that the Jailor brought an
umbrella from the Police Inspector
Dr. Sub Collector and that
the Cellr fouched not certain.

Ghanniya Pillai

? Taylor

D

11.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No.

From

Dated 18 .

FOR ORDERS.

Vela Pillai

deposits in it which the taylor
said he owned remedy -
Hes is all that the witness
knows and this is to be remarked
that he says nothing about
the making of a new umbrella
in place of the one brought by
the Jailor
Peon Vela Pillai says
that a Maistry brought an
umbrella & the Sub Collector
who paid him 40 Rupees,
& obtained a Counter
receipt: His statement
is brief in the extreme & he
has been subjected to no
search cross-examination
by M. Turner - He was sent,
from his station, hastily a
reliable witness that evidence
is not worth much - No
receipt has been produced by
M. Ramachendra Rao

but this of course does not mean that he could not be expected to discern an ordinary receipt like Rent for two years.

In any remaining evidence relating to the umbrella consists the account book kept by Mr Ramachendra Rao's wife which has been put in by Ramachendra Rao as evidence to shew that he paid Rs 40/- for the umbrella.

The Board discusses the material entries in this account at pages 8 – 14 of its Progress Report which attention is invited as also to Mr. Inchie Smith's observations on the results of an examination of the said entries under a powerful magnifying glass and to the enlarged photographs of the same taken in the Survey Office. It is submitted that the Board has demonstrated fully conclusively that the material entries in the account book have been tampered with and are utterly worthless as evidence for the defence

The entries in question are as follows:—

(1) On Page A (Receipts for November)

ನವೆಂಬರ್ (November)

" " "

" " " Rs a. P.

6) ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ (received) Lit: income . 45 —

The figure is said to have originally 5 and then changed into 45.

(2) On Page E (Expenditure)

ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ ಛತ್ರಿಯವರಿಗೆ (for a temple umbrella) ಗಂಗಾಧರಯ್ಯ (paid) (to the Rayer C. Rao – that is her husband Ramachendra Rao } 40 —

(3) On Page H

The total 163 —

The alterations are so fully discussed by the Board that they seem to require no further comment.

Looking at the whole case as submitted

(1) that that the Bill is admitted to be genuine by witnesses who are entirely in Mr. Ramachendra Rao's defence, who also admit that payment was made from the Palace funds on the said bill

(2) that the fact thereon as Mr Ramachendra Rao the

burden of proving that the
bill refers to an umbrella
other than the one made
for and accepted by him
(3) that he has not succeeded
in proving the
attendant circumstances to Mr.
Turner's remarks on the
charge, and to Mr Rama-
chandra Rao's defence
statement which are full
and to the point.
The question is one of appreciation
of evidence and it is for Hon
Members to decide whether
the charge is established and
if so, what further steps are
to be taken * whether Mr.
Ramachandra Rao is to
be put on his defence on the
further charge of having deliberately
put in evidence a forged
account, in order to exculpate
himself.
If Mr. Turner's & the Board's
finding on the umbrella
charge be accepted it seems to
follow that the account
put in must be forged.

× attention is invited
to Mr Hamilton Stokes' remarks
on the last page of the Order
proceedings on C. No 1675/92
under G.O No 1310 dt
8th March 1892
"If clearer proof is
obtained of this having got the
umbrella as a present he
will then be suspended
charged under act XVIII
of 1850."
Rec
× XXXVIII of 1850?

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No.

From

Dated 18 .

FOR ORDERS.

~~adopt the~~ ~~and the~~ ~~Ramachandra~~
~~Rao and the~~ ~~charge~~
~~of having deliberately~~
~~forged~~ ~~and~~
~~himself.~~

2. The second charge
against Mr Ramachandra
Rao is that he received
present of Rs 1000/- a
500/- from the Tahsildar
of Jammalamadugu. There
is no evidence whatever as
to Rs 500/- as to Rs
Rs 1000/- then to show
evidence to show that the
then Manager of the Tahsildar ×
and two other persons must

× Renga Rao.

