

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. /538	<u>Press</u> <u>Mis.</u>
<i>17/172</i>	
Dated	<i>10-7-1867</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th July 1867.*

No. 171. Read the following letter from GOVINDA ROW, late Tahsildar in the District of South Arcot:—

Forwarding Memorial to the Secretary of State,
in triplicate, requesting to be restored to his
former position as Tahsildar in the South Arcot District. } (Here enter 6th June 1867.)

No. 172. ORDER THEREON, 10th July 1867, No. 1,538.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government having again reviewed the whole of the papers relating to petitioner's case, resolve to give him a further opportunity of redeeming his character, and shewing that he can still serve the State usefully.

2. The Collector of South Arcot is therefore authorized to promote him to the post of Tahsildar on a vacancy occurring, and will in due course report how he performs the duties of the office.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

„ the Accountant General.

„ the Collector of South Arcot.

„ C. Govinda Row.

Ed. S. T. Augustin.

TO

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

*The humble Memorial of GOVINDA ROW, late
Tahsildar in the District of South Arcot.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

1. That your Memorialist, who is still in the service of your Honorable Government, has faithfully and to the best of his abilities served the Crown for no less than 32 years, though not more than 21 years of that period can alone count towards pension under the rules, the earlier period of his service having been passed in grades not entitling to pension.

2 Throughout this lengthened career there is not the slightest stain to sully the purity of his service, though that service has latterly been worked out in a capacity peculiarly open to temptation and abuse of power; and until July 1865, there is no circumstance detracting from the ability with which your Memorialist had invariably discharged his duties, though those duties, as your Memorialist will presently shew, were more onerous than those of his colleagues in office. Unfortunately for him and his career in the service, the fact of a long delay in reporting a Yeomiah lapse was, about the date referred to, seized and made the subject of complaint by Mr. W. T. Whiteside, the Sub-Collector, within whose Sub-Division the Taluq of Chellambram, the Tahsil then held by your Memorialist, was situated; and that Gentleman recommended that he should be placed on the pension list as unfit for further service. On this representation, the Collector removed your Memorialist from his first Class Tahsil of Chellambram on 250 Rs. a month, where the duties were very heavy, to the Second Class Tahsil of Cuddalore on 200 Rs. a month, where the duties were comparatively light, probably as a punishment for alleged dilatoriness charged by the Sub-Collector, and probably also to meet his views of your Memorialist's unfitness for the heavy duties of Chellambram. The matter however did not end here. The circumstance attracted the attention of the Government, who, without affording your Memorialist an opportunity of submitting any explanation,* called upon the Board of Revenue and the Collector summarily to displace him from office, simply because they observed that from the Revenue Establishment List, he had completed a service of 31 years on the 1st January 1865. In this summary view of the case, there is not the slightest doubt that the Government were actuated by the best motives in the interests of the service, and in compassion to the successors to the Yeomiah who had thus been kept out of their rights for a long time; but your Memorialist would respectfully submit that the proceeding was nevertheless harsh in itself to an old servant, and scarcely called for by one single act of laches, especially when no opportunity for defence, or explanation even, was allowed.

3. In thus representing the circumstance, your Memorialist does not do so in a spirit of appeal against his masters, but he is simply desirous of placing matters in a light in which it might not have occurred to them to view the proceeding; and because having once decided in his case, they perhaps do not feel themselves at liberty to re-open their judgment. That the Government were not disposed to be ungenerous to your Memorialist, while as already submitted the proceeding in itself was under the circumstances harsh to an old servant, is abundantly apparent from the fact that in the very same order they directed "that measures be taken to obtain for him such pension as he may be entitled to under the rules." And it is easy to see how they were actuated in the steps they took. A long delay had taken place in disposing of a matter in which delay, in justice to the expectants, ought certainly not to have been allowed to take place; and observing from the establishment list that your Memorialist had served 31 years and more, and without any explanation before them as to the circumstances under which the delay took place, they arrived at the not unreasonable conclusion in the abstract that he was an old man, that he was infirm, that it was to his infirmity the great delay was to be attributed, and—bearing in mind how even very old men cling to their appointments and the full emoluments thereof—that it would be a good thing for your Memorialist to be relieved of active duties and placed in the evening of his life on such a handsome superannu-

* Pro. of C.
July 1865 N

ation pension as a service of 31 years at the first blush promised. And this view was more especially not unreasonable, as the Sub-Collector had actually suggested it, and the Collector had so far acted on it as to remove your Memorialist from a first class to a second class Tahsil; but in doing which, the Collector specially reported that your Memorialist was diligent and careful in the discharge of his duties as Tahsildar of Cuddalore, a report which was supported by the Revenue Board.

