C.F. 73.

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

Revenue (1893) Department.

G.O., No. 1931

Confidential No. 592.

DATED 26 May 1893

[Despatch Abstract.]

Concurring in the remarks of the Court of Wards in regard to the management of the Pittapore Estate by Messrs L.C. Miller & A.W.B. Higgens.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Confidential No 14.

1893.

Court of Wards,

MADRAS.

Current Number 3240

To

The Secretary to Govt.

Rev Dept.

Proceedings, dated 25 April 1893.

No. 1323 Enclosures. 2

Subject.

Submitting to Govt the remarks ~~to Govt~~ Mr L. C. Miller's explanation in regard to his lax management of the Pithapuram Estate

Madura Sub. Collector's Office
dated 24 February 1893

No 195

From

Leslie C. Miller Esquire
Ag Sub. Collector Madura

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

(through the Board of Revenue)

Sir,

In reply to G.O. dated 15 February 1893 No 655 Revenue Department, I have the honor to state that I can only attribute the defects pointed out by the Court of Wards to the inefficiency of the whole of the office establishments of the Zemindari, both in the Taluks & at Head Quarters.

2 It may be said that these establishments were of my choosing: this is no doubt true but my hands were tied to a great extent and most of the appointments had to be made (especially those to the higher paid offices), for what I may call political reasons.

3 My chief mistake, and no doubt it was a great one, was that I endeavoured to struggle on with these establishments

instead

instead of reorganizing them when I found matters going badly. I was personally too much impressed with the feeling that everything must be subordinated to the interests of the Suit then & Still pending, but had I known that the Suit would be so long delayed, I would have tried to put matters on a better footing earlier.

4. I do not desire to make excuses or throw blame, that attaches rightly to me, or others. The men employed were old Zemindari Servants unaccustomed to be required to work in any methodical way and difficult to move from their Customary paths. Other men might have done better with them than I did, but the Govt will, I trust, believe that this was not owing to lack of endeavour on my part.

5 This explanation is necessarily very general, as I have now been 8 months away from Pittapur and have no accurate recollection of details.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
(Sd) Leslie Miller
A.S. Sub. Collector

(True Copy)

Lowe
a.g. Secretary

1893
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 2
To Current No. 3240

Confidential

COURT OF WARDS OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Court of Wards.

Dated 25 April 1893.
No. 1323.

READ letter from Mr L. L. Miller Esq. No 195 dated 24 February 1893. to the Secretary to Govt., Rev. Dept. (through the Board of Revenue).

* Copy enclosed.

Resolution.

Submitted to Government.

Pithapuram
C.S.R. 2872/93

2. Government Order dated 15 February 1893 No 655 Rev has not been Communicated either to the Board or to the Court of Wards; but it appears to have been a Call for explanation from Mr Miller with reference to the remarks Contained in para 22 of Courts' Proceedings dated 17 December 1892, No 4400.

3. The "explanation" now offered by Mr Miller Cannot, in the Courts' opinion, be accepted as in any way Satisfactory. The results of his administration of the Estate have been

been disappointing in the extreme, and the expectations which justified the appointment of a Covenanted Civilian on high pay as Manager have not, in any way, been realized.

4. With reference to para 2 of his letter the Court would observe that it has had an opportunity of perusing Mr Miller's memorandum (herewith submitted) prepared for the information of his Successor and that it is Constrained to say that the policy therein laid down (paras 3 + 5) as to the relation of the administration of the Estate to the Conduct of the Suit is unworthy of Mr Miller's position and derogatory to the Court of Wards whose legal obligations in the Control of the minor's estate it was incumbent on the Manager to Carry out. It is a policy which the Court must entirely repudiate & Condemn.

/True Extract/

A. Lindsay
A. S. Secretary.

To.
The Secretary to Govt. Rev. Dept.
with Copy of Mr Miller's memo
(to be returned)

Confidential

COURT OF WARDS OFFICE MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Court of Wards.

Dated 28th April 1893
No. 1357.

~~READ~~

Resolution.

The Acting third Member of the Court of Wards during his recent visit to the Godavari District made enquiries at Cocanada into the administration of the Pithapuram estate and has placed his views before the other members of the Court. The matters brought to notice do not reflect Credit on the officers Concerned and the Court resolves to pass the following remarks thereon.

