M.R.O. 14—5,450—22-10-25.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 2972 Press ~~Mis.~~

248. 250

Dated 13 — 12 — 1867.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
13th December 1867.

Read again Proceedings of Government, dated 31st July 1867, No. 1,751.

Read also the following :—

No. 248. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd October 1867, No. 6,296.

Read the following letter from T. DHARMAROYA MOODELLY, Deputy Collector, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 11th September 1867.

1. With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated the 15th August 1867, No. 5,290, directing me to submit such explanation as I may desire to offer, respecting the transactions mentioned in the Enclosures Nos. 1 and 2 of Mr. Thornhill's letter, dated the 17th May 1867, I respectfully beg to state the following circumstances, offering at the same time my grateful thanks to the Board and Government for the kind consideration they have shown me in giving me an opportunity for explanation.

2. I find from the abstract of the Proceedings of the Government, dated the 31st July 1867, that further information is desired on certain points connected with my conduct in the matter of the appointment of certain Stamp Vendors in the Kistna District. From the two enclosures of Mr. Thornhill's letter, and from the manner in which the abstracts of the statements of the parties is drawn up, it is evident that some interested motives are imputed to me in connection with the appointment of the Vendors. I, therefore, think it desirable that all the facts relating to this subject should be laid before the Board, and which I will try to do in as a concise manner as possible.

3. On the receipt of instructions from the Board, regarding the introduction of the Discount system, Mr. Thornhill, who was then on circuit, sent them to me at Masulipatam, with an order written in red-pencil on its back that I should without any delay carry out the wishes of the Board. I at once gave publicity to the subject, inviting tenders for the purchase and sale of stamps under the new system. Towards the end of March, or the commencement of April, I appointed *six* Vendors for the *six* Divisions A, B, C, D, E, and F, into which the town of Masulipatam was divided after the cyclone, by the Honorable Mr. Ellis, as it appeared to me that such an arrangement could best meet the requirements of the public. I then submitted the list of the Vendors to the Collector.

4. Just about this time, the Collector's Serishtadar came to Masulipatam from the Circuit Cutcherry, and interceding on behalf of the old Vendor (Basava Naidoo, the present petitioner to the Board,) on the Commission system, and who was his dependent, requested me to devise some other plan, so that Basava Naidoo might not be deprived of the income he was thereto getting. But I showed him the Circular Order of the Board on the subject, and said that the object of that authority, which was by the new system to facilitate the supply of stamps to the public, could by no means be attained by any other arrangement than what had been already adopted.

5. In the following month (about May 1866), I received a Telugu Memorandum (Yadast) from the Serishtadar's Department, with the signature of the Collector in the Circuit Cutcherry, directing me to reduce the number of Vendors from six to two. I at once sent for the Vendors, and desired them to give up their licenses. They asked me to allow them time within which they could dispose of

the stamps in their hands. This was granted with reference to the amount of stock in their hands, as required in the Board's Circular Orders.

6. The Vendors not being satisfied with the orders issued, petitioned the Collector, who was still on circuit. On his return to the Huzoor Cutcherry, that gentleman sent for me, and asked me about the matter. I then explained to him all that he required, and showed him the Board's orders. He carefully read them, and marked the principal passages, by drawing lines below them with his red-pencil. Mr. Thornhill seemed satisfied with the explanation, and did not insist on the reduction. No orders were passed on the petitions presented by the Vendors. The petitioner, Basava Naidoo, whose object was to obtain the license in his sole name for the whole town, appeared before the Collector, who, however, did not countenance him, but refused to comply with his request. Although this proceeding on the part of the Collector, showed to me clearly that he did not much care about the reduction, yet as the Telugu Memorandum (Yadast) sent to me on the subject, was not formally cancelled, I gave the Vendors a second warning that they should give up their licenses.

7. Mr. Thornhill took leave in the latter end of May 1866, and Mr. Wilson was in temporary charge of the district for about two weeks, during which period, too, the Board petitioner, Basava Naidoo, did not fail to urge his claim before that gentleman, but he met with no better success.

8. Immediately after Mr. Chase took charge of the district, which was about the middle of June 1866, Basava Naidoo (petitioner) went up to that gentleman with an English petition, but obtained no favorable orders. The other Vendors also presented petitions to the Acting Collector, that they might not be deprived of the licenses which were already granted to them. Mr. Chase sent for me, when I explained to him what had passed; and he decided finally that the six Vendors should be continued, considering that this was a more convenient arrangement to afford facilities to the public. He passed his endorsements on the Vendors' petitions to this effect. He also passed a list of the names of the Vendors for publication in the Gazette, which must be now in the Collector's records. In this list, the name of the Board petitioner (Basava Naidoo) was included. It must be here observed that when Mr. Chase passed his final orders, he was fully aware of the Telugu Memorandum, sent to me by Mr. Thornhill to reduce the number from six to two, as I explained the matter to him. Besides, the Vendors themselves, who presented counter-petitions both in Telugu and English to that gentleman, stated the fact in them.

