

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2956

Press
~~Mis.~~

215.216

Dated 12 - 12 - 1867.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th December 1867.*

No. 215. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st November 1867, No. 7,584.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Tinnevely, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 8th November 1867, No. 612 :—

1. I regret to have to report the misconduct of Ramiah, the Deputy Collector in charge of Salt in this District.

2. Some salt beds, at Paliyakail, were sold by auction in April 1864. The Deputy Collector superintended the sale, which realized 1,354 Rupees. Rupees 350 were then and there paid* as deposit in sovereigns, and the remainder was paid†

* 7th April 1864.

† 22nd, 25th, and 26th April 1864.

at Trichendur subsequently; the deposit money was paid to the Deputy Collector, who took it with him to Trichendur, instead of leaving it into the Salt Treasury at Paliyakail. No proper account was kept; the Chittah of that day's transactions showing but Rupees 135-8-0 received, while the Deputy Collector acknowledges having received £35, and the Superintendent and Head Moonshi depose to between thirty and forty sovereigns having been paid, the accounts indeed are valueless, as, independently of their being prepared in the roughest style, there is not a signature attached to any one entry during the year 1864. The total sum received, Rupees 1,354, is however brought to account, though not in the way it was received; Rupees 135-8-0 being shewn to have been received on the 7th, Rupees 301-7-0 on the 22nd, Rupees 795-2-0 on the 25th, and Rupees 121-15-0 on the 26th; whereas, in reality, £35 were received on the 7th, and Rupees 1,004 on the 22nd and subsequent dates. The then Head Moonshi swears that none of this money was paid in the Cutcherry, and the Deputy Collector acknowledges that it may have been paid in his house. He adds that it was then deposited in the office cash chest, and placed under charge of a guard; the Head Moonshi contradicts this, and swears that the money never was in the cash chest; be this as it may, it soon began to be whispered abroad that the Deputy Collector had lent 1,000 Rupees of the sale proceeds of the salt beds to one Mudukrishna Mudali, a resident of Trichendur who had once been wealthy, but who was then squandering his money to such an extent that his relations brought a suit against him, and prayed for a division of the property according to Hindu law; a petition, purporting to be signed by "Naranayan," was sent to the then Collector on 25th June 1864, warning him of what was going on, and suggesting an examination of the cash chest. This petition was forwarded by the Collector to the Deputy Collector for report, and the allegation contained in it was, of course, denied by the latter.

The petition is not in the Huzoor records. The Clerk, who had charge of it, says that he gave it to Ramiah himself with some other petitions against him, as per late Collector's verbal order.

3. In the meantime, the Deputy Collector had addressed a Yadast to the Collector, seeking instructions as to "how he was to remit the money;" a reply was received in a fortnight, ordering the remittance to be made to the Talook Treasury; this reply was endorsed by the Deputy Collector with the words "Remit the money;" but as this endorsement was virtually made to himself, as the cash chest could not be opened without him, the money was not remitted, though he was at head-quarters for a fortnight after the receipt of instructions; he then

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th December 1867.*

travelled in the district for a fortnight, and subsequently went to Tinnevely for three weeks, still leaving the money unpaid. It was only on receipt of a second Yadast, after his return to head-quarters on 20th June, that he remembered the remittance was due; the fact of his having had the money in the cash chest all this time having entirely escaped his memory, though he owns that money so seldom passed through his hands, that no one Clerk in particular was put in charge of the cash chest and accounts.

4. On the morning the remittance was made, the Deputy Collector borrowed 300 Rupees of his Head Moonshi, as he (the Deputy Collector) says to send in exchange for sovereigns, but he did not give the Head Moonshi the sovereigns, nor has he ever repaid the debt.

