

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 5-31

Press
Mis

31-32

Dated 1st March 1869

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st March 1869.*

No. 31. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 26th February 1869:—

Read the following letter from the Acting Sub-Collector in charge of the Kistna District, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated on Circuit at Vinukonda, 18th February 1869, No. 36 of 1869.

1. I have the honor to forward, for the information of the Board and Government, a petition lately presented to me by one M. Venkataramanaya, in which charges of a very serious nature are brought against V. Venkatachellam Puntulu, late Deputy Collector in charge of this Division, but now employed in the Inam Department. A translation of this petition is also submitted for easy reference.

2. Though from the concluding portion of the petition, it appears that the petitioner is a man who has suffered injury at the late Deputy Collector's hands, and that consequently it may savor somewhat of animosity, still the boldness of the man in presenting his petition, just at the time when the Deputy Collector was expected to return to his Division, and in publicly asserting that the statements contained in it were true, led me to conclude that he would not have dared to come up at this particular time, unless he had some very good grounds to go upon.

3. As the greater part of the irregularities attributed to the Deputy Collector seemed to hinge upon his possession of a Temple at Chilakalurpetta, in Rajapett Talook, I went to the place, to see if there were any truth in what had been stated: on enquiry, I found there was a very great deal of truth in it.

4. I found that, as stated in the petition, there is a temple called "Sri Sita-ramaswamy," which had been erected by the Deputy Collector's father, and extended and improved by himself, and that he had built a car, and erected a portico of bricks-in-chunam, a very substantial edifice for its reception. This portico is situated at the corner of two public streets, and at a convenient distance from the temple itself. I also saw the garden, spoken of in the petition, on the banks of the "Ogeru" river. In it there is a "Mantapam" built of hewn granite, and a "Koveru," or square tank, rivetted with stones. These were constructed by the Deputy Collector, Venkatachellam, in connection with the temple, and for the use of the god, at the time when processions take place. Along side the wall of the temple and in the street, I saw a large quantity of hewn granite stones which had evidently belonged to some old Pagoda.

5. In the petition, it is stated, that the Deputy Collector had the above works executed in the following way, *i. e.* by raising contributions, by forced and unpaid labor, and by obtaining materials, timber and stone, &c., without permission and free of cost. It is, moreover, stated that he employed public servants to supervise, and by their Agency, impressed the villagers for the work. From what came out, on enquiry, I have every reason to believe the above to be perfectly true.

6. I will now proceed to state the facts on which I am led to form the above opinion, as they were communicated to me: one man's name is brought prominently forward in connection with the whole transaction. This is *Polumrazu Narsaya* who is said to be a near relative of the Deputy Collector. He is the Dhurmakurta of the temple, having been appointed to that post by the Deputy Collector; and it will be a question for consideration, whether the part he played in the matter,

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st March 1869.

as detailed below, was altogether independent of the Deputy Collector, or was done with the knowledge and connivance of the latter.

7. After the Deputy Collector came to this Division, a method was devised for obtaining local contributions for the maintenance of the temple. This took the form of a *bandy tax*; one Anna was collected on every bandy bringing merchandise into the Town, and half Anna on every bandy leaving it. As this entailed considerable inconvenience on the Pagoda people, it was rented out by Narsaya the Dhurmakurta, a little more than five years ago, to one Nullakonda Janakeramadu on a lease of three years, who sublet it for the last year of his lease to Madhi Subbaya, a Komati of Chelakalurpetta; on the expiry of this lease, a new one was granted for three years to this Madhi Subbaya by Narsaya. This lease, is unexpired, and has eight more months to run. The annual rental is 200 Rupees, and this Madhi Subbaya executed a contract for the payment of the same to the Pagoda, one Mylaverapu Gundaya standing security for him. The original Contract-deed is stated to be with the Dhurmakurta, and the surety informed me that he certified at the foot of the same that he would stand security for the due payment of the rent by Madhi Subbaya. Neither the Contractor nor his surety made any secret of the transaction. The former showed me his accounts, in which I found entries of receipts from the bandy-men. The latter produced the Agreement entered into by the Contractor (in which he bound himself to pay the instalments as they fell due) as well as receipts granted him by Narsaya, and orders to pay certain sums to other parties, debiting the same to the "Sri Sitaramaswamy" issued by the same individual, together with other accounts and papers. By virtue of the lease, the renter is authorized to collect fees at the rates given above from the bandymen, and has been doing so up to the present time. He says the lease is usually worth the amount of his rent. If more, he pockets the excess, if less, he has to suffer the loss. Lately, he says, he has been a loser.