4. On receipt of the peremptory orders of Government, however, the Board of Revenue and Collector had no alternative but to obey. Your Memorialist was displaced from even his reduced appointment of Tahsildar of Cuddalore, and placed under the treatment of the Zillah Surgeon preparatory to the grant of Medical Certificate required by the Rules. In reporting this step to Government, the Collector* made it a point to submit the hardship of the case, and dwell on the high character always borne by your Memorialist; and it was on this occasion that he pointed out the difficulty not before known to Government, in respect to qualification for pension in these words:—“Although Govinda Rao's service extends over 30 years, his age is under 50 and in appearance he is in the prime of life, and his term of service qualifying him for pension amounts to only 15 years, so that a medical probation is necessary before he can be entitled to pension.” In placing the matter before Government, the Board of Revenue supported the Collector in his views, and recommended that your Memorialist should be allowed to retain his reduced appointment of Tahsildar of Cuddalore until he passed through the required medical probation, and obtained the medical certificate without which he could not obtain pension. The Government* were pleased to yield to this recommendation, and to permit your Memorialist to continue in his appointment of Tahsildar of Cuddalore until the end of the month (September 1865), to allow time for obtaining the certificate and sending in the necessary application.

5. Your Memorialist obtained the necessary Medical Certificate from the Zillah Surgeon at Cuddalore, under whose observation he had been placed; but having been required to proceed to Madras and present himself before the Presidency Standing Board of Medical Officers for the confirmation of such certificate, that Board refused to ratify the Zillah Surgeon's Certificate, being of opinion that your Memorialist was fit to serve as a Tahsildar for 10 or 15 years more. On this difficulty arising, the Collector* recommended that your Memorialist might be permitted to resume office, being of opinion that he would be able to carry on his duties more satisfactorily, especially as under the recent ruling of the High Court in respect to preliminary enquiries, a Tahsildar had been relieved of much harassing work. Dwelling on your Memorialist's excellent character and the great length of his actual service, the Collector concluded his recommendation in these words:—“Of course, if Government decide on granting him the pension as an exceptional case the matter will be ended; otherwise rather than so respectable and old a public servant be cast aside without any future means of support, I have no hesitation in recommending that he be again tried, and possibly in a year or two his infirmities may be such as to justify the grant of a Medical Certificate, which on this occasion had been refused to him.” Unfortunately, however, for your Memorialist, the Collector in endeavouring to show the exact character of your Memorialist's shortcomings, happened to say that his real defect was dishonesty, and that he feared from past experience that such might not be wholly overcome. Probably influenced by this remark, the Board of Revenue recommended that your Memorialist be appointed to a Taluk Sheristadarship; but the Government declined to accede to either recommendation, basing their determination on the conclusions drawn by them from the Collector's own report of your Memorialist.

6. On so disastrous a decision, and feeling that he had been the unwitting agent of bringing ruin upon an old servant of Government, the Collector made a special representation expressive of his deep regret at that decision, especially as he (the Collector) was made to appear the responsible officer in the matter. Government* wrote the Collector, “never had a more respectable public servant in their employ, and one whose character for integrity has even been unimpeached, and if it were possible I would still, with all due deference, urge a reconsideration of the present decision, which simply entails ruin on the family of a man who has

for thirty-one years honestly served the Government, as his father before him. As I am made the immediate cause of so great an injury to a family so highly respected in the District, I may be pardoned for again urging Govinda Row's case on the attention of the Board, in view if possible to their further advocacy on his behalf with the Government.”* The Board of Revenue were pleased to follow this up with an earnest appeal on your Memorialist's behalf in language for which he cannot but be ever deeply grateful; and in the midst of his misfortune, it is most consoling to him to know that such high authority as the Revenue Board, concurring with the Collector of the district, testified to the integrity and purity of conduct of your Memorialist. “It is evident,” said the Board, “that Mr. Reade expressed himself more strongly regarding Govinda Row in the first instance than he is now prepared to justify; and it would seem from the Government Order of 14th July 1865, No. 1614, Revenue Department, that Govinda Row was displaced from office under the impression that he was then entitled to pension without the condition of a medical certificate of physical incapacity. For the sake of the public service, the Board would greatly regret that a Tahsildar who has obtained so marked a reputation for integrity and purity of conduct, should be dismissed in disgrace, after 31 years service without any pension, in consequence of delay in disposing of one of a class of cases, which it has been too generally the custom to subordinate to other business of a more essentially public character. Under the circumstances, the Board respectfully submit that the punishment is excessive, however objectionable the practice referred to. Never was there a case of more earnest, powerful, and justifiable interference which had such little success attending it. The Government so far yielded to the powerful recommendation of the Board of Revenue and of the Collector of the district, as to permit of your Memorialist's employment as a Goomastah; * and as a Goomastah on 30 Rs. a month your Memorialist is now employed in the Collector's Cutcherry, after having without censure or remark, except in the single instance of the Yeomiah case above referred to, discharged the Magisterial and Revenue functions of a First Class Tahsildar on 250 Rs. a month.