Mr Chetty considers it clearly proved that the Chittack has been tampered with (vide his remarks on this charge) Rule

Extract
Pattanapalayam. Then can
it be entrusted to no
doubt that the Zemindar's
Agra Chittack, when it was
procured from the Sub Court
and Examined by Mr. Wynne
Extract on entry of the
travelling Expenses of the
Manager this Attend to
Puttanpalayam & back
for the entries taken from
the chittack, at the time,
by Mr. Wynne's Shanbadar
in Mr. Wynne's presence
as an agent. Mr. Ramachendra
Rao employed himself to
the Huzur Shanbadar but
doubtful it is thought agree
with the Board that there
are no sufficient grounds for such
an imputation. The original
Extract submitted
only underlined by Complainant
& the Extract does not
obviate that the present
entries are forged interpolations
made by the Zemindar's
servants who are, as Mr.
Turner says, all in Mr.
Ramachendra Rao's side
and is difficult to believe

that these interpolations
can have been made without
Mr. Ramachendra Rao's
knowledge. Even supposing
however that the Manager
did get the Attend marriage
then so absolutely no evidence
to shew that the conveyed
Rs 1000/- to Mr Rama-
chendra Rao the fact
whether he attended the
marriage or not seems
therefore immaterial and
in this view the evidence
afforded by the books of
the Railway Company
which is discussed at
length by Mr. Turner in
his remarks, need not,
it is thought be noticed.
For the same reason
the evidence
of the Cellar witness by
Mr Ramachendra Rao's
relation Jaya Rao (Exs 11
12 & 13, which also renders
it very probable that the
Manager attended the
marriage, requires no particular
notice.

The Board comments at para 15 strongly on Mr Ramachendra Rao's conduct in "keeping supplies from the Zemindar & sending in his pocket. Her comments are not justified as although some baskets of flowers & vegetables are proved to have been sent by the Zemindar's orders to Cuddalore, there is nothing to show that Mr. Ramachendra Rao did not pay for them[X], and their value in any case cannot have been large as Mr Dalfas came off with Rs. 6-2-0 at most and Exhibit Sub-enclosure no 15 to Enclosure No 2. ~~[illegible]~~

3. The Board draws the attention of Govt in paras 21 & 22 of Proc to Mr. Ramachendra Rao's attitude towards Mr. Wynne which calls, it thinks, for strict notice

[X] Renga Rao & Krishnaswamy aidar say that Rs 10/- were sent from Cuddalore to pay for them but their evidence is perhaps not worth much

Rec

FOR ORDERS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No.

From

Dated 18 .

FOR ORDERS.

Mr Ramachandra Rao's various letters about Mr. Wynne are perhaps a separate bundle with the objectionable passages marked in pencil with red tape for reference. Then letter has already been noticed by Hon Member in their remarks on this with for orders under G.O 1310 dt 8th March 1892 (Mutupo) to which reference is invited. No orders were then passed on them, and orders are now required. The demi official letter to the Board's Secretary of the 21st of January last in which Mr. Ramachandra Rao charges Mr. Wynne

with blame, about the fabrication of false evidence against him seems to call for particularly severe notice in connection with para 15 of Mr. Ramachandra Rao's written explanation of the 26th of March in which he expresses regret for having been so misunderstood as to forward his notes directly to Govt and to word them as he did, asks that allowance may be made for the circumstances under which they were written, but states in para 9 of his subsequent letter of the 3rd of May he again gives in detail instances of what he considers "unkind treatment and objectionable procedure" on Mr Wynne's part, and he apparently still thinks that he was justified in writing as he did. Mr. Ramachendra Rao's imputation of bias against the Huzur of the Taluq, which is specially

referred to by the Board seems to be based entirely on a misunderstanding by the Shirastadar of a deposition from the village officers examined during the enquiry regarding Jamabandi supplies. The misunderstanding was probably made through ignorance. Mr. Ramachendra Rao's imputation, in any case, does not seem to call for particular notice.

The Board's opinion on the other charges is

(1) that the umbrella charge is proved

(2) that the embezzlement, in the expenditure side of Mr. Ramachendra Rao's sister's account, of the price of the umbrella is certain (para 13 of the B.P.)

(3) that the charge relating to the alleged bribe of Rs 1000 & 500 is established though there is some evidence to show that the Zamindar's Manager attended the thread marriage at Puttaparthy

(4) that Mr Ramachendra Rao has, to say the least of it, shown himself utterly unworthy of

the confidence which has of
necessity been felt by responsible
an officer occupying the position
which he holds, & that there
is very strong prima facie
evidence to show that he has
been guilty of conduct for
which dismissal from the
public service would not be
too severe a penalty. With
these remarks the Board
leave the case in the hands
of Govt.