8. Even were the collections voluntary, I conceive the practice to be objectionable, but when undue influence, which though possibly not, is certainly looked upon by the public as official, is brought to bear to make people pay against their will, the affair assumes a very serious aspect, e. g. the renter states that if any bandyman refuses to pay the usual fee, the other Komaties are called, and make him do before him, and he orders them to pay. To what cause can this influence of Narsaya be possibly, attributed, except to the fact that he is a relative of the Deputy Collector and the Dhurmakurta of the Deputy Collector's temple? A similar practice of collecting small fees, from people bringing bundles of grass and straw for sale into Masulipatam, for the maintenance of a Pagoda in that place, was brought to light some time ago, and Mr. Thornhill issued a proclamation, declaring the same to be illegal, and prohibiting its continuance; and I believe the practice is by no means an uncommon one.

9. I will now proceed to detail the information given me regarding the building of the Temple car, and the portico in which it stands. The car was constructed by one Salim Khan, a resident of Parushottapatnam a village close to Chilkaloorpett. It appears that the Deputy Collector first requested the brother of this Salim Khan, one Hussan Khan Saib, a respectable Mussulman gentleman, and ex-Tahsil-

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st March 1869.

dar of Vinukonda Talook, to get this car built for him, and sent him, by Narsaya above mentioned, 50 Rupees as an advance. He took the money as he could not refuse to comply with the request of the Deputy Collector; but on his Priest advising him to have nothing to do with it, he went to Bapatla, and wrote to the Deputy Collector begging him to get the work done by some one else. The car cost over 800 Rupees, and was built under the supervision of his brother Selim Khan, the money being raised by Narsaya by contributions from the villagers.

10. Selim Khan states that in all, 850 Rupees passed through his hands, 50 of which were given by the Deputy Collector and the remaining 800 were paid him by Narsaya in instalments, extending over five or six months. He paid the money partly to the carpenters who came from Bander, and expended about 50 Rupees for timber, and 100 Rupees for iron. Other wood, besides that purchased by Selim Khan, was brought by the villagers. The particulars are as follows. Some weavers of Rajapett brought two Vepa (Margosa) trees from that place. One "Derisana" tree (procured through the late Tahsildar) was brought from Kesana-pille. Another tree of the same kind was brought from Dandamudi by another brother of Selim Khan named Kassim Khan, who had it cut down for the purpose by the villagers. Kassim Khan admits having done so, and the timber was used for the wheels of the car. Neither Selim Khan nor Kassim Khan received any consideration for the trouble they underwent in constructing the car. The above information was communicated to me by Selim Khan, Hussain Khan Saib, and Kassim Khan.

11. Vaugaru Kotuppa, V. Guruppa and V. Venkayya, Weavers of Rajapett, state that, 5 years ago, when the car was being built, two Talook peons came to them, and said the Deputy Collector wanted them. They went to Chilkaloorpett where the Deputy Collector was, and saw the Curnums of their village and Narsaya the Dhurmakurta, who told them the Deputy Collector required some timber for the car, whereupon they gave up a Margosa tree value 10 or 12 Rupees, but received no price, or other consideration for it. Avari Lingaya also gave a tree for the same purpose and in a similar way. They gave up the trees not knowing what might be done to them if they refused.

12. So much as regards the building of the car, which would shew that the Deputy Collector at all events knew that it was being built and gave 50 Rupees towards it, though it has not transpired from what sources the sum of 800 Rupees paid by Narsaya, was obtained. It may have been paid by the Deputy Collector to Narsaya from his own private pocket, whether again he actually knew that the villagers had supplied timber or not, I am not in a position to say; but whether he knew it or not, it is evident that his name was used, and that trees were obtained from the villagers under the influence of his name, and that they received no consideration.

13. After the car was finished, it was necessary to select some convenient site, on which to build a portico for its reception. The Deputy Collector asked Hussan Khan Saib to sell him a godown site belonging to him in the village for this purpose. As, however, there were partners in the concern, the land was not made over immediately; but, on the Deputy Collector obtaining the consent of one of them (Amcenkhan, since deceased) he and this Hussan Khan Saib conjointly gave

the ground to the Deputy Collector, the extent so given being 4 yards square. For this, Hussan Khan Saib declares that he received no consideration; but admits that from fear of the Deputy Collector, he signed a document purporting to be a deed of sale for the land, which was prepared by Narsaya, who told him that the Deputy Collector desired him to sign it, whether then, in this case, there was any consideration or not is doubtful, but in a Court of law the deed of sale with the man's signature would of course be put in as evidence of the receipt of consideration.