7. Here was the labour of a life swept away, the well earned reward of a career of unimpeached integrity and purity snatched from the workman who had borne the heat and burden of the day. Your Memorialist begs to submit that this is a dreadful punishment for one single act of neglect. For that act of neglect he had been already heavily punished by the Collector who had reduced him from a 1st class to a 2nd class Tahsildarship; but the Government were for sending your unfortunate Memorialist adrift into the world after 31 years faithful service, not because he was corrupt, not because he had abused his power and injured the people committed to his care, but simply because on one occasion he had omitted to report the lapse of a Yeomiah at the proper time. In order to exculpate himself, your Memorialist has no desire to throw dirt on his neighbours; but it is necessary for him to contrast his treatment with that dealt out to others. It is well known that there have been cases in which Tahsildars have been restored to office, even after undergoing punishment for criminal offences; and in this very district a case is not wanting in which a favoured Tahsildar* was reinstated, after having been suspended from office for 6 months for embezzlement and abuse of authority. Your Memorialist is aware that the principles of the law are not to be quoted as bearing with binding authority on his case, but those principles may nevertheless be referred to as generally indicative of the requirements of justice and equity. It seems to your Memorialist therefore that in the treatment of his case, the Government have overlooked two great principles regulating the administration of justice as between the crown and the subject, or as between subject and subject. For the act of neglect of which he was found by his superiors guilty, the Collector had already heavily punished your Memorialist by degrading him to the position of a 2nd class Tahsildar; by directing his dismissal at first, and afterwards permitting his re-employment in the very subordinate position of a clerk the Government *vide* punished your Memorialist for the same offence, overlooking the maxim of the law *nemo debet bis reus pro una et eadem causa*. By aggravating his punishment, the appellate authority disregarded that policy of the Legislature, of which even the worst criminals have the advantage, viz. that a sentence may be reversed or modified by a superior power, but never so as to enhance the punishment.

* Board's Proceedings
22nd December, 1865,
No. 8324.

* 26th January 1866.

* Verduchellam Taluk.

Tahsildars	Period	Month
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1865	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1866	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1867	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1868	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1869	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1870	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1871	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1872	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1873	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1874	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1875	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1876	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1877	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1878	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1879	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1880	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1881	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1882	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1883	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1884	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1885	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1886	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1887	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1888	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1889	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1890	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1891	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1892	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1893	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1894	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1895	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1896	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1897	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1898	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1899	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1900	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1901	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1902	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1903	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1904	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1905	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1906	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1907	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1908	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1909	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1910	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1911	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1912	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1913	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1914	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1915	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1916	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1917	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1918	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1919	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1920	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1921	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1922	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1923	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1924	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1925	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1926	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1927	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1928	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1929	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1930	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1931	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1932	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1933	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1934	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1935	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1936	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1937	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1938	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1939	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1940	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1941	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1942	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1943	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1944	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1945	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1946	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1947	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1948	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1949	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1950	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1951	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1952	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1953	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1954	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1955	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1956	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1957	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1958	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1959	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1960	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1961	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1962	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1963	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1964	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1965	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1966	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1967	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1968	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1969	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1970	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1971	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1972	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1973	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1974	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1975	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1976	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1977	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1978	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1979	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1980	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1981	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1982	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1983	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1984	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1985	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1986	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1987	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1988	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1989	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1990	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1991	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1992	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1993	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1994	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1995	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1996	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1997	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1998	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	1999	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2000	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2001	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2002	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2003	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2004	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2005	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2006	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2007	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2008	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2009	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2010	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2011	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2012	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2013	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2014	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2015	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2016	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2017	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2018	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2019	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2020	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2021	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2022	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2023	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2024	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2025	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2026	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2027	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2028	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2029	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2030	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2031	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2032	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2033	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2034	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2035	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2036	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2037	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2038	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2039	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2040	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2041	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2042	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2043	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2044	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2045	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2046	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2047	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2048	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2049	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2050	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2051	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2052	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2053	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2054	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2055	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2056	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2057	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2058	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2059	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2060	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2061	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2062	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2063	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2064	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2065	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2066	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2067	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2068	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2069	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2070	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2071	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2072	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2073	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2074	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2075	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2076	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2077	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2078	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2079	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2080	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2081	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2082	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2083	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2084	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2085	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2086	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2087	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2088	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2089	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2090	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2091	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2092	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2093	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2094	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2095	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2096	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2097	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2098	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2099	22
Mr. J. S. S. S.	2100	22