9. Basava Naidoo, dissatisfied as he was with this final order, sent up a petition to the Board, with Mr. Chase's endorsement, about the same time (June 1866). The Board referred it in the usual course to the Collector for a "brief report," as the petitioner complained that he was not allowed a license under the new system, which was altogether false, for he was the first person appointed as Stamp Vendor under the new system, and first received the license, before it was given to any other.

10. As soon as the Board petition was received by Mr. Thornhill, he wrote on a piece of dark Goa-paper an order to me in his own hand-writing to give an explanation, sending to me the petition along with it. On the same day I submitted my explanation, returning the petition with Mr. Chase's order to the press for publication of the list of the names of Vendors, which had been passed by that gentleman. My explanation above alluded to, Mr. Thornhill sent along with other papers to the Head Clerk, who as usual gave them to the Serishtadar. If I recollect aright, the petition was received from the Board's office about the end of July 1866, one or two days after Mr. Thornhill's return to Masulipatam from leave. About the middle of September following, I received a Telugu Memorandum, (Yadast,) from the Serishtadar's Department, with the Collector's signature, calling for the explanation. I wrote in reply at once that I had returned the petition with my explanation on the very day that Mr. Thornhill wrote to me about the matter. A month or two after, I think, an English Memorandum, in the form of a reminder, was again sent to me, and I replied to it in the same manner. The matter was then allowed to drop. Mr. Thornhill took no further notice of the matter, nor did he even think of reducing the number of Vendors as originally required in the Telugu Memorandum. In fact, no action whatever was taken to report upon the Board petition, until that gentleman was to leave Masulipatam recently to take up his acting appointment in Madras.

11. I was liked by Mr. Thornhill for about three years after I joined Masulipatam, during which tenure I had his confidence, and he was extremely kind to me; but unfortunately for me, he was appointed Acting Collector of Ganjam about the middle of 1865, during my absence at Madras, and Mr. Chase succeeded him temporarily. After my return to Masulipatam from Madras, about the middle of November 1865, he sought my aid now and then in carrying out certain reforms in the district, and I heartily assisted him as well as I could. I did nothing more than simply carrying out the orders which that gentleman issued in the several Official Memoranda addressed to me. I beg to submit, for the perusal of the Board, a Memorandum from Mr. Chase (A), from which they will see that he was of opinion that some *humbug* was going on in the office.

A.

12. When Mr. Thornhill returned from Ganjam in about February 1866, the Collector's Serishtadar did his best to poison the mind of that gentleman against me. The first attack upon me was a report about some delay in a salt case. The matter was made to assume a very important aspect, and it was also insinuated that I was concerned in some mercantile dealings. Mr. Chase, who was again in temporary charge of the district after Mr. Thornhill took leave on the 27th May 1866, reported, however, on receiving my explanation, that there was no foundation for such a charge. That gentleman observed on that occasion as follows:—

"Had he once stepped aside to do wrong, I feel he would have endeavoured
"to make friends at all events in the Cutcherry; but so far from this being the
"case, I find nearly all the highest Cutcherry officials are opposed to him, and that
"a great deal of enmity exists between him and them."

The Board disposed of the case, acquitting me fully of any improper motives in the salt transactions, and warning me for my carelessness in the matter. Had it not been for the liberal and impartial consideration of the Board towards me on that occasion, I would have then only fallen a victim to Mr. Thornhill's severe displeasure, and the intrigues of his Cutcherry.

13. After Mr. Thornhill's return from leave, towards the end of July 1866, the chief servants of the Cutcherry took every opportunity to carry tales against me. It was represented to him that I had concern with some of the anonymous petitions sent to the Board against that gentleman. In fine, the mind of Mr. Thornhill was completely poisoned against me. I could get no access to him to explain any matter. The Cutcherry servants took advantage of this, and I was now and then furnished with Telugu Memoranda calculated to annoy me. I submitted to everything with patience. When I was thus in a disturbed state of mind, I received a Telugu Memorandum from Mr. Thornhill, calling for my opinion in reference to the transfer to the General Deputy Collector, a relation of the Collector's Serishtadar, of a portion of the talook tappal business under my charge. Considering the time and the displeasure of my superior towards me, I should have been very cautious and careful in replying to his call; but unfortunately for me, I submitted to him a reply, which, I afterwards found, was calculated to irritate him. This opportunity was taken, and I was at once handed over to the Board and Government. The perusal of the somewhat hasty letter I wrote, accompanied by severe remarks against me by Mr. Thornhill, necessarily created an unfavorable impression towards me in the minds of the superior authorities, and I am now suffering its consequences. I freely admit and confess that I was not prudent enough in writing a letter of the description to my superior, particularly at the time when I was under his displeasure.