5. The Head Moonshi swears that the Deputy Collector asked for any sum up to 1,000 Rupees, that he lent 300 Rupees, and that the remainder was made up in the village by the Deputy Collector's friends; at all events the remittance was made, the Deputy Collector retaining the sovereigns, which he urges were not current coins. No mention of these sovereigns is anywhere found in the accounts. The Head Moonshi assumes that the rumoured loan of Government money to Mudukrishna Mudali was true, from the fact that the money for the sale of the salt beds was received by the Deputy Collector in an irregular manner; that to the best of the Head Moonshi's knowledge it never was placed in the cash chest; that extraordinary delay occurred in remitting this money to a Government treasury; that on the day it was remitted money had to be borrowed; and that he himself was sent by the Deputy Collector to Mudukrishna Mudali shortly after the remittance was made to sell the Deputy Collector's gold chain and buttons, and to ask for the re-payment of "the former loan;" this former loan the Deputy Collector explains to have been 500 Rupees, which he had lent to Mudukrishna Mudali sometime before, and he adds that the rumour of his having lent 1,000 Rupees of Government money to Mudukrishna Mudali must have received some colour from the fact, that during the time the money remained unpaid he had negotiated a loan of 1,000 Rupees for Mudukrishna Mudali with a Tinnevely Sowear, and that this Tinnevely Sowear subsequently paid him Mudukrishna Mudali's debt of 500 Rupees, and the price of the chain and buttons; this negotiation for a loan for a friend, however, took place at a time when the Deputy Collector, as he states in his letter to Mr. Silver, was so busy at head-quarters, or so fully employed in the district, that he quite forgot to make the remittance of Rupees 1,354, which he had inadvertently kept by him

for upwards of two months and a half; From 7th April, the date of the first receipt, and Mr. Silver in reply informed him that "this plain and straightforward statement was perfectly satisfactory," and assured him that "the good opinion which he had often expressed of him to higher authority still remained unshaken."

6. Nothing further occurred for upwards of a year and a half, when the Head Moonshi failing to recover his 300 Rupees, addressed a petition to the then Collector on 8th March 1866, bringing to notice the alleged misappropriation of Government money in 1864, and praying for orders to the Deputy Collector to repay him his 300 Rupees; this petition received an endorsement to the effect, that the alleged

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th December 1867.*

misappropriation had been explained to the satisfaction of a former Collector, and that as regards petitioner's claim the Collector declined to interfere. Nothing further was heard of this petition till May last, when it was currently rumoured that the Deputy Collector had occasioned the death of his milkman at Trichendur, by striking him an unlucky blow, and that strenuous efforts were being made by the Deputy Collector and his friends to hush up the matter. As I was unable to leave Palamcottah at the time, I requested the Superintendent of Police to make a personal inquiry on the spot, and this was accordingly done; this resulted in the charge against the Deputy Collector being pronounced unfounded, and led to the indictment of four persons on a charge of conspiracy and false complaint; these persons were acquitted by the Session Court, but during the trial, allusion was made to the petition of 8th March 1866; and I thus first became aware of its existence; about this time the petitioner was appointed Manager of a Zemin estate, and when free from the Salt Department, he began again to urge his claims on the Deputy Collector, and represented his case to me. I sent for the petition, and took a deposition from the petitioner regarding it. This statement seemed so clear, and was so fully supported by the witnesses cited, that I called on the Deputy Collector to appear before me to answer the charges against him.

7. He has appeared before me, and made a statement, which, with the other papers in the case, I enclose for the Board's inspection; this statement speaks for itself, and though nominally a confession, (as the Deputy Collector has thrown himself on my mercy, and begged to be saved from disgrace,) it is only a confession of irregularity in the remittance, and of money transactions with subordinates; he denies the misappropriation of Government money, and attributes all that took place to carelessness and want of thought.