But was the delay of so heinous a character, or was it such a delay that your Memorialist alone was answerable for it? The duties of a Tahsildar are multifarious in their character, and he is constantly disposing of matters of the highest importance. The bringing to notice of so comparatively unimportant a matter as the lapse of a pension, or Yeomiah, may well therefore escape his attention. The Board of Revenue have themselves explained that it is "one of a class of cases which it has been too generally the custom to subordinate to other business of a more essentially public character." It had been lost sight of for 16 months before your Memorialist came into office by his two immediate predecessors; and even although your memorialist actually lost his appointment on account of the delay in this very case, the lapse was not brought to notice for disposal until five months after his successor had been in office, so great are the difficulties that not infrequently attend the disposal of cases of this kind. The delay that actually took place was 39 months in all, distributable as shown in the margin. But in considering your memorialist's case it is of importance to him to examine the extent and range of work that fell to his lot as Tahsildar of Chellambaram, as compared with that which fell to the lot of the Tahsildars of the other Taluks. The subjoined statement shows this at a glance.

Names of the Taluks (South Arcot)	Amount of Annual Assessment	REVENUE CASES Disposed of			MAGISTRATE CASES Disposed of			Total of Revenue and Mag. Cases disposed of
		Revenue Taluks	Revenue Taluks	Revenue Taluks	Magistrate Taluks	Magistrate Taluks	Magistrate Taluks	
Rs.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Cuddalore.....	247,262	1197	143	12	385	117	1416	2890
Velloppooram.....	124,707	51	51	402	410	42	818	2134
Chellambaram.....	550,023	1413	204	619	444	144	1444	3058
Vandichellam.....	257,400	535	344	337	351	235	586	2870
Erudiyannam.....	282,200	1015	329	206	180	39	531	2040
Talagavannam.....	167,508	751	210	273	124	5	421	2036
Theravannam.....	187,061	473	100	455	30	33	337	1799
Kallavannam.....	254,760	654	42	358	210	32	333	2040

The bare figures do not represent the importance of the work. Now the importance of the Taluk itself will best speak for itself. But even taking the bare figures, the above statement shows that during the time your Memorialist had charge of the Taluk of Chellambaram, he disposed of 3,353 Magistrate and Revenue cases, or 804 cases more than the Tahsildar of Velloppooram, whose Taluk was next in importance to that of Chellambaram. The Velloppooram Tahsildar collected 1,24,707 Rs. 10 in the year, while your Memorialist collected 5,50,023 Rs. or more than one-third as much again. Not more than 9 or 4 per cent of his Magistrate and Revenue disposals were reversed on appeal, while the superior Magistrate and Sessions Court admitted to no greater extent than 4 or 5 per cent of his commitments. The Taluk of Chellambaram was confessedly a heavy charge, almost too much for one man, and this was admitted and acted upon by Mr. Whiteside himself who, although loath in complaining of your Memorialist's business, did on the transfer of your Memorialist to Cuddalore and the appointment of Mr. Whiteside to Chellambaram, publicly acknowledge that the Taluk of Chellambaram was too onerous and unwieldy to be managed by a single person, and did thereupon make a representation and obtain the appointment of an additional Sub-Magistrate to dispose of cases arising in the Velloppooram Division of the Taluk. This alone is an eloquent attestation of the hardship of your Memorialist's case.

