CONFIDENTIAL.

Revenue (1893) Department.

G.O., No. 3539.
Confidential No. 611.
DATED 25 September 93

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording Pro. of the Court of Wards stating that the Court cannot withdraw from the Condemnation which it has already expressed in regard to the management of the Pittapore estate by Bickly D. Jagannadha Rau.

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 44

1893.

Court of Wards,

MADRAS.

Current Number
6820.

To

The Secretary to Govt.
Rd.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
13 SEP 93
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Recd 13/9/93

Encl. 1 & 59 (including 8(a))

Proceedings, dated 8. 9. 1893

No. 2976.

Subject.

Stating that the Court cannot withdraw from the Condemnation which it has already expressed in regard to the management of the Pittapur Estate by Mr. K. Ry. D. Jagannadha Rao.

COURT OF WARDS OFFICE MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Court of Wards,

Dated 31 July — 1893.

No. 2489

READ Endorsement of the Collector of Godavari dated 9 June 1893 No 158.

Resolution

The settlement of the tannas in question is approved with the following remarks:-

(1) It is stated that in the case of Vemavaram and Vizianagaram, a hamlet of Mallavaram, reductions of Rs 250 and 400 respectively have been allowed in order to compensate the villagers for the loss of crops sustained in previous years. In such cases the proper procedure would be to remit the rent due by the villagers for the years in which the loss occurred.

(2) A report giving full information in regard to the lands taken up for the East Coast Railway, the compensation awarded &c should

should be forwarded in due coure

(2) Sanction is accorded for writing off the sum of Rs 25 refered to in the con-cluding sentence of para 13 of the Manager's letter.

3 The delay on the part of the Manager in submitting his report was excessive, but Mr. Jagannadha Row has since left the service of the Court of Wards.

(True Extract)

(signed) W. S. Meyer.
Ag Secretary

To
The Collector
of Godavari

(True Copy)

Ag Secretary.

To. Government

1893.

Court of Wards,

MADRAS.

To

Copy of

Proceedings, dated 31 July 1893,

No. 2489.

Subject.

1893
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 1
To Current No. 6820

COURT OF WARDS OFFICE
MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Court of Wards,

Dated 25th April — 1893.

No. 1324

READ letter from the Collector of Godavari dated 17th March 1893 No. 68

Resolution

The Manager's explanation is altogether unsatisfactory. It was his business to see that the accounts were sent up in proper time from the tauna offices, and this he completely failed to do. — Moreover when the accounts were forwarded by him, they were sent up in a disgracefully incomplete state.

(2) M.R.Ry. Jagannadha Rao — management of the Pithapur Estate has hitherto been marked by an utter absence of zeal and efficiency, and if he does not speedily improve, the Court will not hesitate to remove him from

from his appointment. In the meantime, in order to ensure the proper submission of the accounts current in future, the Collector is directed to stop the Managers pay whenever the accounts current for any month are not received by him in proper form before the end of the month next succeeding, and not to disburse it until they have been duly rendered.

(3) The late Collector Mr. Higgens is also much to blame for his remissness in not taking steps to keep the Manager up to his duty and in not reporting his neglect to the Court.

(4) With reference to para 9 of his memo to the manager dated 24th January 1893 No. 24, the Collector is directed to deal with the adjustment of the advances without further delay.

(True Extract)

(signed) W.S. Meyer

Ag Secretary

To
The Collr of Godavari
A.W.B. Higgens Esqr.

(True Copy)

Ag Secretary

189*3*.

Court of Wards,
MADRAS.

To

Copy of

Proceedings, dated 25 April — 1893,
No. 1324.

Subject.

1893.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 2
To Current No. 6820

N.B.—*The reply to this communication should be addressed to the Secretary, Court of Wards.*

COURT OF WARDS OFFICE MADRAS.

Memorandum.

Dated the 24 December 1892.

No. 4556.

It is observed that there is habitual and excessive delay in the submission of administration reports, accounts-current from the Godavari collectorate. The marginally-noted returns which have been long overdue have not yet been submitted and in regard to the accounts current at any rate which are of a very simple character, there can be no excuse for delay. The Court has already had to comment on the Collector's dilatoriness in connection with the Pittapur Estate (Court's Proceedings dated 17 December 1892 No. 4400) and trusts that he will now take steps of a character sufficiently stringent to ensure punctual compliance with the Court's orders.