8. Ramiah is 34 years of age, and has been eleven years in the Government service; he has been a Deputy Collector five years, and consequently attained the rank of Deputy Collector after six years' service; he was formerly an Inspector of Police, and was selected for the post of Deputy Collector on account of his superior intelligence and education, and as an encouragement to the subordinate officers of the Police force. Since he has been under me he has given me complete satisfaction, and from all I hear, he has acted uprightly of late; if his conduct throughout is not free from blame, some leniency may be shown him in consideration of what he did having been done at a time when corruption was the general rule, and nothing was ever heard of it. I believe him capable of doing good service under strict supervision; but men who want looking after are not fit for responsible posts; and a Deputy Collector to be efficient must be perfectly trustworthy. Ramiah comes of a respectable family, and is well-to-do in the world: he begs that he may not be dismissed, and has tendered his resignation praying that it may be accepted.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 19.—Correspondence.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department.
12th December 1867.

No. 216. ORDER THEREON, 12th December 1867, No. 2,956.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government have attentively considered the papers submitted by the Collector, and are of opinion that the facts established in evidence against the Deputy Collector C. Ramiah, and the admissions made in his own statement, convict him of gross irregularity in the disposal of public monies that came to his charge, and of habitual pecuniary dealings with his subordinates, in direct contravention of established rules, while they raise against him a strong presumption of still more serious offences.

2. Under these circumstances, the Government are precluded from accepting his resignation of his appointment, and resolve to direct that he be dismissed from the public service from the date of these Proceedings.

3. Mr. Wedderburn, the present Collector of Bellary, who as Collector of Tinnevely received the petition of 8th March 1866 from Gopal Pillay, formerly Head Munshi in the Deputy Collector's Office, and then Salt Superintendent of Kulasagarapatam, in which petition the fact of petitioner's having lent Rupees 300 to the Deputy Collector was stated, and assistance for the recovery of the amount was sought, will be requested to explain the grounds on which, in his endorsement on the petition, dated 20th March 1866, he declined to interfere in regard to this claim, which in fact involved the charge of a grave irregularity against the Deputy Collector, such as it was to all appearance the Collector's duty to investigate.

4. The Board of Revenue should not have sent up these papers without any expression of their own opinion on the Deputy Collector's conduct and deserts.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Accountant General.
„ A. Wedderburn, Esq.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

No. 7,584.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 21st November 1867.

Read the following letter from R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 8th November 1867, No. 612:—

1. I regret to have to report the misconduct of Ramiah, the Deputy Collector in charge of Salt in this District.

2. Some salt beds, at Paliyakail, were sold by auction in April 1864. The Deputy Collector superintended the sale, which realized 1,354 Rupees. Rupees 350 were then and there paid* as deposit in security and the

* 7th April 1864.

+ 22nd, 25th, and 26th April 1864.

remainder was paid† at Trichendur. The money was paid to the Deputy Collector, who took it with him to Trichendur into the Salt Treasury at Paliyakail. No proper account was kept; the Chittah of that day's transactions showing but Rupees 135-8-0 received, while the Deputy Collector acknowledges having received £35, and the Superintendent and Head Moonshi depose to between thirty and forty sovereigns having been paid, the accounts indeed are valueless, as, independently of their being prepared in the roughest style, there is not a signature attached to any one entry during the year 1864. The total sum received, Rupees 1,354, is however brought to account, though not in the way it was received; Rupees 135-8-0 being shown to have been received on the 7th, Rs. 301-7-0 on the 22nd, Rupees 795-2-0 on the 25th, and Rupees 121-15-0 on the 26th; whereas, in reality, £35 were received on the 7th, and Rupees 1,004 on the 22nd and subsequent dates. The then Head Moonshi swears that none of this money was paid in the Cutcherry, and the Deputy Collector acknowledges that it may have been paid in his house. He adds that it was then deposited in the office cash chest, and placed under charge of a guard; the Head Moonshi contradicts this, and swears that the money never was in the cash chest; be this as it may, it soon began to be whispered abroad that the Deputy Collector had lent 1,000 Rupees of the sale proceeds of the salt beds to one Mudukrishna Mudali, a resident of Trichendur who had once been wealthy, but who was then squandering his money to such an extent that his relations brought a suit against him and prayed for a division of the property according to Hindu law; a petition purporting to be signed by "Narayan" was sent to the then Collector on 25th June 1864, warning him of what was going on, and suggesting an examination of the cash chest. This petition was forwarded by the Collector to the Deputy Collector for report, and the allegation contained in it was of course denied by the latter.