14. The people in the Cutcherry did not feel contented with the misfortune that had befallen me by the unfavourable orders passed by the Government, which caused my removal from the district with the reduction of pay, but wanted to go further in view to insure my downfall and utter ruin, by making up some case against me, affecting my character. They accordingly endeavoured their best to prevail upon *people*, who are ever ready for such work, to bring false suits against me in the Court. Their object in doing this, was to give some material to Mr. Thornhill before he left the district, on which to ground a complaint to the authorities at Madras, affecting my character while reporting on the Board petition, regarding the appointment of Vendors, which, though received in *July* 1866, was purposely kept back up to *May* 1867. The number of suits instituted against me were four in the Small Cause Court, of which, three were filed in different months while I was in Masulipatam, and the remaining one after I left the district. It should be here remarked that the suits referred to, were all filed against me after Mr. Thornhill reported me to the Board for writing a disrespectful letter. These suits were all dismissed as false and malicious, except one, relating to the demand of commission, &c., for the Promissory Notes purchased, which was decreed against me. The circumstances connected with this case will be fully explained elsewhere.

B. I beg to enclose an extract from a letter received from my Vakeel marked B., from which it will be seen that the Judge declared in the open Court that the suits brought against me were false, and that it was done through enmity.

15. I have now laid before the Board the plain facts connected with my case, facts which can be proved to their satisfaction if a fair trial is allowed, which I am prepared to stand. I will now proceed to submit my explanation regarding the transaction alluded to in the two enclosures received with Mr. Thornhill's letter.

16. In the Enclosure No. 1, an abstract of the depositions of eight individuals noted in the margin is given. I would notice them seriatim. The first man, Venkaya, is a relation of the Collector's Serishtadar. I entirely deny that I had anything to do with him. He is an Ummedwar for employment. For the distribution of the Relief Fund, the Collector's Serishtadar employed him, and I had occasion to report him to the Collector for misappropriation of the fund. This man had, apparently under the instruction of some one, written a letter to my brother at Madras, in order to draw a reply from the latter with a mention of my name. But my brother discovered the dark intention of the writer, and informed me of it, and also addressed him a reply, stating, among other things, that my name should not have been mentioned in the letter. This dodge was played at the time that the Collector was reporting me to the Board in the salt case for delay, and was alluding for the first time to the allegation that I recommended merchants to trade with my brother. Venkaya, who was really a beggar, brought a suit that he had lent me 50 Rupees. It was thrown out as false at once. A perusal of the records, and an inquiry as to the party who propped him with the payment of the cost of Court, will show to the Board who was the prime-mover of all this annoyance, and also how improbable it is that I should borrow money from an Ummedwar, whom I once reported to the Collector for misappropriation of the Relief Fund. The suit was filed against me after I left Masulipatam. This is an extraordinary invention without the least foundation.

1. K. Venkaya.
2. T. Nagaboosham.
3. S. Nagaboosham.
4. V. China Ramasawmy.
5. S. Payadaya
6. T. Padmanaboodoo.
7. T. Sreeramooloo.
8. M. Kolilungam.

17. The second had been a Vendor of postage-stamps long before the introduction of the Discount system. After the cyclone, there were reports that he, in concert with the Head Shroff, (his relation,) was vending in his house damaged stamps which were missing in the Treasury office. I took the Tahsildar with me and searched his house, but intimation had reached him before I left the office, and made my efforts to detect unsuccessful. He also did not lose this opportunity of annoying me by a suit for some 20 or 15 Rupees; but his case met with the same treatment as the other at the hands of the Judge.

18. The third and fourth have answered that they had no dealings either with me or my brother, and I have therefore, no remarks to make. I must, however, say that at times I purchased from them petty articles, such as candles, &c., and paid for them. When I left the district, I appointed one of them, No. 3, to sell my chairs, &c.

19. The fifth is the only Stamp Vendor who happens to have had any concern with my brother at Madras, and that too was on only one occasion. It is true that the party did send gram and obtained spirits in return. But there is an alloy of an untruth in his statement. He was instructed to add, I fear to my injury, that he was told by me that my brother would send him, at low rates, whatever things he wanted from Madras. This, I never did; I do not understand why my brother

should send anything at a low rate to his own disadvantage. My brother has furnished to me the original letter of this man, which I beg to enclose (marked C) with translation, and which he had addressed my brother when he sent the gram. By this the Board will be pleased to perceive that my name would not have been omitted in the letter if I had had any little concern in the matter, or if the gram was sent at my recommendation.

C.

20. No. 6 deposes that he had no dealings with me or my brother, but that his brother was frequently visiting me, though he did not know on what business. His brother, No. 7, corroborates this fact, and acknowledges, on being questioned, that he had advanced me 280 Rupees, receiving an order to the cash-keeper for the same amount, which was the balance of my pay. I admit that No. 7 was my agent, who usually supplied provisions for my house. When I left Masulipatam on the last occasion, I settled all my accounts with him, and received an advance of Rupees 280 from him on the eve of my leaving the district, and gave him an order to the Cash-keeper for the same amount, which was the balance of my pay. I hope the Board will find that there was nothing irregular or improper in the transaction, particularly at a time when my connection with the district had ceased.