Your Memorialist has now fully stated the facts of his case, and he respectfully begs a fair and impartial review of the whole, cannot but expect that his case of rare

hardship, and that it appeals in eloquent terms for redress. Having in the course of 31 years attained dignified position in the service, and having during all that period sustained a character of unsullied purity in various capacities and under various superiors, he suddenly incurs (for no reason that he can think of) the displeasure of a Junior Officer; and through the representation and influence of that Junior Officer, he is summarily ordered to be deposed from his office on the trivial charge of having neglected to report in due time the lapse of a pension, and he is directed to be placed on the Pension List. In doing so Government presumed your Memorialist was entitled to a pension of one half his salary by his service of 31 years. But it turned out that one-third that service had been passed in grades not entitling to pension; and that therefore, to secure even the reduced pension of one-third for his 21 years of qualifying service, it was necessary that he should be placed under Medical probation. Your Memorialist was accordingly placed under the Zillah Surgeon's treatment and observation, and obtained from him the necessary certificate; but that certificate the Medical Board declined to confirm, believing that your Memorialist is sufficiently vigorous in mind and body to serve as Tahsildar for several years. Between these two stools, your unfortunate Memorialist has fallen to the ground, and the most powerful appeals from the Collector of the District and the Board of Revenue have failed.

10. In the afternoon of his life your unfortunate Memorialist now finds himself a petty Goomastah in a Collector's Kutcherry, deprived of the opportunity of earning that ample provision for his old age which he would have acquired in his position of Tahsildar after 25 years qualifying service, and deprived also of the reduced pension of a Tahsildar which he had already earned by his 21 years of qualifying service. What provision can be expected in the evening of his life, if he continues to work in his present petty position of Goomastah? Had this terrible punishment befallen him through misconduct or any fault involving moral delinquency, your Memorialist would have had nothing to plead; but having ever enjoyed the approval and high opinion of his superiors, of which his progressive rise in the service is the surest proof, and his character for integrity and purity having been testified to by the highest officials acquainted with him, it is inexpressibly mortifying and depressing to think that by a combination of unhappy influences at the eleventh hour, he is deprived of the just reward of the heat and burden of the day. Your Memorialist therefore earnestly prays that, on a full and generous review of all the circumstances of his case, and with especial reference to his proved purity and integrity of character, he may be restored to his former position of Tahsildar with his arrears of salary, in order to work out the period entitling him to a pension in that grade; or if there be objection to this, he would seek, as a special case, that one-third of his salary of Tahsildar of Chellambaram be awarded him as a superannuation pension from the date of his removal, in consideration of a service of upwards of 30 years, during the whole of which career he has earned and maintained an unblemished reputation.

And as in duty bound, your humble Memorialist will ever pray.

C. GOVINDA RAO

Cuddalore, }
6th June 1867. }

ENCLOSURE.

A.

The translation of the Tukeed No. 88.

From

C. W. READE, Esq.

Collector of S. Arcot.

To

GOVINDA RAO,

Tahsildar of Cuddalore.

On reconsidering the Proceedings of the Govt. which direct to displace you forthwith from your office for the delay occasioned by you in reporting a Yeomiah case of Chellambaram Taluk, you are hereby directed to deliver immediately your charge to Atmanada, your Sheristadar, and obtain a receipt from him, and you must be under the treatment of the Medical officers as directed in my former order.

Dated 7th August 1865.

(Signed) C. W. READE,

Collector.

His Excellency the Governor
in Council of Fort St. George
Madras

The humble address of
Govinda Rao late a Tahildar
in the District of South Arcot

Humbly Sheweth

With due respect and profound

* with three
printed
copies.

Submission I herewith forward a Memorial
in triplicate to the Secretary of State for
India and beg that the Noble Govt will
be pleased to review the arguments therein
set forth and to grant my prayer respecting
my restoration to my former position.

2 If I am not fortunate enough
as to have my prayer granted by this
Govt I earnestly beg the Nobles Govt
will be at least pleased to submit
the said Memorial to the Secretary of
State for India with favorable recommendation.

And as in duty bound your
humble Memorialist will ever pray.

G. Rao
6th June 1864

Obedient to remain
My Lord
Your most obedient and humble servant
Govinda Rao

forwarded to him for
not found in the papers date of his removal

Pr: 14 July 1865 No 227-8
 - 15 Sept " " 321-40
 - 20 Nov " " 572-26
 - 26 Jan 1866 " " 475-46

Per = 1867. Over
No of Coal for July
W. 1868.

From
Govinda Row
late Tahsildar
in the Dist. of
South Arcot

Noted 6th 3 June
Received 18th 3 1867.
S. A. C. 1038-10 del.

Forwarding -
Memorial to the Secy.
of State in triplicate -
requesting to be restored
to his former position
as Tahsildar in the
South Arcot District

171

@ 22° S. 10. 11.

7th 6
My dear Mr Phillips,

Gowda Row
seems to have been
appointed tahsildar
on the 26th March ~~1856~~
1857.