14. The portico was then erected on this ground; but in building it, the street on each side was considerably encroached upon. The land, given for the purpose, adjoined the street, forming a corner. The total length of Hussan Khan Saib's godown site was 16 yards and a half E and W., the breadth being 4 yards. The whole block as it now stands was measured in my presence, and is 18 yards long by 4 and a half in breadth. The street running north and south has therefore been encroached upon to the extent of a yard and a half, and that running east and west of $\frac{1}{2}$ a yard. This is sufficiently evidenced by glancing along the line of houses in each of the streets; but this is not all. If an encroachment on the public street is allowed to be made for the accommodation of the Deputy Collector's car, similar concessions can hardly be denied to others: consequently, Hussan Khan Saib was told by Narsaya that he might extend his godowns bringing them out to the same line with the portico in the street running east and west. Hussan Khan Saib of course, availed himself of this privilege. I was wrong, now I think of it, in doubting if he received any consideration for the land given up to the Deputy Collector, for of course he gained more one way than he lost another. The consideration was more than adequate, but then unfortunately it was not the Deputy Collector's or his man Narsaya's to give.

15. As regards the construction of the portico, it was stated by Ramachetty Kassipatti and others, that the bricks were made by the pot-makers and fuel brought by the Vetties free of hire; and that the Komaties were called upon to contribute bratties for fuel, at the rate of 200 per each house. I casually asked a Komatic named G. Pullaya, who had come to my camp with supplies, and who had set up a small temporary shop under a tree close by, about this, and he unhesitatingly said that he had given a basket of bratties as his contribution towards fuel for burning bricks for the portico, and that all the other Komaties did the same, being told to do so by a Talook peon named Mekala Athayappa. The peon handed over the bratties to the Vetties to be taken to the pot-makers who made the bricks. Another Komatic told the same story, but neither of them was paid any thing for the fuel.

16. I also questioned four Vetties of the village about it, and they said they were employed for two or three months in cutting wood, bringing paddy husks and bratties (which latter were supplied by the Komaties) for fuel to burn the bricks required for building the car portico. They were ordered to do this by the peon abovementioned (Mekala Athayappa) and by the Daloyet (of the Deputy Collector's office) named Balaramprasad who supervised the work. They did not receive any wages for the work done by them. The Deputy Collector and Tahsildar were in

this Village at the time, and one of the Vetties (Ayogodu) says that upon asking the peons, who impressed him for hire, they refused to give him any, whereupon he went direct to the Deputy Collector and characteristically enough, asked him "if he (the Vetti) was not born to eat food?" The answer he received was that he was a Vetti and that was enough! a peculiar significance attaches to this answer; for, as the Board perhaps are aware, the literal meaning of *వెట్టి* is people who do work for nothing.

Vettivandlu.

17. Two pot-makers of Chilkalurpetta named Sashaya and Mamaya informed me, that they were employed for 3 months together with the pot-makers of the surrounding villages in making bricks for the Deputy Collector's portico, these men being appointed maistries over the others. They were impressed by the same Talook peon, who has been mentioned above, and by Balaram the Deputy Collector's Daloyet, who gave one of them (Sashaya) 5 Rupees as an advance, which he distributed among the others: twelve men were employed each day, and, at the usual rate, they ought to have received 4 Annas per man, per diem. They received, however, no consideration beyond the 5 Rupees advanced to them. They asked the Peon and Moonsiff and Carnum for hire, but were told that as the *శ్రీ* (Deputy Collector) had come there, it was their business to work for nothing. They then appealed to the Deputy Collector himself, and represented that, though former Zemindars made them work without hire, they at least gave them *batta*, &c. This appeal, however, was not favorably received, for they were told by the Deputy Collector that he was the *శ్రీ* master and they must do the work any how.

18. If this evidence is to be believed, and I have no reason to doubt the truth of what was told me, it would appear that the portico was built for nothing, that people were forced to work without any remuneration, that the agents employed to supervise the work, were public servants, subordinates of the Deputy Collector, and that the appeal made to the Deputy Collector himself by the laborers did not procure them any redress.