21. No. 8, or the last one, is a Moonsiff of the Petta, and joint partner in an Arrack shop. He was originally a Vendor, and his name was accordingly included in the list prepared for Mr. Chase's consideration upon his orders. But that officer, on examination, rejected his name on the ground that a Moonsiff could not be a Stamp Vendor too. I never asked him to speak to his relation Appasawmy to get supplies from my brother. He says that Appasawmy wrote to my brother, but got no answer. This is strange, and what is still more strange is the allegation, that I asked No. 8 to arrange to send money in advance to my brother, and that I deprived him of the Vendorship because he refused to send the money without some security. This is altogether a trumped-up story, to which no credence could be given even under probabilities.

22. From the foregoing circumstances, the Board will be pleased to judge with what object Mr. Thornhill submitted Enclosure No. 1 in connection with a "brief report" called for by the Board upon a petition presented to them by a Stamp Vendor, who wanted to be the sole Vendor in that large town of Masulipatam. I need hardly draw their attention to the notorious characters brought by my enemies to act in the play, and to the indifferent statements given by these men as abstracted by Mr. Thornhill. If even these circumstances were true, there was nothing criminal in them. For the last four years I have been in the Kistna District, and it is wonderful that I should, about the time of leaving the district, be a defaulter for the trifling several sums of Rupees 15, 20, and 50, for which the suits were brought, and which were summarily dismissed by the Judge. I must not trouble the Board with further comments on the matter, but leave it for their benign and judicious consideration.

23. I shall now proceed to state, briefly, the facts of the suit referred to by Mr. Thornhill in his Enclosure No. 2. I shall place before the Board the plain facts as far as I recollect. About the middle of the year 1864, my brother at Madras

wrote to me to say that he purposed to purchase Government Promissory Notes for 1,000 Rupees from one of his fellow-merchants at Madras, provided I paid him the amount through the merchant's agent at Masulipatam. I consented to it, and spoke to that effect to the plaintiff,* and told him that if a receipt of my brother was produced, I would pay him the amount by instalments. To this the plaintiff agreed, and about two months after he produced a receipt signed by my brother, showing the amount I should pay upon it, namely, 1,000 Rupees. This was in June 1864, when the liquidation commenced. In five months, I believe, I paid the whole 1,000 Rupees by several monthly instalments, the last being in October 1864, when, I think, about 400 Rupees were paid at once on its being urged by the plaintiff that he had to meet calls upon him from elsewhere. After the whole amount was paid, the receipt, which was carefully kept by the plaintiff, was delivered to me for return to my brother at Madras.

* He is no Stamp Vendor, nor has he any connection with the office.

24. These are the facts of the case. Every time the payment was made, it was noted on the back of the receipt produced, and taken again on each occasion by the plaintiff or his son. I was not aware of any charge having been made for commission, &c.; nor was any demand ever made to me, as the purchase was arranged by my brother. If any such sum was really due, it would have been noted on the receipt of my brother, or the merchant would not have returned to me the receipt after the whole amount of 1,000 Rupees entered in it was discharged.

25. All on a sudden, after a lapse of two and half years, a suit was filed to my surprise and without my knowledge, for some commission, &c., as due from me. This case was decreed against me, not from inquiry of the merits of the case, but upon the oath of the plaintiff, who being a merchant of respectability, my Vakeel hastily thought would not declare an untruth in an open Court to please others. But the old man (plaintiff) swore from pressure outside, and I had to pay the amount.

26. Should my Vakeel have patiently waited for a regular inquiry, this suit would have met the same fate as the other cases have at the hands of the Judge. The discrepancy in the statements of the evidence for the prosecution, and the absurdity of the claim, are apparent on the very face of it. The first witness, (the Head Shroff,) who appears to be more sanguine in his deposition than anybody else, states that the last demand was made a year ago, that is about December 1865. But the plaintiff says that I was repeatedly asked for the money. The former states that, on the payment of the last instalment, the receipt was returned to me with a note showing that 100 Rupees was still due; but the latter is silent on this point.

27. Moreover, it is a fact beyond doubt that the plaintiff's son was the only man that came to me and received the 400 Rupees, the last instalment, and credited it on the back of the receipt with his own hand-writing. (He manages his father's affairs.) The Head Shroff never came to me.

28. Further, it could be proved that the plaintiff and the Head Shroff have not been in good terms for a long time, one bringing suits against the other. Under these circumstances, the Head Shroff could not have gone up to plaintiff and asked him to purchase the notes for me at Madras, as the Head Shroff states in his deposition. Even here, there is a great falsehood on important point. The plaintiff states that I spoke to him direct, and asked him to purchase notes, whereas the Head

Shroff says that *he* was the person spoken to by me, and that he then told it and arranged with the plaintiff for the purchase. The plaintiff does not say a word about the mediation of the Head Shroff in the matter as alleged by the latter. It is a wonderful concoction.