Mr Ramachandra Rao
has made four statements
in his defence in different
dates [x], which are
found on separate sheets.
The last statement is an
elaborate one which is
found convenient for reference
as it contains in print
the whole evidence taken in
the course of the enquiry.
His main argument is that
the Dubash & Zemindar
should be looked on as hostile
witnesses & that their evidence,
viewed in the light, has broken
down. Mr Jones thinks however,
and apparently with good reason
that these two individuals

Tailor

Sheriff

FOR ORDERS.

x 16th Dec.
22nd March
26th March
30th May.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No.

From

Dated 18 .

FOR ORDERS.

as in fact all the other witnesses
who gave material evidence
in the criminal charge have
been examined on Mr
Ramachandra Rao's
side and have failed to
substantiate his defence.
Mr Ramachandra Rao
also makes a great deal
of what he calls an official
Conspiracy to ruin him, the
chief members of which
appear to be the Deputy Collector,
(Sellamuragum Pillai) the
Nayar Shericladar & the
Interpreter Pandigal. There
seems however to be no evidence
of any such
Conspiracy.
To sum up:—
the points calling for
orders are:—

(1) The umbrella charge
(2) The suspicious entries in Mr. Ramachandra Rao's account-book in Mr. Ramachandra Rao's handwriting
(3) The charge that Mr. Ramachandra Rao received bribes from the Zemindar of Rs 1000 & 500 respectively
(4) His conduct in obtaining vegetables & flowers from the Zemindar for use at the thread marriage
(5) His conduct in writing in an improper manner about his conduct to Mr. Wynne.

I submit that the further steps, if any, to be taken in this case, should be taken in the Public Department

Rell
1-8-92

The foregoing note states the case fully and analyses the evidence which has been recorded. It is unnecessary therefore, for me to go into details, and I will merely indicate the opinion I have formed on the charges.

As regards the "umbrella case" I entertain no doubt that the charge is true but it seems clear that the witnesses have been tampered with as their statements before the Tahsildar materially differ from those previously made by them before Mr. Wynne. If these last statements stood alone it would be impossible to convict Mr. Ramachandra Rao on the evidence adduced, but the account book which he produced in support of the alleged payment for the umbrella contains palpable falsifications and there must have been some motive for Ramachandra Rao thus deliberately attempting to mislead the Collector. Attention is invited to Mr. Ramachandra Rao's letter to Mr. Sivan of the 22 March 92 in which he alludes to Mr. Wynne's remark that if an entry of payment for the umbrella in Mr. Ramachandra Rao's account had been produced he would have regarded it as conclusive proof of the falsity of the charge. This remark

for the production of the account books long after the first investigation had been closed is a strong presumption that the entries were fabricated in order to support the evidence which would be regarded as conclusive proof and it is by the barest accident that the forgery was detected, Mr. Bliss having noticed the alterations of the figures after the account books had been examined by two of his colleagues. In his endeavour to discredit his case Mr. Ramachandra Rao has cast his own account, for which alone there is direct evidence that cannot be disputed, under the gravest suspicion. The case, however, appears to me to be one which the Court cannot pass orders without a judicial investigation, unless I am clear that there is a *prima facie* case for prosecuting Mr. Ramachandra Rao at once. I do not think it necessary, therefore, to appoint a Commission under Act XXXVII of 1850 but to pass judgment on the results of a formal inquiry under that Act. The case has assumed so much grave an aspect owing to the fabrication of evidence which the Board has brought to notice in which the photographs have enabled apparent that no punishment short of dismissal from the public service would suffice if Mr. Ramachandra Rao is held guilty of having been a party to such fabrication in order to exculpate himself. The acceptance of an umbrella from the Zemindar is a minor matter altogether.

As regards the other charge of the acceptance of a deed of Record P. Rs 500 from the Zemindar there is no evidence worth the name to connect Mr. Ramachandra Rao with those entries in the Zemindar's accounts & he cannot be further proceeded against on the former point nor the charge of the 1000 rupees paid to the Zemindar & the 5 Lacs, 50 & the third marriage at Madras took place on the 3rd when Mr. Ramachandra Rao returned to Bimlipatam on the 10th.

attention is invited to the fact that the entry of payment in the account book produced is made under date 6 Nov/89 whereas the hackney bill for the umbrella which he says was rejected by Rama Chandra Rao & thereupon taken by the Zemindar is dated 14th Nov. as is also the endorsement of payment. i.e. 8 days after which Ranga Rao's petition dated 22nd Nov 89 with 6 enclosures & marked with pencil shows that according to his statement the second umbrella had not then been made. It has to be explained therefore why the price of the umbrella was debited in Ramachandra Rao's private account some time after the Books were delivered. It may have been that he could not remember after any figure or type A relating to subsequent date.