Yours very truly,
J. G. Cole

June 24

Govinda Row's Memorial

Dated 6th June 1867

Go 27 Nov 65, 2922

Lakshmi Narayan Lakshmi 26 Mar 57

~~He was first~~ ^{then} tahsildar of Cuddalore

then promoted to Chellumbaram

then ordered to Cuddalore

exact date not found in the paper

but some time in 1867

In this Memorial Govinda Row, late tahsildar of Cuddalore in the district of S. Arcot, complains of his dismissal from the service for delatoriness, & prays that he may either be restored to his former position of tahsildar, with arrears of pay, to work out the period entitling him to pension in that grade, or that ^{a pension of} one third of his salary as tahsildar of Chellumbaram, may be awarded to him for the date of his removal from that post.

In the covering letter
he begs Govt to consider
the arguments contained
in the Memorial, &
either to grant his papers
for restoration to the
grade of tahsildar,
or to send the Memorial
Home with a favourable
recommendation.

On the 7th April 1865
the Colr of P. & A. C. C.
reported that a Commis-
sary had died on the
13th Decr 1861, &
recommended that
the Commis. should be
continued to a consul
of the deceased.

The Board remarked
that the case was a
very simple one &
directed the Colr to
explain the excessive
delay of the papers.

Go 14 July 1865, 1814

The Colr reported that
the delay had taken
place in the taluq,
that 3 tahsildars had
been in charge of it
^{since the death of the deceased}
& that the delay, at-
tributable to the lack
of them, the Memorial
amounted to 18 months.
He added: 'The dilatori-
ness of this officer, who
is Govm da Row, & now
tahsildar of Cuddalore
has been the subject
of frequent animad-
version, & at times the
almost amounted to
disqualification for
office. It was with
this consideration the
Govm da Row was re-
cently removed to a
taluq where the duties
were less onerous, &
where the salary was less
x x x x with Govm da

now it has really been
a hopeless task hitherto
to expect of him punctu-
ality or obedience
in the conduct of his
duties. & as since
his return to And
alore he has been more
diligent & active. I am
not disposed to recom-
mend any measure
of severity for the past,
however deserved, & es-
pecially as Govinda
Row from some alleged
infirmary, has reported
that he wishes to return
as soon as he is qualified
for a pension under the
recent rules prescribed
by Govt.

The Comd^r remarked
that the delay had been
excessive beyond excuse,
but from the fact that
Govinda Row had of

After infirmity had
been established & this
certification of the Medical
Council before Govt. then
appeared, he was sent
the Med. Comd^r & Medicine
the Assistant Civil Surgeon
had been supposed to pass
that the Med. Council found
him to be strong & fit for
10 or 15 years service.

20 15 Sep 65 P 2217

for 31 years on the 18th
Jan 1884. They directed
that Govinda Row should
be at once turned out,
& be taken to obtain
for him such pension
as he might be entitled
to.

On the 7th Aug 1885
the Comd^r reported that he
had displaced Govinda
Row, & placed him under
medical treatment
with a view of getting
the certificate neces-
sary in applying for
pension. He added: "I
am sorry that Govt. should
have thought it neces-
sary to be so very severe
upon this officer on
this present instance
occasion, as & I had
pointed out that Go-
vinda Row had of
late been more diligent

and active. x x x. I
still desire to pension
Govt a consideration
of their orders as regards
Corum da Row x x x he
has always borne a high
character in every
respect except for
dilatations. Although
Corum da Row's service
extends over thirty
years, his age is under
50; in appearance
he is in the prime of
life, & has years of
service qualifying
for pension amounting
to only 15 years, so
that a Medical pro-
bation is necessary.
Before he can be
entitled to pension.

On this the Board
recommends
that, as the Col. has
submitted Corum da
Row's case as a
pension case.

112
at that his main fault
is dilatoriness, Govt
^{would}
allow him to retain
his appointment until
he had passed through
the Medical probation
& obtained the medical
certificate, which
would be requisite for
a pension could be
granted to him.

The Govt on the 15th
Sept. passed an order
allowing Corum da Row
to hold office till the
end of the month
in order that he might
have time to apply for
pension.