29. The other two witnesses for the plaintiff were his own Gumastahs. Above all, a reference to the records will shew that the Head Shroff, by his bad conduct, made himself so notorious, and that I had to recommend his transfer both to Mr. Thornhill and Mr. Chase. I could not have, therefore, used him in the matter to purchase notes for me, as he was not in my confidence. Should the Board be pleased to send for the receipt, the whole transaction will appear clear to them, as well as the amount I was desired to pay.

30. In conclusion, I most respectfully beg that I may be pardoned for the prolixity of this letter, which was unavoidable, as it was my anxious desire to lay before the Board the whole of the facts connected with my case. I am confident that a perusal of the papers will convince the Board that my character has been wantonly assailed, and that ordinary things were made matters of importance through sheer malice, and with an intent to injure me wholly. However, I had the misfortune unintentionally of incurring the severe displeasure of Mr. Thornhill, and ultimately the disapprobation of the Board and Government. I, therefore, most humbly beg that the Board will be pleased to view my unfortunate case with leniency, and relieve me from my present degraded position, by recommending to Government to restore me to my former grade and position. I beg to assure the Board and Government that I shall make it my constant study to discharge the duties that may be assigned to me with every care and precaution, and to the satisfaction of my superiors.

Enclosure No. 1, A.—Memorandum from Mr. Chase.

Enclosure No. 2, B.—Extract from a letter.

Enclosure No. 3, C.—Letter from a merchant with translation.

Forwarded to the Acting Collector of Madras, for his observations.

No. 249. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th October 1867, No. 6,757.

Read again letter from Deputy Collector Dhurmaroya Moodelly, dated 11th September 1867, recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 3rd October 1867, No. 6,296.

Read also the following letters:—

From W. WILSON, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 26th August 1867, No. 298.

Board's Proceedings, 15th August 1867, No. 5,290.

1. I have the honor to enclose, in original, the papers called for in paragraph 1 of the Government Order, No. 1,751, dated 31st July 1867.

2. These are (first) explanation given by T. Dhurmaroya Moodelly, and second) a list of Vendors approved by Mr. Chase.

3. There exist on record no orders of Mr. Chase passed on this subject: the matter seems to have been settled in personal conference between the Collector and the Treasury Deputy Collector.

Enclosures Nos. 1 and 2.—Original papers.

From T. A. N. CHASE, Esq., Collector of Kurnool, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated on Circuit Markapore, 28th August 1867, No. 264.

In reply to Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 5,290, dated 15th August, I have the honor to inform you that, beyond appointing during the time I acted in 1866 as Collector of the Kistna District, several Stamp Vendors, of whom some, I forget how many, were appointed to Guntoor, I have no recollection of anything else on the subject which took place.

From G. THORNHILL, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Sydapet, 9th October 1867, No. 333.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Board's Proceedings, dated 3rd October 1867, No. 6,296, forwarding to me, for my observations, a letter of explanation addressed to the Board by T. Dhurmaroya Moodelliar. The letter is a reply to a call for explanation of certain enclosures in a report submitted by myself as Collector of the Kistna District on a petition referred by the Board, and entered in Board's Proceedings, dated 6th July 1867, No. 4,235.

2. The petitioner alleged that Dhurmaroya Moodelliar had, from interested motives, appointed a large number of persons as Stamp Vendors. My inquiry into the matter was limited to questioning a few of the persons immediately concerned; the late Deputy Collector had left the district, and a more formal inquiry was not, under the circumstances, possible.

3. In the course of inquiry mention was made of certain suits which were brought against the Deputy Collector before he left the district.

4. One of these suits related to the purchase of a Government bond by the Deputy Collector through his Shroff, and the refusal to pay the proper premium on it, and I was therefore led to examine the record, and to furnish an abstract of it for the Board's information.

5. On these two points, namely, the improper appointment of Stamp Vendors, and the transaction relating to the purchase of the bond as reported by me, the Deputy Collector was directed to give his explanation.

6. His explanation is offered in the letter under review, and it does not appear to me that it requires many observations, as, although very lengthy, it does not contain any satisfactory explanation on either point.

7. Paragraphs 5 to 8 show that I disapproved of his appointing a large number of Vendors from the first, and directed the discontinuance of all but two, but that during my absence the original number was re-appointed.

8. Paragraph 10 relates to the receipt and disposal of the petition reported on in my letter of the 17th May 1867.

9. The petition was sent by me to the Deputy Collector for explanation, and when returned, the petition and his explanation were put by me into my drawer and overlooked. They were not, as stated by the Deputy Collector, given by me to the Head Clerk, and by him to the Serishtadar; and it was only on finding, at a later period, that the petition was still on the file as undisposed of, that I searched and found it in my table drawer. No one but myself is to blame for the delay in its disposal.

10. In remarking on the replies to the questions put by me to the Stamp Vendors, and those immediately connected with them, the Deputy Collector denies his dealings with some, and acknowledges them with others. No searching inquiry was made into the allegations that his motives in granting licenses were interested, as shown above in paragraph 2; but by his own showing, his brother, who never had any dealings with Masulipatam before Dhurmaroya became Deputy Collector, traded with one of these Vendors, and he himself employed the brother of another as his confidential Agent; the latter when first asked denied having any money dealings whatever with the Deputy Collector, but the fact that he had received the balance of pay due to him, and that he had been Dhurmaroya's Agent was so notorious, that when questioned he could not entirely deny it.