19. The ("Koncru") tank and the "Muntapum" in the Deputy Collector's garden on the banks of the "Ogeru" still remain to be disposed of: with regard to the former, one Tyagure Lingareddy, the Pedda kapu (head man) of Chilkalurpetta, states that he was ordered by the Deputy Collector and Narsaya to collect bandies and bullocks to convey the stones from a well in the bazaar at Chilkalurpetta to the garden by the river. The Daloyet Balaram superintended the collection of the bandies, the stones were placed upon them and taken to the garden, where the tank diggers were set to work to excavate the "Koncru," and to rivet it with the stones. This Lingareddy gave his own bandy for the purpose for ten days, and the owner of each bandy in the village had to take four loads. No remuneration was given to him or any one else in his village as bandy hire: the peon Balaram said the Deputy Collector would not pay them anything: I was also informed by other villagers that the tank was constructed in this way.

20. The stones used for building the Mantapum, as well as for the temple were brought from the old "Madirala Madhavi" Pagoda at Madirala near Rajapett. I visited the site of this pagoda, and found a few stones still standing. It is about four miles from Chilkalurpetta. Lingareddy, "the Pedda kapu" of the latter place, says

also that he had to fetch a big stone from this pagoda which took three pairs of bullocks to draw it. The stone now forms part of the roof of the "Mantapum." Kodireddy, the "Pedda kapu" of Kavur, states that the Moonsiff and Curnum of his village ordered him and the villagers to supply bandies, bullocks and coolies to convey stones from this pagoda to Chilkalurpetta. They did so; and took the stones and deposited them by the side of the Sitaramasawmy temple. This Kodireddy, took two long stones there, driving two pairs of bullocks on each trip. A ryot of the same village named Linga Appunna makes the same statement, and says he sent a bullock to help to convey the stones, as the Curnum told him it was to be done by "Circar's orders." One Adilachmi, a woman, residing in the same village states, she lent her bullock for the purpose, that it was yoked to a bandy with others, and took a heavy stone to Chilkalurpetta, and that it came back in the evening "half dead." This woman also states that 2 peons came to the village and restrained the people from going to their fields or taking their cattle to graze until they gave the requisite help. None of these people received any consideration. In the same way one Sunda Kotaya, a resident of Maderala, states that he carted a bandy load of stones from the Madhavi Pagoda to the Deputy Collector's garden for the Mantapum. He was made to do so by the Duffadar and Talook peons, and got nothing for it. He moreover, states, that several people of his village who refused to supply bandies, were taken by the peons to the Deputy Collector at Chilkalurpetta, and detained there 8 days and made to hold a procession in honor of the temple, which cost them 10 Rupees. This man also states, that before the stones were removed, the Deputy Collector came into the village with the Curnum *Paradési* and inspected the pagoda, and had it pulled down by the tank diggers, under the superintendence of Talook peons. Each villager had to contribute 100 bundles (கூலி) of Cholum straw to place under the roof, so that the stones might not get broken in being removed. He gave his 100 bundles like the others, and though the straw was rendered useless, he received no payment for it. The temple was built by his ancestors, and the Deputy Collector appropriated the stones belonging to four compartments (கூலி) of it, while the Tahsildar took those of two *கூலி* for his Pagoda at Narsarowpet. So much for the force of bad example, but of the Tahsildar's pagoda I shall speak more fully hereafter.

21. From the above statements, it is clear that the villagers were obliged to afford assistance of every conceivable kind towards the construction of the Muntapum in the Deputy Collector's garden, that they received no remuneration for their labor; and that this was done through the agency of Talook Officials, under the very eye of the Deputy Collector himself.

22. For the sake of accuracy I reduced to writing the statements of those who furnished the above information; but there were many others who spoke to the same facts, whom I had no time to examine at length.

23. I will now proceed to touch upon the remaining allegations contained in the petition. It is stated that the Deputy Collector appointed the sons of two dismissed Curnums of Madirala (Rajapett) on account of the obligation rendered by them in obtaining stones from the old pagoda at that place for the temple at Chilkalurpetta. On enquiry, I found that these Curnums had been dismissed, and that their sons (mere children) were appointed in their place during their life time.

(They are alive to this day). These dismissed Curnums are also doing the work of the village. I went there and called for the Curnums, and one of the dismissed men *Paradési*, the same who is reported above, (paragraph 20) as having accompanied the Deputy Collector when he went to inspect the old Pagoda prior to its demolition, stepped forward just as if he were in office. The other man *Sotaya* did not put in an appearance. They said he was absent. I saw the son of *Paradési*, who has been appointed Curnum, he is a mere child, so young that it is not considered indecent to let him go about the streets without a stitch of clothing on him.