The petition is not in the Huzoor records. The Clerk, who had charge of it, says that he gave it to Ramiah himself with some other petitions against him, as per late Collector's verbal order.

3. In the meantime, the Deputy Collector had addressed a Yadast to the Collector, seeking instructions as to "how he was to remit the money;" a reply was received in a fortnight, ordering the remittance to be made to the Talook treasury; this reply was endorsed by the Deputy Collector with the words "Remit the money;" but as this endorsement was virtually made to himself, as the cash chest could not be opened without him, the money was not remitted, though he was at headquarters for a fortnight after the receipt of instructions; he then travelled in the district for a fortnight, and subsequently went to Tinnevely for three weeks, still leaving the money unpaid. It was only on receipt of a second Yadast, after his return to headquarters on 20th of June, that he remembered the remittance was due; the fact of his having had the money in the cash chest all this time having entirely escaped his memory, though he owns that money so seldom passed through his hands, that no one Clerk in particular was put in charge of the cash chest.

4. On the morning the remittance was made, the Deputy Collector borrowed Rupees of his Head Moonshi, as he (the Deputy Collector) says to send in exchange for sovereigns, but he did not give the Head Moonshi the sovereigns, nor has he ever repaid the debt.

5. The Head Moonshi swears that the Deputy Collector asked for any sum up to 1,000 Rupees, that he lent 300 Rupees, and that the remainder was made up in the village by the Deputy Collector's friends; at all events the remittance was made, the Deputy Collector retaining the sovereigns,

X These proceedings were to have been finished on 9.0 12 Dec. 67, which is with the papers.

either - there were many strong points

which he urges were not current coins. No mention of these sovereigns is anywhere found in the accounts. The Head Moonshi assumes that the rumoured loan of Government money to Mudukrishna Mudali was true, from the fact that the money for the sale of the salt beds was received by the Deputy Collector in an irregular manner; that to the best of the Head Moonshi's knowledge it never was placed in the cash chest; that extraordinary delay occurred in remitting this money to a Government treasury; that on the day it was remitted money had to be borrowed; and that he himself was sent by the Deputy Collector to Mudukrishna Mudali shortly after the remittance was made to sell the Deputy Collector's gold chain and buttons, and to ask for the re-payment of "the former loan;" this former loan the Deputy Collector explains to have been 500 Rupees, which he had lent to Mudukrishna Mudali sometime before, and he adds that the rumour of his having received Government money to Mudukrishna Mudali must have received some colour at the time the money remained unpaid he had negotiated a loan of 1,000 rupees for Mudukrishna Mudali with a Tinnevely Sowcar, and that this Tinnevely Sowcar subsequently paid him Mudukrishna Mudali's debt of 500 Rupees, and the price of the chain and buttons; this negotiation for a loan for a friend, however, took place at a time when the Deputy Collector, as he states in his letter to Mr. Silver, was so busy at headquarters, or so fully employed in the district, that he quite forgot to make the remittance of Rupees 1,354, which he had inadvertently kept by him for upwards of two months and a half; and Mr. Silver in reply informed him that "this plain and straightforward statement was perfectly satisfactory," and assured him that "the good opinion which he had often expressed of him to higher authority still remained unshaken."