(1) Accounts-current from May '92 & sub-vouchers for previous months of the Pittapore Estate.

(2) Accounts-current from August '92 of Lakkavaram & Tengallamudi.

(2) Administration Reports for fasli 1301 of all estates.

(4) D.C.B. statements, Public Works Progress Reports &c &c.

(Signed) W. S. Meyer
Ag Secretary

To the Collr of
Godavari

(True Copy)
Lmeyer
Ag Secretary

1893
To Current No. 8820

"Confidential"

COURT OF WARDS OFFICE
MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Court of Wards,

Dated 8 September 1893.

No. 2976.

Read the following Endt of the Collector of Godavari dated 22nd July 1893, No. C. 15 on letter from the R.Ry D. Jagannadha Rao, dated 26 June 1893.

Forwarded to the Court of Wards.

Resolution:-

In the papers read above the R.Ry. D. Jagannadha Rao Pantulu, late Manager of the Pittapur Estate, requests a reconsideration of the censures passed upon him by the Court of Wards in

in that Capacity in Court's Progs:
25th April 1893, No: 1324 and 28th
April 1893, No 1357.

2. The gist of the Rajah Jagannadha
Rao's Defence is that the accounts
current, in regard to which the
former Progs: was passed, and
which were also referred to in Court's
Progs: 24th December 1892, No 4536
among other papers, were submitted
with much greater promptitude
and Correctness in his time than
is that of Mr: Muller, and that
there was also considerable im-
-provement in the Collections, as
in other matters, during his adminis-
-tration which lasted from June 1892
to July 1893. He Contends further
that he was most seriously hampered

(1) by the "instructions" issued by
Mr: Muller in regard to the Sub-
-ordination of all other matters, to
the interests of the Succession Suit,
and (2) by the inefficiency of the
Estate Establishments.

3. With reference to para 11 of the Rajah
Jagannadha Rao's Explanation the
Court has to observe that the state
ment now made as to the prepara-
-tion of a list of debts is in direct
variance with what its present
Fourth Member was told when he
visited the District in March last.
Mr: Arundel could then get no
information from the Manager
on this important matter.

4. That there was some gradual
improvement both as regards account
work and Collections during the
35 months that elapsed from the
time

in the time the Estate was taken under
25 management
in August 1850 to
the termination of Rv: Jagannadha
Rao's management, may be admitted
and the Court also observes that
this improvement was specially
marked during the months that
followed an inspection (in March
1853) by a member of the Court of
wards which the extreme maladmi-
-nistration of the Estate up to that
time had rendered necessary.
Had this not been so it would have
been a case not merely for censuring
Mr. Rv. Jagannadha Rao or for
removing him from the post of
manager, but for recommending
to Government his reduction from
the rank of Deputy Collector. The
purpose of employing highly paid
Special

Special managers for this Estate was in
of Course to reduce order out of the
chaos that prevailed at the time of
the late Raja's death, and what a
the Court has had to report and
Censure is that after 3 years of
management so very little has been
done in this direction.

5. Nor has the Court failed to take
into account that Rv: Muller's
management was in every respect
painfully inefficient and that
Mr. R. Rv. Jagannadha Rao was
very much impeded to start with
by the evil traditions of his pre-
decessor's regime and by the
policy which the latter had adopted
in regard to the succession suit and
which was embodied in the 'decree'
referred to in Court's Proc: 28th April
1893 No 1357 and in para 4 of
Court's Proc: 25th April 93, No 1323. The
Court

Court has already in the last mentioned Proc: expressed in strong terms, its opinion of Mr: Miller's management and its remarks have received the Concurrence of Govt.

