

CONFIDENTIAL.

Revenue (1894) Department.

G.O., No. 954

Confidential No. 637

DATED 6 March 94

[Despatch Abstract.]

Expressing entire concurrence with Board's view
of Mr. Le Jan's action in giving two grade
promotions to his Angkor Sheridatta, Krishnanna Chari

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 of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 21st February 1894.

No. 883 (mis)

READ again B.P. 2. 13 Feb'y '94 No 717.
 also Board's Sub-Register No 575 of 1894 (from Col. V. Arcot 19 Feb'y 4)
 — Encl. of Col. V. Arcot on V. Krishnamachari's application for 3 mos. privilege leave d. 6 Feb'y 4.
Resolution

In the Proceedings read again above
 the Collector of North Arcot was asked to
 explain his action in appointing M.R. V.
 Krishnamachari to be permanent Tahsildar
 of Arcot on Rs 225, on the 31st January last,
 when he knew that the Board had instituted
 an enquiry into that officer's conduct only
 a fortnight previously, and before he had been
 made acquainted with the result thereof.

2/ In his reply M. Le Fanu states that
 he was under the impression that there was
 nothing against Krishnamachari, & that if there
 was

any real charge against his subordinate he would have been kept duly informed of the same. He formed the impression from the account of the inquiry furnished to him by Krishnamachari and from the fact that the demi-official letter which he received from the Secretary on the 22nd January did not enlighten him as to the real nature of the investigation or as to whether there was any charge against Krishnamachari.

3 The inquiry was concluded on the 22nd Jan, the papers were submitted to Govt on the 27th; they were received back on the 2nd February & on the 3rd February the Board issued its Proceedings No 552, transferring Krishnamachari to Cuddapah. The Board cannot understand how the Collector, even upon the garbled account of the matter given by his Sheristadar, can have concluded that the Board had nothing further to communicate beyond its Secretary's demi-official of the 22nd January; and in submitting the papers to Govt it is compelled to observe that Mr. Le Fanu's action in promoting Krishnamachari, within ten days after the conclusion of the inquiry, from being Tahsildar on Rs 175, to be Tahsildar on Rs 225, without prejudice to his subprotem appointment as Huzur Sheristadar, has all the appearance of an intention to nullify any decision adverse to Krishnamachari at which the Board might, and as a matter of fact did, arrive.

4 The Board cannot of course recognize the promotion accorded to Krishnamachari in such a manner and at such a time, and in the exercise of its general power of revision directs that he should proceed at once to take up his appointment as Subprotem Huzur Sheristadar of Cuddapah, as already ordered, in B.P. D. 3 Feb 94. No 552. His application for three months privilege leave will be rejected.

5 D. Krishna Rao, ~~Subprotem~~^{Huzur} Huzur Sheristadar of Cuddapah, will proceed to N. Arcot as directed in B.P. 552, d. 3 Feb 94, on relief by Krishnamachari.

(True Extract)


Minister
Secretary.

To The Secretary to Govt, Revenue Dept
with N. Arcot Collis letter d. 19 Feb 94.
in orig! (to be forwarded)



Revenue (1894) Department.

Confidential No. 8
Current Number 1446.



B.P. No. 883, d. 21 Feby 94

Recd 22/2/94.

Encl. 1.

Subject

Remarks on the promotion
of V. Krishnamachari, Subproblem
Hajur Sheristadar, Narcoth to
2nd grade Tahsildar on Rs 225

P.T.O.

Drift G.O. for approval.

954 d. 6-3-94
G.O. 6/3/94 3/3

H.E. the Commr in
Council entirely concurs
in the Board's view of
Mr Le Fanu's action
and considers that he
is deserving of some
censure for his conduct
which appears to border
upon insubordination.

Ch
3 lines.

The Commr & Genl Revenue
with 1 Encl.
Dtd 6/3/94

D
2 1,000-7-9-93.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 1446

Confidential No. 8

From

Dated

189

FOR ORDERS.

The Board submits Mr
Le Fanu's explanation as to
his action in having pro-
posed his Sheristadar's
removal at the time when
the letters under were under
examination in the Board's office.
Mr Le Fanu's explanation seems
to me very lame as he can
hardly have been fully believed
that there was nothing against
Krishnamachari although the
Board had not informed him that
the charge was not correct
state it was his obvious duty
to wait & ask before proposing
a man whose conduct he knew
to be under enquiry - I am
in the Board's view of Mr
Fanu's action & think that
he is deserving of severe
censure.

So do I

Mr de Fanu's conduct appears
to me to border on
insubordination.

2 Mar.

22/2

23/2/94

Ch
22 Feb/94

FOR ORDERS.

Lt Col Fines Stationer
Regarding his action in
promoting Keith's nomination

Ans to the Governor

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for Signature.

Despatched.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
 189 ,

DATED

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

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.