6. Nothing further occurred for upwards of a year and a half, when the Head Moonshi failing to recover his 300 Rupees, addressed a petition to the then Collector on 8th March 1866, bringing to notice the alleged misappropriation of Government money in 1864, and praying for orders to the Deputy Collector to repay him his 300 Rupees; this petition received an endorsement to the effect, that the alleged misappropriation had been explained to the satisfaction of a former Collector, and that as regards petitioner's claim the Collector declined to interfere. Nothing further was heard of this petition till May last, when it was currently rumoured that the Deputy Collector had occasioned the death of his milkman at Trichendur, by striking him an unlucky blow, and that strenuous efforts were being made by the Deputy Collector and his friends to hush up the matter. As I was unable to leave Palamcottah at the time, I requested the Superintendent of Police to make a personal inquiry on the spot, and this was accordingly done; this resulted in the charge against the Deputy Collector being pronounced unfounded, and led to the indictment of four persons on a charge of conspiracy and false complaint; these persons were acquitted by the Session Court, but during the trial, allusion was made to the petition of 8th March 1866; and I thus first became aware of its existence; about this time the petitioner was appointed Manager of a Zemin estate, and when free from the Salt Department, he began again to urge his claims on the Deputy Collector, and represented his case to me. I sent for the petition, and took a deposition from the petitioner regarding it. This statement seemed so clear, and was so fully supported by the witnesses cited, that I called on the Deputy Collector to appear before me to answer the charges against him.

7. He has appeared before me, and made a statement, which, with the other papers in the case, I enclose for the Board's inspection; this statement speaks for itself, and though nominally a confession (as the Deputy Collector has thrown himself on my mercy, and begged to be saved from a confession of irregularity in the remittance, and of money transactions with subordinates) he denies the misappropriation of Government money, and attributes all that took place to carelessness and want of thought.

8. Ramiah is 34 years of age, and has been eleven years in the Government service; he has been a Deputy Collector five years, and consequently attained the rank of Deputy Collector after six years' service; he was formerly an Inspector of Police, and was selected for the post of Deputy Collector on account of his superior intelligence and education, and as an encouragement to the

subordinate officers of the Police Force. Since he has been under me he has given me complete satisfaction, and from all I hear, he has acted uprightly of late; if his conduct throughout is not free from blame, some leniency may be shown him in consideration of what he did having been done at a time when corruption was the general rule, and nothing was ever heard of it. I believe him capable of doing good service under strict supervision; but men who want looking after are not fit for responsible posts; and a Deputy Collector to be efficient must be perfectly trustworthy. Ramiah comes of a respectable family, and is well-to-do in the world: he begs that he may not be dismissed, and has tendered his resignation praying that it may be accepted.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 19.—Correspondence.

Submitted for the orders of Govt.
(A true Copy and Extract.)

Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with enclosures.

Copy to the Collector of Tinnevely.

In Order.

Exd. J. Wright.

*This one of those most unaccountable
indications of low moral tone in a
superior officer who is not to be
washed off by any ordinary means
cannot in my opinion be allowed to pass
without serious notice. If found of conduct at
least in the higher grade. It is expected
from the same to be generally.*

*There seems to be a charge of
employing public money a little to the wrong
purpose. This could be
checked by knowing of money from subordinates
W. S. in many cases said that there
were numerous charges against the man of
subordinate. Knowing from subordinates
that he was paying such like. But all of them
or less and did not do so. As this present
one. I that he stopped proceedings in the name
tender of his resignation & created confusion*

*either; there were many strong
proceedings*

Dec 29/5

in this particular case. It is to be observed
originated in a state made before the Supreme
Court. I think the Senate's designation of his office
will be accepted. & that the public service will be
well rid of him.

John Quincy Adams had the good
fortune to rise to the grade of Secy. in a great
service, carried the President & he spent it
as a Senator & died his duties. Not to
above influences. The sooner he takes
himself off the better. D. D. D. D. D.

2 Dec. 64

8
ground for believing that we view
to his own interests the Collector; during
the two months in question, had lent
out all, or some even, of the full
sale proceeds of the Friday or Monday
he would have been fully of mis-
application of public funds.