Corum da Row then
obtained the requisite
certificate from
the Allah surgeon.
But it was necessary
under ^{the standing} orders
of Govt for him to
submit a pension case.

by a committee or
personal examination
When he appeared
before the Precedency
Committee, they saw
no ground to confirm
the certificate &
expressed their surprise
that a recommendation
for pension on medical
grounds should have
been submitted to them

26 Oct. 1865

The Collor then asked
Govt through the Board
either to grant Coranda
Row a pension as an
exceptional case, or
to let him resume his
office, when, said the
Collor: "perhaps he
may be able to carry
on his duties more
satisfactorily than
of late, especially as
under the recent ruling
of the High Court in
respect to Preliminary

GO 27 Nov 65 2922

is now relieved from
much harassing work
& I have already put
out ~~some~~ ~~the~~ the
Coranda Row's only
defect is dilatoriness
& though I fear from
past experience that
this may not be what
overcome, still, his
excellence of character
& the great length of
his actual service
may, I think, be urged
in Coranda Row's fa-
vor, & justly give
him a claim to con-
sideration & a little
pension as respectable
old a public servant
should be cast aside
without any further
means of support.
I have no hesitation
in recommending
that he be given

need, & possibly in a year or two his infirmities may be such as to justify the grant of a medical certificate which on this occasion has been refused to him."

The Board recommended that Corinda Row should be made a taking steward, the officer next below a taker of shares.

But Govt remarked that according to Mr. Reader's letter of the 12th June Corinda Row had shown himself unfit for service by delatoriness, unpunctuality & disobedience. What it was evident that this was not the effect of delatoriness.

Thus, a man with certain physical infirmities, the real character of which the Govt abstains from representing, though he lays much stress on them, and with an acknowledged reputation for delatoriness - mutatis nominibus, laziness? - is to be made steward & is sent to have conferred on him the interest of thousands of inhabitants being within the limits of his charge!!! His infirmities will not decrease as his age advances. Can we expect, then, an increase of energy & a decrease of his delatoriousness, than will nothing be accomplished - a man for the action & the patient duty of a steward.

* Note. It is evident from Mr. Reader's letter that by "disobedience" he means "impunctuality", which is pretty much the same as delatoriness.

held themselves precluded from granting either promotion or gratuity, & dismissed him without notice.

The Collector addressed the Board again on the 15th Decr. He said "I have to add my deep regret at the decision of Govt & especially that I am made to appear as the responsible officer in the matter. Govt never had a more respectable public servant in their employ, one whose character for integrity has never been impeached, & if I were present I would still urge a reconsideration of the present decision with strongly embodied views on this formal matter."

for 31 yrs honestly
served the Govt, this
father before him."

The Board recommended
this letter to Govt for
favourable consideration.
They said that Mr Reade
had evidently expressed
himself more strongly
about Govinda Row
in the first instance
than he was prepared
to justify, & that the
order of Govt displa-
cing the man was
apparently passed
under the impression
that he was entitled to
pension. The Board
added: For the sake of
the public service
the Board would greatly
regret that a Tahsildar
who has obtained so
marked a reputation
for integrity & purity
of character should

be dismissed in disgrace
after 31 years' service
without any pension
in consequence of
delay in disposing of
one of
a class of cases, &c.
It has been too general
the custom to subordinate
to business of a more
essentially public
character. Under the
circumstances the Board
respectfully submit
that the punishment
is excessive, however
objectionable the practice
referred to.

On this Govt said
they would not object
to Govinda Row's re-
employment as a gumastah.

This is the state of the
case.

Govt have dismissed
a Tahsildar for delay

the very strongly ex-
pressed opinion of the
Collo (in whose report
they have acted) &
of the Board.

In the case of
from araz Narasinga
Row a tahsildar, was
dismissed for ignorance
of the Codes, excessive
indolence, laziness & sluggish
habits, & marked neg-
lect of duty. The Collo
& the Board expressed
opinions strongly in
favour of his dismissal.
The Govt. per-
mitted his re-employ-
ment in the grade next
below that of tahsildar
Cherstadar.

Thus the case
of Mr. Row was
settled, & his treat-
ment more lenient
than that of the

But it is rather
difficult to trace
the real opinions of the
Collector - He has been blowing
hot & cold in the same breath.

Lo Sec Ch. Mag 4 N 30, 1886

This Spawny is the case
of a leading tahsildar
reported on & dismissed
by Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Fraser's complaints
are very general. but in
the teeth of the strong opinion
of the Collo? & the Board
Mr. F has insisted, the Govt.
could scarcely rescind them.
The upshot of the
case is, with a subordinate
officer, the Board have
dismissed him.

When the Govt. has
dismissed a tahsildar
it is not of expecting an
immediate desertion
of the tahsildar?
W.D.