24. It may fairly be presumed that the stones were obtained through the instrumentality of the village officials; but whether the appointment of their sons was consequent upon the obligation rendered, is a question which has to be decided by common sense. There is no proof. A petition was presented to Mr. Plunkett who succeeded Venkatachellem as Deputy Collector, regarding the removal of the stones. He forwarded it with a letter to this office; but no orders, it appears, were passed on the matter.

25. The petition goes on to say that the Deputy Collector rented out the "Pulari izara" (grazing tax) in Vinukonda Talook to certain lower bidders, from whom he collected money for the expense of his temple. There is no proof of this: but it is certain that the tax has been rented out of late at a much higher figure than it fetched in Deputy Collector, Venkatachellem's time. In some cases it is more than double.

	Days.	Total.	
		Months.	Days.
1864 { 18th to 26th April. 4th to 23rd July...	9 20	...	29
1865 { 12th to 20th April. 14th July to 5th Aug. 26th August to 25th September. 17th November to 1st December.	9 23 30 15	2 1	17 12
1866 { 24th March to 5th May.	42		
1867 { 12th April to 3rd June. 12th Aug. to 15th idem.	53 4	1	27

26. The Deputy Collector is next stated to have spent much of his time at a village called Komara-vallipad, which is in fact part of Chelakalurpett, in order to superintend the temple improvements. A reference to his Office Diary shews that he was there during the periods noted in the margin in the years 1864 to 1867. The Superintendent of Police informed me, that this predeliction of the Deputy Collector for this particular neighbourhood was noticed at the time, owing to the great inconvenience to which prisoners under trial before him, and the Police in charge of them, were put for want of proper accommodation.

27. Of the appointment of Polunrazu Narasaya by the Deputy Collector to the Trusteeship of his temple, I have already spoken, but regarding the alleged gift, &c., of lands for the appropriation thereto, I have not been able to obtain any satisfactory proof.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st March 1869.

28. The next case, that of the Gummanumpad Manovurtidars is decidedly suspicious. I beg to forward, in extenso, copy of a statement on the subject, which I took from Kondramatla Dasaya, who is stated further on in the petition to have been illegally punished by Venkatachellem in his capacity of Deputy Magistrate. This statement, though it is hard to believe that the iniquity alleged in it, could have been committed by a public servant, holding a high position, to my mind bears upon it the impress of truth. The man's manner in giving it too, was that of a man telling the truth. I will leave it to speak for itself.

29. It is, however, quite true that the Deputy Collector, when on general duties, ordered the produce of the Porumboke Talook land, which the Manovurtidars had cultivated, to be attached. It is also true that the Manovurtidars appealed to the Collector quoting an order issued by Mr. Goldingham, late Collector of Guntoor, which gave them leave to cultivate the land; and that Mr. Thornhill directed the Tahsildar to forward the order for reference. It is also, no less a fact that the Tahsildar reported that the order referred to was not to be found in the record; (I have seen the correspondence), but what became of this order, if it ever existed, no one knows. The punishment of this man Dasaya, and the fines imposed upon the Curnums are a matter of record.

30. After Venkatachellem became Inam Deputy Collector this was one of the villages he had to settle, and a reference to the Inam Commissioner, to whom the case has been referred for disposal, and to whom petitions on the subject are stated to have been submitted by the villagers, will shew the amount of quit-rent fixed upon this village, and the Deputy Collector's proposals regarding it. If it has been fixed upon the sum mentioned by Dasaya (Rupees 600) it is a great deal too low, for I have examined the Curnums' Accounts and subjoin a Statement shewing the "Dowle" of this village from Fusly 1272 to Fusly 1277.

Fuslies.				Extent of land cultivated.		Assessment.		
				A.	K.	RS.	A.	P.
1	1272	...	...	651	39	597	8	0
2	1273	...	...	2,374	26	1,346	9	11
3	1274	...	...	2,374	26	1,346	9	11
4	1275	...	...	2,374	26	1,346	9	11
5	1276	...	...	1,102	38	788	4	0
6	1277	...	...	1,102	38	788	4	0

The Curnums state that in Fusly 1273 the cultivated lands were measured by the Deputy Collector's order, and from that year the Dowle increased. The decrease in Fuslies 1276 and 1277 is owing to the cultivation in the Tank Porumboke having been stopped under the orders of the Deputy Collector.