A.J.
2.16

If this case had been really
intended to be presented on
the Record it could have
been drawn earlier. For
it does not appear, the
Account books had been ten-
dered in the attempt
of Mr Ramachandra Rao,
and reasonably objected
that of a formal inquiry
which then was not
held. Some witnesses
have since been examined, &
after the matter to the extent
to which the charges
proceeded. Others can
be had on the question
of the genuineness of
the prosecution, forming the
charges or.

CL
2/8.

FOR ORDERS.

C. No 6432/82

Report on the charges
against Mr. Ramachandra
Rao as Sub Collector

The Hon: Mr. Garbett C.S.I
The Hon: Sir H.S. Stokes K.C.S.I
H.E. the Governor.

I think the conclusion arrived at by Mr Turner & the Board & concurred in by my learned colleague that there were only two matters, as first stated by the Secretary, that it was necessary to refer to Sub Coll & not fair for the Accused that it was then proposed by the majority of the Board to refer to him for explanation matters which were not before him when he was charged, & which were not even mentioned in the charges framed against him. Such a course is opposed to all principles of fair dealing & justice, & is unknown to the Criminal Procedure Code in force in the Territories subject to this Presidency. The first charge against Mr Ramachandra Rao was that he had received from Ramaswami Naidu, a Cattle Contractor, a bribe of Rs 1000 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Commissariat Department during the Afghan War. The second charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Public Works Department during the famine of 1877. The third charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Salt Department. The fourth charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Forest Department. The fifth charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Police Department. The sixth charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Jail Department. The seventh charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Education Department. The eighth charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Medical Department. The ninth charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Revenue Department. The tenth charge was that he had received from the same person a bribe of Rs 500 in connection with the contract for supplying Bullocks to the Miscellaneous Department.

P. Ramchandra Rao's case

The Board recommend that
no further action be
taken in respect of the
2 charges of receiving
bribes of Rs 1000 & Rs 500
from the Commissariat
Commissioner, or that
Ramchandra Rao with
the letter in the Civil
relating to them 2 charges
and that there is a
prima facie case
against him, but that
there is
spiracy.

Dropping all considera-
tion of the money bribes, Mr Turner
& the Board think the inquiry
held by Mr Turner with the
limitations laid on him
cannot obtain a conclu-
sive determination as to
whether there is no doubt that the
charge has its origin in a
stolen Collector's bill for
bullocks, amounting
to Rs 37. 2. 0 dated Nov 14th

This bill bears the endorsement of the Annamaikanur Zemindar passing it for payment [illegible] alternately abstracted from his papers & sent anonymously to the Coll^r of Madras. [illegible] signature.

Ramachandra Rao admits that he asked the Police Inspector of Nellakotta to order him an umbrella like one which he had just seen carried beside the Annamaikanur Zemindar's palki on the occasion of his visiting the Coll^r & Sub Coll^r (R. Rao himself) at the Annamaikanur Bungalow & says that the umbrella was sent to him later, on account of him by the Inspector, that he ordered the tailor who made it to make some alterations in it (which were made) & that he paid for it, some 40 Rs, & got a receipt from the tailor & presented the umbrella to a pagoda ~~in [illegible]~~ in pursuance of a vow. The story is a perfectly reasonable one & the only question is whether it is true. The strongest point in it against R. Rao is that he has not produced the receipt alleged to have been taken by him from the tailor -

He has, however, filed a letter from the Police Inspector (whom he says he asked to order the umbrella) dated Oct^r 28th /89 & written from Nellakotta - in which the Inspector says he sends (the umbrella) by the tailor which R. Rao had ordered for the pagoda and that the Inspector has settled the price of it at 30 Rs. This seems a genuine letter - & if so bears out R. Rao's statement as to the umbrella having been ordered through the Inspector. But R. Rao says that when the tailor brought the umbrella & the Inspector's letter he ordered some alterations in it which were carried out & that about a month or subsequently the tailor brought him an umbrella corresponding to his instructions & that he paid him 35 or 40 Rs for it - This would be about the end of Nov^r 1889. This date is very important. Because R. Rao has subsequently tried to prove payment for the umbrella by an entry in his wife's private account book which is dated Nov^r 6th 1889. The evidence for the prosecution about the umbrella is printed in the packet containing R. Rao's explanation. This is somewhat contradictory & unsatisfactory