2. It is observed that the nominal Current demand of the present fasli up to the end of February is Rs 901,899 of which Rs 6,27,364 has been Collected, or only 69.5 per Cent. The percentage of Collections in the different tannas differed Considerably

ae

as under:

(1) Pithapuram tanna - - 77.6 per Cent.
(2) Karapa " 74.4 "
(3) SamalKota " 74.6 "
(4) Mallavaram " 61.5 "
(5) Kadiam " 56.2 "
(6) Palivela " 59.3 " .

3. On examining one of the tannas (Karapa) it was found that there was no Complete villagewar list of D.C.B. Statements; Still less was there any knowledge of individual arrears in the Villages. For this reason the Court Cannot rely on the figures given as the total demand for each tanna and for the estate, and Considers that they are more or less manufactured. Further proof of this is found in the fact that the balance of one D.C.B. Statement is sometimes altered in the next.

4. In this tanna there was no record forthcoming of orders issued for Collections or for the attachment of property.

5. The third Manager Called for the individualwar D.C.B. of a Single village (Suryarowpet)

(Suryarowpet); and after Considerable delay, the Kurnam appeared with an account, the Greater part of which had evidently been written up during the night. It appeared that out of the arrears due by this village, Rs 1,500 was payable by three individuals against whom no process had been issued, though it was said orders had been given for the tanna - which however were not produced.

6. It was obvious that the Manager had never taken the trouble to make for himself the Simple enquiries above noted; Still less had any measures been taken to bring about the elementary reforms which these defects indicated.

7. As to <u>arrears</u>, the demand at the beginning of the Current fasli Stood at Rs 11,18,118, and the Collections up to the end of January at Rs 55,404. A fasliwar list of these arrears has been obtained; and although no Confidence Can be placed in the figures for each fasli, it would appear that the arrears go so far back as fasli 1253. As none of these arrears, unless Covered by bonds, Can be Collected for more than three years, the preposterous Character of the accounts is apparent. On being asked for a list of the debts due to the estate, including arre

arrears of rent Covered by bonds, the Manager reported that no such list was in existence. Some of the bonds are at the head office, and others with the Tannadars who have not furnished the necessary information. But even for the bonds in the Manager's office, no list was forthcoming. The estate has been under the Court of Wards since 1890, and neither Mrs Milles nor Mr Jagannadha Rao has has yet Completed that most obvious essential for proper administration, Viz a list of the debts due to the estate.

8. The Court Considers that the State of things thus revealed is disgraceful to all Concerned; and Shows *prima facie* that the present Manager, who appears to be wanting in energy, firmness and vigour, is unfit for the post he holds. He has been warned in a Separate proceedings that unless he Shows better results in future, he will be removed from his post.

9. The Collector is requested to direct all Tannadars at once, under pain of Suspension & dismissal, to Complete the Collection of the Current demand without delay, and to prepare Complete lists of all debts with full particulars of bonds &c within a date to be fixed by the Collector

10. In regard to public Works, the Court understands

understands that no improvement has been made on the Confusion that existed before, and that the Supervisor on Rs 100 (with horse allowance of Rs 20) Sanctioned in Courts' Proceedings of 17 December 92 No 4400. has not yet been appointed. It appears to the Court that for the responsible work that has to be done, including the expenditure of about Rs 70,000 annually, for the preparation of plans & estimates for regulating Sluices in the Jeluru Channels and for repair of buildings, and above all for Shaking the work Clear of the incompetent, if not Corrupt Control of the Tannadars, an officer of a higher grade is needed.

11. The Court doubts whether Qualified overseers Can be had for the pay now allowed and would raise the pay so as to attract men, who now seek employment in the D. P. W. or Local Fund Service.

Pay Rs.	Horse allowance Rs
Overseer 40 —	15
Sub overseer 30	7½
Do 25	7½

The attention of the Acting Collector, Mr Rawson, has already been drawn to the matter and revised proposals should, if necessary, be Submitted to the Court for Sanction

12. In the previous paras, the Court has had to Comment Strongly on the incapacity of the Manager in elementary matters of administration. It must, however, be

he noted in his favor that he has been most Seriously hampered in all his attempts to impose the administrative Staff under him by the extraordinary policy adopted by his predecessor and tacitly acquiesced in by the Collectors, Messrs Happell & Huggens, whereby efficiency of administration of the estate has been Subordinated to the interests of the Suit brought by the adopted Son against the minor. This matter has been brought to the notice of Govt in Courts' Proceedings d/ 25 April '93, No 1323. C.R. 3240/93.