11. In paragraph 21, Dhurmaroya rather derides the notion of Appa Sawmi, the brother of Kotlingam, writing to his brother for supplies; whether Dhurmaroya asked him to advance money or not I do not know, but he certainly supplied Appa sawmi with his brother's address, as I saw it myself written in English in Dhurmaroya's *own hand-writing*, with a Telugu translation beneath it.

12. In paragraph 6 of my letter of 17th May, (Board's Proceedings, 6th July,) I wrote that "it would appear from the replies to the queries that the petitioner's allegation was not groundless," and I do not think that anything T. Dhurmaroya has now advanced is calculated to alter the opinion I then formed.

13. With respect to the transaction in connection with the purchase of the bond, I have only to refer to my abstract of the case published in Board's Proceedings, 6th July 1867. Dhurmaroya states in paragraph 25 of his letter that the case was decreed, not on its merits, but on the oath of the plaintiff. The Board will, however, see that the complaint was supported by the evidence of plaintiff and three witnesses; the third witness produced the account of the plaintiff's agent at Madras to shew the amount originally charged for the notes.

14. The Deputy Collector states, in paragraph 25, that the plaintiff swore from pressure from without, I can only say that I know no one less likely to enter into a suit of this nature to further the ends of others. He is a man of very considerable wealth, and very cautious in all his dealings; as shown in my letter of 17th May, paragraph 8, he was formerly Head Shroff in the Collector's Treasury at Masulipatam, and is father-in-law to the first witness against Dhurmaroya, who is now Head Shroff himself.

15. It is true, as stated by Dhurmaroya in paragraph 29, that he complained to me against this man, and asked me to transfer him to another post, but he was never able to substantiate any charge against him, and I never heard a complaint against him from any one else.

16. There is nothing, I venture to think, in the explanation of Dhurmaroya to cause me to modify the opinion that I expressed in paragraph 11 of my letter of 17th May.

17. The enclosures A, B, and C are herewith returned; they do not appear to demand any notice.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Original papers.

1. In their Order under date 31st July 1867, No. 1,751, the Government desired the Board to obtain from the Acting Collector of the Kistna District the explanation which Deputy Collector Dhurmaroya Moodelly stated he had submitted to Mr. Thornhill on the subject of the appointment of certain Stamp Vendors in the Kistna District with Mr. Chase's orders on the same subject. They also desired that Mr. Chase would report what he remembered to have taken place relative to the matter, and that the Board would submit these papers, together with the Deputy Collector's explanation, with their own remarks.

2. The papers above recorded contain the information called for by Government, as well as Mr. Thornhill's views on the Deputy Collector's answer. It appears that the so-called explanation is a mere statement of what had taken place when the six Stamp Vendors were appointed by Mr. Chase, and that it contains no sort of explanation of the Deputy Collector's conduct in the matter. Mr. Chase has unfortunately no recollection of what passed between himself and the Deputy Collector on the subject, so that it is difficult now to ascertain positively whether or not the Deputy Collector deliberately took advantage of Mr. Chase beingnew to the district in order to induce him to set aside the known views of Mr. Thornhill, for whom he was officiating as Collector.

3. In the defence of his conduct, which the Deputy Collector has now submitted, he points out that the views of Mr. Thornhill were fully set forth in the cross petitions from the Stamp Vendors to Mr. Chase, and that, therefore, he must have been aware of them when he passed his own final orders on the subject; but as now observed by Mr. Thornhill, the Deputy Collector's own explanation shows that Mr. Thornhill had disapproved of the appointment of a large number of Vendors from the first, and had directed that only two should be retained, and that during his absence the number originally proposed by Dhurmaroya were re-appointed.

4. Even supposing, however, that Mr. Chase had been made fully aware of the opinion held by Mr. Thornhill, and that he nominated six Stamp Vendors instead of two for the town, because he differed with him, far the most serious charge against the Deputy Collector is still unexplained. Mr. Thornhill's letter of the 17th May 1867, No. 146, recorded in the Government Order under date 31st July 1867, No. 1,751, went to shew that the statement made in Petition No. 2,347 of 1866, that the Deputy Collector had induced the Acting Collector Mr. Chase, to nominate "his friends, the Sowcars, as Stamp Vendors," was not without foundation, and that the Deputy Collector had also taken advantage of his official position, and had attempted to evade the payment of money justly due.