[illegible] the case in this matter [illegible]

I don't think [illegible]

[illegible]

As to the [illegible] [illegible] alleged [illegible]

I would [illegible] R.R. [illegible] Commission [illegible] this [illegible] R.R.'s [illegible]

I think the charges should be framed, as [illegible], by the [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] I think of [illegible] [illegible] Rao [illegible] would do. [illegible]

H.E.S.
16 Aug^t

I quite agree - Ramachendra Rao will have to explain the curious apparent alterations in the Account Book & the anomaly of the dates. He seems to have tied a halter round his own neck - otherwise the case against him is only suspicious. W

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] him - Proving of the
Statement of the Reminder
& the Evidence before Mr Bryans
& Mr Turner of the
[illegible] (the Reminder's
Servt) (Muttukumaru Chetti),
of the Police Inspector (Dharmi
Lewis Corea), of the Korale
(Rengaker) & of Reminder's
Head Clerk (Kirihewa Cryasekera)
before Mr. Turner -
Before Mr. Bryans Reminder
was sworn in the Shortest
manner. [illegible] the Reminder
said Lord what remarks
pring the Complt & R. Rov.
that Tailor said he under
took to give bells for the Pole
Otherwise the Reminder was
that he may make one &
did otherwise and like for
the Reminder afterwards.
Before Mr Turnell the Reminder
further said, that he is having
entitled, & after that he
presented Rotan with the
mahalle he was using then
he paid the Cost. Kandiah
Kathirawelkamam Angelay
which the Tailor depositd that
he had given one bell for
the Lord's Chowdiship
it, & he took it & the Reminder
& the Inspector each
order of the Inspector for it.
he was paid Rs 40 odd.
The evidence of the other wit-
nesses is to the effect that

2/

5

5

that after R Rov asked the
Inspector, Dharmi to get
him an umbella, which he
Reminder, the Inspector asked
Rengaker (the Korale)
Lord to call down
with his arrack from the
palace Tailor was told to
Mahawel, which Ludiki
Mahawel, which Ludiki
that it was taken by the Inspector
by the Tailor
Mahawel & the Reminder
to take it home it for
but under the Lord, &
that the Tailor thereon took
it & the Reminder stopped
for it kept it, & asked
an bells was made for the
Lord's. [illegible]
Lord, which understood
by him to be told by him being
that bell of the Reminder or a
Mahawel wanted for the
dagoma. As this is
possible but improbable, but,
if true, the Tailor must have
made 2 or bells after the
model of the Reminder's
original one - & the Reminder
ought to take 2 or bells,
& R. Rov ought to have the
money for the one made
by the Tailor for him. The
Chief was known as proving that
2 or bells were made by the
Tailor under my order, & with
Bryans or Mr Turnell took
enough bells to take their
print & the letter - Before
Mr Turnell with the Reminder

and asked him how
it was he had not
mentioned this before
to the Magistrate at Annamitcam
& stone. His answer
was 2nd May/92. The Swindler
replied that he was shewn
one Rupee & Rollabitta, how-
ever he took note of
the Rupee & Rollabitta
Col. Pendarves, Lieut. Brown,
Mr Turner & Capt. Crosby
saying to the Palanquin
bearers & Peons & Sepoy
& beyond doubt that he
had 2 Rupees, & only
one Rollabitta & Pendarves left
Myself with
contents
saying that if there had been
2 Rupees the Swindler
Officer would have produced
them that inspiring his
regret. Then the pro-
-duced the same note for-
-ging.
Now doubtless it is a most
suspicious circumstance that
the Swindler did not
produce 2 Rupees. &
also that R. Rov cannot
produce Receipt for the
Rs40 which he says he
paid to Taila, Kopla
because doubtful that
he paid 35 or 40. which
he suspects Utta former
that the former actually that
Officer has Rs 30. & only
40 Rs. has he paid to
Officer. Circumstances

& also with his saying that
the Rollabitta that the
Swindler stopped the Rollabitta
Bill kept the Rollabitta
& Rupee & R-Rov.