13. It is not too much to say that at the present moment the Manager administers the estate Subject to the Supervision of the local pleader in Charge of the Suit; Mr G. Venkataratnam, as regards all changes in the Staff, even to peons, and to an important extent as to the Collections of revenue. The Senior Rani is also allowed an important Share in the disposal of appointments. Fifteen appointments and four dismissals are traceable to these influences up to the end of February last.

14. The Court has already been Constrained to Submit to Govt in Connection with Mr Miller that the Course pursued by that Gentleman which was followed by Mr Jagannadha Rao and tacitly accepted by the Collectors Messrs. Happell & Huggens was unworthy of Servants of Govt and derogatory to the Court of Wards. The Court most emphatically repudiates it; and the Collector should see that the interests of the Suit are not permitted in any way to interfere with any measures required to effect the Greatest efficiency in the administration of the estate, and should instruct the Manager to perform his duties in Complete independence of the local pleader & of the Senior Rani. The latter may however be Consulted in regard to the palace Servants.

15. In para 2 of his letter dated 8 Decr '90 No 608, the Collector Said it would be possible to repay, in three months, the loan of Rs 1,90,000 then proposed to be taken from the Cocanada Bank, but the re-payment does not appear to have been made accordingly. The Collector is requested to explain why this was not done.

/True Extract/

Lewis
A.S. Secretary.

To the Collector of Godavari
Copy to Secy to Govt Rev Dept
" A.W.B. Huggins Esq
Coll of Ganjam

Confidential 16.

1893

Court of Wards,

MADRAS.

Current Number 3316

To

The Secretary
to Government

Revenue Dept

The Honble Mr Garstin C.S.I.

Proceedings, dated 28 April 1893
No. 1357. Enclosures.

Subject.

Issuing instructions to the Collector of Godavari with a view to improve the administration of the Pithapuram Estate

Confidential No 17

1893

Court of Wards,

MADRAS.

Current Number 3317

To

The Secretary to
Government

Revenue Dept.

Proceedings, dated 28 April 1893
No. 1358 Enclosures. 1

Subject.

Submitting to Govt. with remarks, the explanation of Mr Higgens with regard to the lax management of the Pithapuram Estate

COURT OF WARDS.

822 of 1893

From

A. W. B. Stiegens Esquire,

Collector of Godavery (in transit).

To

The Secretary to Government,

Revenue Department, Madras

through the Board of Revenue

Dated Chatrapur 28th February 1893.

Sir, I have the honour to submit the explanation called for in G.O. No. 655 dated 15th February 1893 regarding the management of the Pithapuram Estate. I regret that, having now quitted the Godavery District — the order of Government under reply has just reached me on my arrival at Chatrapur — I am only able to write from recollection, and in general terms, and not in reference to records.

2. The chief reason why more progress has not been made and cannot readily be made in the proper management of the Estate is the fact that the suit brought by the adoptive son has been and will be for some time pending. The Sanadars and their Establishments, who must supply material for all accounts, consist throughout of men who belonged to the old regime — men who are for the most part inefficient and whom it would be desirable to replace by others who would render more faithful service, but who, owing to the influence which they exercise over persons whose adherence to the Minor Zemindar must be secured for the purposes of the suit, cannot be very violently disturbed without great risk of disaster

disaster to the minors' cause. The same may, in a less degree, be said of the Manager's Office (please see para 5 (1) of my endorsement dated 27th September 1892 29 284). These circumstances constituted and still constitute standing difficulties interfering with the punctual performance of all work. Mr. Miller, I believe, did his best, and the present Manager has done his best to infuse more life into the administration; but until the incubus of the suit is removed, very little real progress will, I am afraid, be made.

3. My personal concern with the administration of the Estate began only at the end of February 1892. Mr. Miller was then Manager. When, after a few months, Government decided to remove him, I selected the person whom I considered the most suitable among the eligible applicants as his successor, and up to date I have not repented of my choice. But the fact of a change in the person of the Manager naturally caused some impediment to work. The new Manager necessarily took some time to grasp the situation, and it is not surprising that he was not able to make more rapid progress than he did in the submission of accounts and of the Budget. I do not think that there was any remissness on the part of my Office in issuing reminders regarding the accounts or the Budget, or that there was any unnecessary delay in the revision of the Budget figures when the Budget was received from the Manager. The causes which rendered the punctual submission of all accounts and of the Budget difficult were so well known that explanation was unnecessary.