5. Mr. Thornhill is of opinion that the Deputy Collector has entirely failed to clear himself of this part of the charge against him, and the Board concur in the view taken by him. They consider it to be established that the Deputy Collector

did endeavour to obtain business at Masulipatam for his brother at Madras, and that he used his official influence to oblige some persons who were connected with his brother in this manner, and others who had pecuniary transactions with himself. They are further of opinion that his conduct in connection with the purchase of the Promissory Notes and his refusal to pay what was justly due by him is highly reprehensible, and that he has committed a breach of the orders of Government. From the account of the transaction, as gathered from the proceedings in Court, it would appear that, early in 1864, the Deputy Collector applied to his own subordinate, the Head Shroff, asking him to obtain, through his father-in-law, a Sowcar at Masulipatam, Promissory Notes of the five per cent. loan to the extent of Rupees 1,000, and that these Notes were so obtained, and partially paid for by instalments through the Head Shroff during 1864. Should this account of the transaction be correct, the Deputy Collector has obviously obtained pecuniary benefits through his own subordinate; for from his own showing he only paid Rupees 1,000, leaving unpaid interest and commission; but even from the Deputy Collector's own account of the matter, it is clear that he received either for his brother or himself, a considerable advance of money from a Sowcar who resided in the town when he was acting as Deputy Collector, and who was the father-in-law of the Head Shroff employed under him, a proceeding which was in direct contravention of the orders of Government.

No. 250. ORDER THEREON, 13th December 1867, No. 2,972.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government observe that Dhurmaroya Moodelly having been appointed to the public service as a Clerk in 1852, became Talook Sheristadar in 1853, Tahsildar in 1854, Sub-Collector's Sheristadar in 1856, Naib Sheristadar in 1858, Deputy Collector, 4th class, in March 1859, and promoted to 3rd class in June following on transfer to the Inam Commissioner's Department.

2. In January 1861, he was sent to Tanjore as a Deputy Collector on the regular establishment for general duties, and in August following his removal for misconduct was recommended by the Board, and sanctioned by Government in G. O., dated 5th October 1861, No. 1,927. In November following he was appointed to act in the Salem District, where he did not give satisfaction. In October 1862 he was sent to act in Malabar, when the Government have reason to know that his performance of his duties was not efficient.

3. In April 1863, he was sent to do special duty in the Madras District, connected with some partial revisions of assessment, and in the December following his incompetency for the task was reported to Government, with the request that another officer might be sent in his stead. In the same month he was transferred to the Treasury charge of the Kistna District, from which he was again removed in January 1867 for incompetency, and unsatisfactory conduct in a matter relating to the change in the Government price for salt, when at least his negligence involved a loss to Government, and he was at the same time reduced from the 3rd to the 4th class of Deputy Collectors. About the same time very improper conduct on the part of Dhurmaroya Moodelly, in writing privately to the Civil and

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
13th December 1867.

Session Judge, reflections on the Board, the Collector of the District, and the superior officers employed in it, was brought to the notice of Government, but they deemed the punishment they had already awarded to him to be sufficient for the requirements of the case as it then stood.

4. The correspondence now before Government originated in certain petitions to the Board, and the facts proved and admitted by Dhurmaroya Moodelly indicate a spirit of insubordination, and a laxity of conduct in pecuniary matters of much the same kind as formerly came to light in Tanjore, which, in the opinion of Government, stamp Dhurmaroya Moodelly as altogether unfit for retention in the influential and responsible post of Deputy Collector.

5. The Government resolve accordingly to remove T. Dhurmaroya Moodelly from the appointment of Deputy Collector, but they desire to secure his re-employment in a more subordinate office, and the Board of Revenue will consider and report how this can best be effected.

(True Extract.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Accountant General.
,, the Examiner of Claims.
,, T. Dhurmaroya Moodelly, G. O. only.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

No. 6,296.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 3rd October 1867.

Read the following letter from T. DHARMAROW MOODELLY, Deputy Collector, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 11th September 1867:—

1. With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated the 15th August 1867, No. 5,290, directing me to submit such explanation as I may desire to offer, respecting the transactions mentioned in the Enclosures Nos. 1 and 2 of Mr. Thornhill's letter, dated the 17th May 1867, I respectfully beg to state the following circumstances, offering at the same time my grateful thanks to the Board and Government for the kind consideration they have shown me in giving me an opportunity for explanation.

2. I find from the abstract of the Proceedings of the Government, dated the 31st July 1867, that further information is desired on certain points connected with my conduct in the matter of the appointment of certain Stamp Vendors in the Kistna District. From the two enclosures of Mr. Thornhill's letter, and from the manner in which the abstracts of the statements of the parties is drawn up, it is evident that some interested motives are imputed to me in connection with the appointment of the Vendors. I therefore think it desirable that all the facts relating to this subject should be laid before the Board, and which I will try to do in as a concise manner as possible.

3. On the receipt of instructions from the Board, regarding the introduction of the Discount system, Mr. Thornhill, who was then on circuit, sent them to me at Masulipatam, with an order written in red-pencil on its back that I should without any delay carry out the wishes of the Board. I at once gave publicity to the subject, inviting tenders for the purchase and sale of stamps under the new system. Towards the end of March, or the commencement of April, I appointed *six* Vendors for the *six* Divisions A, B, C, D, E and F, into which the town of Masulipatam was divided after the cyclone by the Honourable Mr. Ellis, as it appeared to me that such an arrangement could best meet the requirements of the public. I then submitted the list of the Vendors to the Collector.