on his part is consistent with
only one Rollabitta having
made of the Taila, that
Rollabitta having been with
Comit R-Rov last, & the
Bill being kept with the 6
Taila being taken, the proof
the Swindler having, of
Guilt for it. That is a
probability that the Rupee
he has said this from &
Rollabitta was of Rov &
one of the Swindler. When
this hypothesis has been
supported. The circumstance
known as above stated & taken
with that having been 2 Rupees
made. & on this also supports
point that is that the
said
Before Mr Byrne:
Swindler Rollabitta Hyde &
order for the Coll. x + +
Swindler only one x x x
The 1st Coll. did not pay
for Rollabitta x x x
did not make another after-
like this for the Swindler
said. did not remember
out. The like question
Rollabitta made for the Swindler
self
Before Mr Turner:
The Swindler
ne on the Rollabitta
for the Coll. I saw
him on the Rollabitta
the Swindler - the
take it the Coll. -
dream same also pay
the Coll. counts on
the Rollabitta
Receipt & Disciple - the Coll.
produced not certain dispute

Mr Thomas I moved the Defts
Counsel to produce the Minutes of
the meeting. Which produced
marked this Exhibit - XXX
I then moved the Bill
open for the Examination xx
(Re cross exam: by R. Roe to
said)
by Thomas from Bill to
Exhibit Dft. Dent and Drawing
Lewis.
(Cr. Mr Turner)
In this case I only made one
Bill for the Defts - I
took one Bill to the Exhibit
Office the printed not certain
defects - After I moved to
Depts upon the Bill
the Examination -
(Cr R. Roe)
Drawing Surveyor gave
me order to make a
Bill another to the
Bill I made - I
then the Bill entitled
the Bill - I declared it to
Drawing Lewis on
Examination when
paid for it - I supplied Pltf
copy of it - I my own
Exhibit for it - I did
not last XXX
Mr Hayward the above. The
Record in the Exhibit marked one
about it. Then I some
Distinguish. Those exhibits
I took it out - I did not
understand his Trial work.
XX
I by came over the Exhibit
about the Bill when it was
long - After altering it I did
make better Examination
again. The Exhibit Office may
have paid it but Drawing
Surveyor paid it in the long
hand. XX

3/

Now this Statement of the Exhibit
that this being examined.
Bill for Drawing Lewis is
found by the Exhibit, in my
opinion, by Drawing on
Deposition upon Mr. Turner
when he said;
After days after Exhibit brought
me in Bill with the Examination
Bill. This annexed at Exhibit
Bill is by the Exhibit Office. This
annexed in the Affidavit - Exhibit
III (Exhibit dated 29th Oct 1857) for
Letter of the one Bill that
Bill Exhibit. I then Exhibit
has to do with the Bill
afterwards. Exhibit brought
to Bill with the Bill
Exhibit Dft 38 marked in
Exhibit III. Bill - XX By
Bill and Exhibit Bill
Bill and Exhibit
for me - Exhibit days after
hand Exhibit Bill
Bill of Examination
Exhibit me Exhibit Bill
duty on Bill not attended
to Bill obliged to make
Bill one Exhibit this
Bill one Exhibit of Exhibit
Bill.
upon the whole case of the Exhibit
Bill Exhibit Bill
is Exhibit of one Bill - Exhibit
it was paid for by the Exhibit
after it was taken from
Exhibit Bill Exhibit Bill from
Exhibit Bill Exhibit Bill
practically admits Exhibit he from
Exhibit Bill Exhibit Bill to Exhibit
The Existence of the Exhibit
which Exhibit Bill he Exhibit from

the Tailor is an honest boy
and the money R Rowe
took on Sunday last he own
paid the Tailor worsnop for
a receipt from him shall.
But whether he got the mo-
ney or offer a note, it
is doubtful, perfectly clear,
from an examination of the wit-
nesses and both, that false
evidence has been fabricated
by him & Lee to help upon
the Tailor who paid
£40. it being too risky to
pay a receipt. But the
only person to pay
was Lee against the paid for the
mantle & Morris
Secretary on Aug 3 of N.
R. Rowe from Lowes,
Bankers of Bank York
the entries & also an entry
of R 5 into Aug 4 5 N.
Rowe then clear that his
in Dec & that Knight
total of 123 N. in about
into 163. for the 2 in dispute
with. Rowe later
finally was Mr Lee stopped
and fabricated evidence.
this between R Rowe
the Lees in connection
dealings with Whether Lee
finally.
his work the particulars
which it is impossible to
prove. Perhaps Rowe
the hypothesis this is
be borne out. but at
any rate his proceedings
the evil attended by the