From Sec of State 16 Nov 6 1886

I did not read the
report from recollection, &
made the above
W.D.

matter of the Memos
referred.

Never the less the
Sec of State, on appeal,
considered the case
one of great hardship
& said he should be glad
to learn that means had
been found to place
him again in the
same grade.

I request orders as
to the tenor of the covering
letter with which
Goswami Row's Memorial
(it is very ably written)
to be despatched.

H.

I have no personal
acquaintance with this
man. but I am aware
that he is a singularly
high character for
his position, & for
his industry in
his official capacity.
& I should be glad if

Even at this stage the Gov.
could in some consider
this promise order to
permit his restoration
in recognition of his
somewhat sane & most
valuable characteristics

21. Summary. L.B.

~~Memorandum~~
re as per the memo.
July W.D.H.

Grinnard Row's Memorial

The Memorialist's printed appeal
to the S of State is a clearly pre-
pared paper & placed in a good
light. The points that make it
Retri from ~~State~~, there is no
denying the fact, that, on the
very unfavorable reports of the
two principal Officers of the
S. Acad. District, the Gov. seems
to ~~have any mark~~ ^{be} ~~displeased~~ ^{displeased} their displeasure of
Retri's general dilatoriness and
poor official respect in an
important case, by directing
that ~~State~~ ^{he} be brought on the
pension list under the Rules
in force.

At the time this order was
issued, it was the belief of the

foot on refer to the paper before
it, that Lett had served 31 odd
years. On an analysis of his record,
it was however, discovered that
Lett would entitle him to a
pension, amounting to only something
short of 15 years. As a measure
of indulgence and partly also
on the information of the
Council that Lett was suffering
from some physical infirmity,
the order of retirement for Lett
was held in abeyance for about
2 months so that Lett might
complete the minimum period
entitling him to a retirement
allowance.

Very soon, another difficulty
arose owing to a committee of
medical officers having declared
on examining Lett that he was

in good sound health. For the
service for another ten years. It
was however, if the foot order originally
opened to the Lett to retire was in
any degree practicable, that the
unimpaired opinion of the Medical
Council formed as to what was
for the restoration of Lett to his
appointment as Quartermaster.

Accordingly, with a view of securing
to the Lett the benefit of his past
services & affording him an
opportunity of securing the character
he had lost, the foot decided that
he should be provided with the
superior education of a postmaster
in a ~~well~~ ^{well} ~~known~~ ^{known} ~~school~~ ^{school} of the
S. Army to the Lett.

In all probability Lett is now
serving in that capacity, in which
it is clear he may by applying and
applying himself to the discharge of
his duty, again show himself

- the worth of promotion to higher grades. But in regard to the memorial itself, it calls in question
- (1) the propriety of the order of the Govt. regarding his withdrawal from the
 - (2) post of Masildar, - his entitlement on the superannuation allowance to which he was supposed to have a claim, taken that was discovered to be an erroneous belief, - his transfer to a subordinate post in the revenue department, & am sorry that I do not feel the Government could now, with any reasonable consistency, undo all they have done and accordingly the prayer of the memorial is to direct his restoration to the very office for which he has proved himself to be disqualified

1 July 67

Wm

5 July 67

I think that the
Mr. Schilder will
certainly be restored
by the Home Govt.
The Government in
ordering him to be
restored had a
disregard to his
intention to turn him
into the world with
a provision for him

Read to be empowered
to promote him to the
position of Tahildar
in a vacancy occurring
with an order to
perform the manner
in which he performs
his duties. N

Revenue Department

25-1838.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 10th July 1867.

Read the following
letter from Govindarao Row
late Tahildar in the Dis-
trict of South Arcot.

Forwarding memorial
to the Secretary of State in
triplicate requesting to be
restored to his former position
as Tahildar in the South
Arcot District.

(Here entered 6th June 1867)

The Government
having again reviewed the
whole of the papers relating
to Belitamb case resolved
to give him a further op-
portunity of redeeming
his character and showing
that he can still serve
the State usefully.

Collecting

South Street is therefore
ordered to promote him
to the post of Subaltern
on a vacancy occurring
and will in due course
report how he performs
the duties of the office.

LB

— to Board of Civil & Criminal
— Accountants
— Colls of S. Street
— to Ground No. 1

140
6

MS 1535
South
Street

MS 1535

of the Madras Govt
July 10th July 1867

authorizing Col. J. Van Allen
to promote Subaltern
to the post of the 5th to the
post of Subaltern on the occur-
rence of a vacancy & to
report how he performs his
duties.

MS 171-172