4. I have no doubt that, with more time at my disposal, I might have done more personally towards improving the administration of Pithapur; but I venture to submit that, so far as I was able, I tried to do my duty by the Estate, and that my shortcomings were chiefly due to the great bulk of other work which devolved upon me.

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

Collector.

COURT OF WARDS.

From 822 of 1893

A. W. B. Higgens Esquire,
Collector of Godavery (in transit)

To The Secretary to Govt.,
Revenue Department, Madras
through the Board of Revenue

BOARD OF REVENUE
6 MAR 93
MADRAS

Dated Chatrapur 28th February 1893.

Re. Extra A.

Subject

Submitting explanation called for in G.O. Rd. 655 dated 15th February 1893 regarding the management of the Pithapuram Estate.

1893
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 1
To Current No. 3317.

Confidential

COURT OF WARDS OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Court of Wards.

Dated 28th April 1893
No. 1358

READ letter from A. W. B. Higgens Esq. No. Extra A dated 28th February 1893.

Resolution. Submitted to Government in Continuation of Courts' Proceedings dated 25th April 1893, No. 1323.

C.R.D. 3240/93

2. Mr. Higgens "Explanation" is, in the opinion of the Board of Revenue & Court of Wards, no more Satisfactory than was Mr. Miller's. Under the plea of the paramount importance of the Succession Suit the whole of the Estate establishment seems to have been left absolutely to its own devices nor is there any evidence to show that Mr. Higgens did anything in the direction of putting any effective pressure on the Manager to get the accounts of the

the estate Settles. The facts Set-forth in Court of Wards Proceedings dated 17th December 1892, No 4400, Show that it was not merely the budget that was neglected, but that even the Simple accounts Current were Scandalously delayed, while Mr Higgens was making reckless proposals for a loan by telegram.

3. In Separate Proceedings (No 135) of 28th April 1893) the Court has expressed its views on the mismanagement of the estate as ascertained on personal inspection of the office by the Acting Third Member.

C No. 3316/93

/True Extract/

for Manager
Ag Secretary.

To
The Secretary to Govt.
Revenue Dept. with Mr Higgins'
letter in original

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. S. 3240, 3316, 3317.

From

Dated 189

FOR ORDERS.

The explanations submitted by messrs. Higgins & miller in reply to G.O. 15 Feby. 1893. No 655, is submitted for orders, (alone, with the C. of W.'s remarks in each case.) as per the G.O. was communicated direct to the officers concerned, instead of through the Board.

C. No. 3316 contains the Board's Courts remarks regarding the management of the Pithapuram Estate, based on a report by the Acting Third member.

The explanations of Messrs Higgins & Miller are very unsatisfactory & while they fully neglected their duty as Manager of the Pithapuram Estate, this is shown by the Court's Proc.

C.W.S.
15.5.93.

of the 28 April 93 357.
The Court is justified
in keeping its distinct
fact in at the withdrawing
of the administration and
in repudiating the policy
which was adopted in respect
of appointments to the charge
but of the Estate simply
for the purposes of the pending
suit. Legal rights &
liabilities have both of the
parties but in consequence
of the occurrence of Sir
Courts
in the ~~Court~~ views last
stated & recorded.

C.S. Tupper.

Management of the
Pithapuram Estate.

The Hon. Mr. Garstin C.S.I.

The Hon. Sir W. E. Sorrell
K.C.S.I.

Lapse
24/5
21/5/93 Mc
22 May

Read G Nos. 3240 & 3316
& 3317

G.O. Misc. D. 1931 dated 26th May 1893

Recorded.

2. The Government fully concurs in the remarks of the Court of Wards.

C.S.
25/5/93

Form Orders

To the Court of Wards
with the 1 endorsed.
G.O. B. Fisher Esq. I.C.S.
C.P. L.C. Lindsay Esq. I.C.S.
25 May 93.

Dispd
29/5/93

C No. 3240 & 3316 & 3317

Draft Go.

Re: management of the Pittapur Estate.

DISPOSED OF BY GOVT ORDER
No. 1931
1926 Aug 1/3

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for Signature.

Despatched.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter

READ AGAIN G.O., N. DATED
189 ,

Spare Copies.

Struck .. ..

Issued .. ..

CURRENT No.

Total ..

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

In hand ..

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. ..

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

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