6. But it is idle for Lukka Jagannadha Rao to plead his predecessor's mistakes and incompetence as an excuse for having followed in the same lines. He was a much older and more experienced man than Mr: Miller, and must have already obtained during his Considerable Service as Huzur Sheristadar a very good idea of the General position and politics of the Estate.— Mr: Miller had no power to give him "instructions" on any point, and it is seriously to his discredit that he simply accepted the state of things resulting from that Gentleman's unwise 'memorandum' above referred to without making any attempt to bring them to notice, and in view to effecting a new departure. As he ought to, there can be no doubt that the disavowal of Mr: Miller's policy which the Court promptly made, on its discovery, in 1893, would have been obtained much sooner to the great benefit of the estate administration.

7. Granting again that Lukka Jagannadha Rao had a very incompetent establishment working under him, it is again to his discredit that he did not promptly bring the fact to the Collector's notice and to suggest remedies therefor. As he failed to do this he cannot shield himself behind the shortcomings of his subordinates.

Further

8. Further the worse the Subordinate officials, the greater the necessity for a close supervision of their work. But in this the Manager altogether failed. The Court's Fourth Member found, on his inspection above referred to, that Dt. Rly. Jagannadha Rao Garu had never taken the trouble to examine the D.C.B. accounts of the headquarter Taluqs or of any single village - And from some papers which have lately been before the Court it appears that a considerable amount of debts that might otherwise have been recovered have been lost to the estate by lapse of time owing to failure on the part of the management to take any steps for their recovery. The person chiefly responsible for this is the Assistant Manager whose services have since been dispensed with, but there seems to have been a complete want of Control over his work exercised by Mr. Dudley but subsequently by Dt. Rly. Jagannadha Rao both of whom as Managers were primarily responsible for the finances of the Estate.

9. A further instance of Dt. Rly. Jagannadha Rao's negligence is furnished by the excessive delay in carrying out the settlement of certain Estate Taluqs (taken credit for in para 9 of his Explanation) which was noticed in Court's Proc^gs. dated 31st/July 1893 No 2489.

In.

c. No 6820.

Forwarders.

The Court of Wards submits an explanation from M.R.Ry. D. Jagannatha Rao Pantulu, late Manager of the Pithapuram Estate, together with its Proceedings declining to accept the explanation. M.R.Ry. J. Rao Pantulu's defence is summarized in the Court's Pros. Orders are requested as to whether the Court's opinion may be accepted & recorded. The explanation ~~is dated~~ bears date subsequent to M.R.Ry. J.R. Pantulu's resignation of his post as Manager

hls 20/9.

I think it may be recorded
Hd/ 24/9. Expunged. If Jagannatha Rao stands for re-appointment his opinion will be of importance. But my opinion is that J. Rao was not restored to the post. The Court ought now to form its opinion on his fitness for the post. If it is not favourable he ought to be informed of the fact & asked to resign. If he declines to do so the Court should report to Govt. but he did not like to do this or thought himself precluded from doing so. Either he should be dismissed or his petition should be rejected & he informed thereof.

23/9/93

Cwds
18-9-93.

To.

M.R.Ry D. Jagannadha Rao Pantulu Garu
with copy of C.P. 31.7.93 / 2489.

The Collr of Godavari.

Secy to Govt. Rd. with the Manager's letter 4 encls; C.W.R. No 2155 4 encls; C.W.R. No 1095 4 encls: all in orgl to be returned with copies of C/S 4556/24.12.92, 1324/25.4.93 & 2489/31.7.93.

to. In short M.R.Ry Jagannadha Rao until he was galvanized into action by Mr. Arnold's inspection, took things mainly as he found them and the Court cannot therefore with benefit from the condemnation which it has already expressed in regard to his management.

11. A Copy of these Proceedings will be submitted for the information of Government.

Yours obedt

Lwgs

Ag Secretary.

Mr R.Ry. L. Jagannatha Raós
Pantulu's Explanation regarding
his management of the
Pithapur Estate.

G.O. (Mis) No 3539 dt 25-9-93
Revised -

Ll 25/9.

DISPOSED OF BY GO.T ORDER.
3539
25-9-93

The Hon. Mr Garstin CSI.
The Hon. Sir H.E. Stokes KCSI.

To the Court of Wards 26/9.
with 16 Encls-retd

Forwarders -

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., No. 189 , DATED

Spare Copies.

Struck .. ..

Issued .. ..

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No

Total ..

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.