the date of the tailor bills paid
the reminder is Nov 14th/89
that the entry in the private
is 8 days to one — the
one can + that 3 under
to one in the letter

false entry Nov 6th on print
ought to prove the whole
the fabrication — for the bills
dates have paid for, after the cashier
& the Bankers, as the
are being, about one week
from the date of 20th Dec 89. the
letter,
Mark Napier, the moment
I have formed inquiry into
Rowe's conduct in taking a
promissory note from
Lee, and the fabrication of
a receipt by the fabrication of
false evidence by from the
part first in Court
thereof the Town in Court
on 9 October Mark or
Council.

9/1890

Confidential

Read: P. No 6432/92

G.O. Mis No 3658 dt 15-8-92

The papers read above relate to the Enquiry ordered in G.O No 1310 dt 8th March 1892 into certain charges of misconduct against Mr. Ramachandra Rao as Sub Collector of Tinnevelly. Those charges are:-

(1) that in 1889 while acting Sub Collector of Madura he accepted a valuable ~~Shawl~~ umbrella as a present from the Zemindar of Ammanaickam

JH 13/8/92 Hd 17 Aug?

(2) that he received on two occasions in 1890 ~~Rs~~ bribes Rs 1000 & 500 from the same Zemindar

2 No evidence whatever has been brought forward in support of the second of the above charges ~~the same~~ that it may therefore be dismissed without further discussion. ~~It~~ lowers ~~appears~~ appears from the evidence recorded during the enquiry that Mr. Ramachandra Rao obtained some baskets of vegetables & flowers

34

from Ammanaickam in
connection with a marriage
ceremony & the Board
~~considers~~ considers that his
conduct in the matter calls
for severe notice on the ground
that he abused his position as
Tahsildar for the purpose of
levying subscriptions from Hindus
living within his division.
This matter does not however
in the opinion of Govt call for
any particular notice as the
value of the vegetables & flowers
obtained from Ammanaickam
appears to have been trifling,
& there is no evidence to show
that Mr Ramachandra
Rao did not pay for them.

3. On the first charge,
which relates to Mr ~~Pitt~~
Umbrella, the Governor
in Council is of opinion, after
a careful consideration of Mr
Evidence recorded, that a
prima facie case has been
established against Mr.
Ramachandra Rao and that the charge is sufficiently serious
to necessitate a formal enquiry
by a Commission appointed
under the provisions of Act
XXXVII of 1850. His Ex
Governor in Council also agrees
with the Board in the conclusion
which it has arrived at
regarding the witness in the

private
in the account book which
Mr Ramachandra Rao
has produced as evidence
of the alleged payment for
the umbrella. The entries
evidently
appear to have been altered
forged & Mr. Ramachandra
Rao has, by his production
of this book which contains
them, laid himself open
to the very serious charge
of fabricating or abetting
the fabrication of false
evidence in his defence,
a charge which also seems
to require thorough investigation
by a Commission appointed
under the Act above referred to.

4. Before however finally
deciding to appoint a
Commission to investigate
the last charges dealt
with in the first
resolution it is necessary to refer the whole
record of this enquiry to the Govt
the Advocate General, with
the request that he will
carefully peruse the same
and state whether or not as at present
there are sufficient
grounds for making a

formal enquiry under the
act ~~xxxxx of 1850~~ referred to.
In the event of his considering
the appointment of a Com-
mission advisable he
should draw up & submit
for the approval of Govt the
articles of charge required
by § 2 of the act ~~in particular~~
to. The Govt will defer, for
the present, passing ~~any~~
orders on the enclosed letters
written by Mr. Ramachandra
Rao against Mr. Wynne.

12.8.92

12/8

G. O. Referring the papers
re Mr. Ramachandra
Rao's case to the Advocate
General for opinion

Mr Hon Sir H E Stokes K.C.S.I

Letter enclosed A. dtd 16/8/92

" to Hon. the Advocate General
with B.P. No. 4358A dt 16-7-92
Little papers in original

dtd 16/8/92

given for copying ____
copied ____
examined ____
signed ____
} 189

MAIN G.O., No. 189 , DATED

NT No

OCUMENTS TO C. No.

M OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
M OF GOVERNMENT							
ENT WITH DITTO							
NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only

Fair