If further still, the Gov. to meet
the disbursement of the account general,
had borrowed from some of his official
subordinates, a portion of the money
he had, perhaps undeposited, been
called on to pay up, he would have
contravened in a serious manner
one of the leading salutary standing
orders of the Govt.

I would pursue the parallel, but
the other points are minor ones &
may be left without special notice.

If however, when the Collector's
conduct in these respects came under
official formal investigation, he asked
permission to resign the service, I would
refuse to him such permission and
would dismiss him.

Having attentively considered these
papers, I find that the case of Sdmt
Collector Ramaya is a case such
I have above sketched. I would be
similarly punished and wd. eject him from
a service which he has dishonoured
by neglecting.

although it should be our
 aim to raise the standard
 of public morality among our
 native employees & that which
 we are justified in applying
 in the case of an European
~~employee~~ employee, I do not think
 that the time has yet arrived
 for judging the two classes of
 public officers by precisely the
 same standard. I would

accept the Deputy Collector's resignation
 I think that the Government
 should be called upon to explain
 his removal & notice ^{the complaint} prepared against
 the Deputy Collector in 1886 of
 having borrowed money from one of
 his official subordinates.

30th Nov/87

by A.

On the whole I incline to the more lenient
 or moderate view of the case taken by Mr.
 Arthur. I would accept the resignation of the
 Deputy Collector but I would place on record an
 expression of the Government's disapproval of his conduct and

state that his resignation is admitted on the ground of the removal of the Deputy Collector and in consequence of the good service in other respects which he may have performed.

112956
 Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government
 Under date the 12th December 1887.

Read the following
 Proceedings of the Board
 of Revenue.

Submitting for the orders
 of Government, letter from the
 Collector of Tinnevely, reporting
 the misconduct of Ramiah
 in charge of salt Department
 in that District.

(Here enter 21st Nov^r/87)
 No 7581

The Government
 have attentively considered
 the papers submitted by
 the Collector, and are of
 opinion that the facts
 established
 in evidence against the
 Deputy Collector, L.
 Ramiah and the admis-
 sions made in his own

W.D.A.

sum

statement convict him of
gross irregularity in the
disposal of public monies
that ^{came} to his charge, and
of habitual pecuniary
~~transactions~~ ^{dealings} with his
subordinates, in direct
contravention of established
rules - while they raise
against him a strong pre-
sumption of still more
serious offences.

Under these circum-
stances, the Government
are precluded from ac-
cepting his resignation
of his appointment, and
resolve to direct that
he be dismissed from the
public service from the date
of these Proceedings.

10
Mr. Wedderburn,
the present Collector of
Bellary, who ^{as per P. D. M. No. 10} received the
petition of 8th March 1866
from Gopal Pillay, for-
merly Head Munshi in
the Deputy Collector's
office, and then Salt
Superintendent of Kula-
sagarapatam, in which
petition the fact of
petitioner's having lent
Rs. 300 to the Deputy
Collector was stated, in
and assistance for the re-
covery of the amount was
sought will be requested
to explain the grounds
on which in his endorse-
ment on the petition
dated 20th March 1866

he declined to interfere
in regard to this claim,
which in fact involved
the charge of a grave
irregularity against
the Deputy Collector, such
as it was ~~clearly~~ the Col.
lector's duty to investigate.

X to all appearance
N

The Board of Re-
venue should not have
sent up these papers
about any expression of
their own opinion on the
Deputy Collector's conduct
and deserts.

inf. Island ^{in found}
Lithuan ^{by}
(a more distinct)
N

5. Dec/67.

L.B.

14 Copies to the W. of Seal with 19 Enclosures Dec 12/67
6 — — — — — to Seal Dec 12/67
1 — — — — — A. Wedderburn Esq Dec 12/67

57/13
13/4

Ac. 215-216-

Revenue 1867 Repts
Treas of Govt of India

No. 2926

No of the Madras Govt
2/12 December 1837