31. The Curnums moreover state that the quit-rent has been fixed on Rupees 600 including the Tank Porumboke, in which case it is tantamount to fixing the quit-rent on the Dowle of Fusly 1272 (there being only an increase of Rupees 2-8,) without taking into calculation the enormous increase shewn in the subsequent Fuslies. By this arrangement the Manovurtidars, of course, are considerably the gainers, but what is the reason for this indulgence being shewn to them? The

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st March 1869.

reason assigned is that the Inam Deputy Collector, Venkatachellem, got from them four Kuchels (84 acres) of land for the support of his temple at Chelakalurpett, getting it entered in the name of Gadlavallaty Streeramulu (his own man).

32. Dasaya says this is known in the village, and one of the Curnums state that he had it from Streeramulu himself. The document (Danapatrim) has not been presented for registration, and there is no proof. If it be true, the interests of both parties are so well secured that the truth is not likely to come out. In any case the reduction of the Dowle of the village requires full explanation.

33. The Deputy Collector is next said to have employed many of his own relations in the talooks in his Division. This is a fact; but an explanation on the subject was submitted by the Deputy Collector to Mr. Thornhill, who intended to remove them to other talooks. Nothing however was done, as that gentleman shortly afterwards left the district.

34. The Statement that the Deputy Collector levied contributions from the Curnums and others of Palnad Talook is too indefinite to go upon, and the allegations contained in the concluding portion of the petition do not seem to call for any particular notice.

35. In a former paragraph 20, I mentioned that P. Lukshmeenaroyruppa the Tahsildar of Rajapett, built a Pagoda at Nursarowpett. It was only natural that he should seek to emulate the example of his official superior, but the mischief does not end here. He must have a Dhurmakurta too, and to this important post he has nominated one Brahmaya the Curnum of the village (against whom there is now a charge of extortion in connection with this Pagoda). This is by his own admission, and he further states that he gave 1,000 Rupees to this Brahmaya to purchase lands for the maintenance of Pagoda. Some lands have been purchased, but the Tahsildar says he is quite ignorant of the amount expended, and the amount remaining in the hands of the Curnum Dhurmakurta. It is quite impossible to believe this statement or the one that followed it viz., that the Tahsildar has no idea how much the temple cost to build. If he got the materials for nothing, probably it cost very little. He admits that he got the land for nothing— $\frac{1}{16}$ th of an acre; but what land is this? It is part of the village site (Grama Kantam) reserved by Government, as ground to be granted to villagers for building purposes. The Tahsildar admitted to me that this was so, and that he had appropriated the land without leave, and without reporting the matter. He however, proceeds to justify himself by stating, that he shewed it to the Deputy Collector Venkatachellem, when a well was being dug in that land, in which case it was clearly the duty of the latter to have ordered the work to be stopped, but how could he possibly check the irregularities of his inferior, when the public streets in another village had been encroached upon to make room for the car belonging to his own temple, and the other abuses, since brought to light, had been committed, with his sanction, expressed or implied, or under the influence and fear of his name?

36. The force of a bad example puts an end to all discipline, and when the example is set by a public official of influence and position, the country under his charge must suffer. This seems to me to go to the root of the whole matter, and on public grounds alone. I consider it would be very bad policy to allow Deputy Collector Venkatachellem to resume charge of this Division, and I would therefore

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st March 1869.*

earnestly and respectfully beg of the Board to recommend to Government that, whatever *further* steps they may direct to be taken, he be transferred to some other district where his local interests and family-ties are not sufficiently strong to have an injurious effect upon the public.

37. I have not called upon Venkatachellam for any explanation. He is not under me, nor do I think the facts stated in this letter admit of any explanation, as they certainly do not of denial. I have, however, written so much at length for two reasons, (1) that the Board may be put in possession of all the facts, and (2) that, in the case of their calling upon Venkatachellam for an explanation, he may know exactly what has been spoken regarding him.

38. The late Acting Deputy Collector, L. Venkatappaya is now on his way to Coimbatore. It seems almost a pity that he was removed from this district just at this particular time. He is a straightforward, energetic and intelligent Officer, and is very highly spoken of in this Division, in which he was doing much good. Under these circumstances, I would venture in conclusion, to suggest, that he may be allowed to revert to his appointment as Acting Deputy Collector of this district.

1. The Board resolve to submit these papers for the Orders of Government, and to recommend that the very serious allegations against Deputy Collector V. Venkatachellam Puntulu be formally investigated under Act XXXVII. of 1850, and that the Acting Collector, Mr. Boswell who is on his way to the district, and is wholly unconnected with the enquiry already made, be appointed Commissioner, under Section 3 of the Act.

2. They understand that the services of the Deputy Collector have been dispensed with in the Inam Department, and that unless the present arrangements be counter-ordered by telegraph, he will resume charge of his Division on the 1st March. The Board are of opinion that, under the circumstances of the case this is highly undesirable.

3. Paragraphs 28—32 of Mr. Comyn's letter together with an extract from the petition of the paragraph relating to the Inam village of Gumanampudee will be forwarded to the Inam Commissioner for such observations he may consider necessary.

No. 32.

ORDER THEREON, 1st March 1869, No. 531.

Miscellaneous.

V. Vencatachellam Puntulu be formally investigated under Act XXXVII. of 1850, and he is pleased to appoint Mr. J. A. C. Boswell to be Commissioner for this purpose.

2. On reaching the District, Mr. Boswell should at once commence the enquiry concurrently with his other duties. It will, however, of course be open to him to transfer to his subordinates so much of the latter as he deems proper.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st March 1869.*

3. A telegram will at once be despatched directing the Acting Sub-Collector not to permit V. Vencatachellam to resume charge of Deputy Collector's Division until further orders.

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

70

X
I would condemn the dispatch
of telegram. - W.D.

By A. to Mr. Comyns That the
By Col. F. Venkatachellam
is not to take charge of
the Deputy Col. Office
until further orders. He
would also suggest that

This showed, I think, he done; The Bds recommendation
 Mr. Boswell ought not to take chance of the district pending
 the ruling, for he will not be able to ^x apppt Mr. Boswell to
 conduct this and the over-
 dunning summatively work at-
 once the same time. W.D. for the investigation of the

I must let Mr. Comyns change against the 2^d lot.
 The change of the list might be adopted
 but how it to turn it
 a prize within the week or any
 of his (Mr. Comyns) book is still in the
 he has not time, & Mr. Comyns. I would let him
 late change.
 Mr. Comyns ought himself to
 taking care of the
 complaints against the

Mr. Conway ought himself
to try to answer the
complaints against the

Oct. of 1869] *Illinois*.

REVENUE.

50

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

Dated March, 1st,

Fixed

Index

G. O., 1st March 1869, No. 531

7. From S. J. - New York with
E 12 16-6.
MARCH.

WAPCH

PGs: 31-32

Dputy Collector, v. Tennalachellam Purubolu.—Charges against him to be formally investigated under Act XXXVII. of 1850, by Mr. Bowdell.

Shasildar, in connection
with the construction of a
Palada, should any above
proposal be approved.
W.D.

It may be proper to con-
sider whether the late
Deputy Collector L. Venka-
tappa should not be
sent temporarily, he
ordered back to Rithua
District. W.D.

The occurrence of matters
of this serious character
within the District, cause
reflect, no credit on the
management of the Dist.
by the Collector who may
have been - W.D.

No 531 Revenue Department
Proceedings of the Madras Govt. 8
Under date the 1st March/69

Read the following
Pro: of the Board of Revenue.

Submitting, for the orders of Govt.,
papers relating to certain charges brought
against V. Venkataswami, late Deputy
Collector, and now employed in the same
Dept., & recommending that an investiga-
tion may be held under Act XXXVII. of
1850, and that Mr. J. B. Boswell may
be appointed Commissioner. -

(H. E. 26th Feb^y 1869.)

1. The Right Honorable the
Governor in Council resolves
to direct that the charges
against Deputy Collector V.
Venkataswami should be
formally investigated under Act
XXXVII. of 1850, and he is pleased to ap-
point Mr. J. B. Boswell to be Com-
missioner for this purpose.
2. On reaching the District, Mr. Boswell
should at once commence the enquiry/
conveniently with his other duties.
It will, however, of course be
open to him to transfer to his
subordinates so much of the
latter as he deems proper.
3. A telegram will at once
be despatched directing the
Acting Sub-Collector not to
permit V. Venkataswami
to resume charge of Deputy Collector's
Division until further orders. -

14 Copies of this Order of Revenue and Enquiry
Sent to the District Collector