4. Just about this time, the Collector's Serishtadar came to Masulipatam from the Circuit Cutcherry, and interceding on behalf of the old Vendor (Basava Naidoo, the present petitioner to the Board,) on the Commission system, and who was his dependent, requested me to devise some other plan, so that Basava Naidoo might not be deprived of the income he was thereto getting. But I showed him the Circular Order of the Board on the subject, and said that the object of that authority, which was by the new system to facilitate the supply of stamps to the public, could by no means be attained by any other arrangement than what had been already adopted.

5. In the following month (about May 1866) I received a Telugu Memorandum (Yadast) from the Serishtadar's Department, with the signature of the Collector in the Circuit Cutcherry, directing me to reduce the number of Vendors from six to two. I at once sent for the Vendors and desired them to give up their licenses. They asked me to allow them time within which they could dispose of the stamps in their hands. This was granted with reference to the amount of stock in their hands, as required in the Board's Circular Orders.

6. The Vendors not being satisfied with the orders issued, petitioned the Collector who was still on circuit. On his return to the Huzoor Cutcherry, that gentleman sent for me, and asked me about the matter. I then explained to him all that he required, and showed him the Board's orders. He carefully read them, and marked the principal passages by drawing lines below them with his red-pencil. Mr. Thornhill seemed satisfied with the explanation, and did not insist on the reduction. No orders were passed on the petitions presented by the Vendors. The petitioner Basava Naidoo, whose object was to obtain the license in his sole name for the whole town, appeared before the Collector, who, however, did not countenance him, but refused to comply with his request. Although this proceeding on the part of the Collector, showed to me clearly that he did not much care about the reduction, yet as the Telugu Memorandum (Yadast) sent to me on the subject, was not formally cancelled, I gave the Vendors a second warning that they should give up their licenses.

7. Mr. Thornhill took leave in the latter end of May 1866, and Mr. Wilson was in temporary charge of the District for about two weeks, during which period, too, the Board petitioner, Basava Naidoo, did not fail to urge his claim before that gentleman, but he met with no better success.

8. Immediately after Mr. Chase took charge of the District, which was about the middle of June 1866, Basava Naidoo (petitioner) went up to that gentleman with an English petition, but obtained no favourable orders. The other Vendors also presented petitions to the Acting Collector that they might not be deprived of the licenses which were already granted to them. Mr. Chase sent for me when I explained to him what had passed; and he decided finally that the six Vendors should be continued, considering that this was a more convenient arrragement to afford facilities to the public. He passed his endorsements on the Vendors' petitions to this effect. He also passed a list of the names of the Vendors for publication in the Gazette, which must be now in the Collector's records. In this list, the name of the Board petitioner (Basava Naidoo) was included. It must be here observed that when Mr. Chase passed his final orders, he was fully aware of the Telugu Memorandum, sent to me by Mr. Thornhill to reduce the number from six to two, as I explained the matter to him. Besides, the Vendors themselves who presented counter-petitions both in Telugu and English to that gentleman, stated the fact in them.

9. Basava Naidoo, dissatisfied as he was with this final order, sent up a petition to the Board with Mr. Chase's endorsement about the same time (June 1866.) The Board referred it in the usual course to the Collector for a "brief report," as the petitioner complained that he was not allowed a license under the new system, which was altogether false, for he was the first person appointed as Stamp Vendor under the new system, and first received the license, before it was given to any other.

10. As soon as the Board petition was received by Mr. Thornhill, he wrote on a piece of dark Goa-paper an order to me in his own handwriting to give an explanation, sending to me the petition along with it. On the same day I submitted my explanation, returning the petition with Mr. Chase's order to the press for publication of the list of the names of Vendors which had been passed by that gentleman. My explanation above alluded to, Mr. Thornhill sent along with other papers to the Head Clerk, who as usual gave them to the Serishtadar. If I recollect aright, the petition was received from the Board's office about the end of July 1866, one or two days after Mr. Thornhill's return to Masulipatam from leave. About the middle of September following, I received a Telugu Memorandum (Yadast) from the Serishtadar's Department with the Collector's signature, calling for the explanation. I wrote in reply at once that I had returned the petition with my explanation on the very day that Mr. Thornhill wrote to me about the matter. A month or two after, I think, an English Memorandum, in the form of a reminder, was again sent to me, and I replied to it in the same manner. The matter was then allowed to drop. Mr. Thornhill took no further notice of the matter, nor did he even think of reducing the number of Vendors as originally required in the Telugu Memorandum. In fact no action whatever was taken to report upon the Board petition, until that gentleman was to leave Masulipatam recently to take up his acting appointment in Madras.

11. I was liked by Mr. Thornhill for about three years after I joined Masulipatam, during which tenure I had his confidence, and he was extremely kind to me; but unfortunately for me, he was appointed Acting Collector of Ganjam about the middle of 1865 during my absence at Madras, and Mr. Chase succeeded him temporarily. After my return to Masulipatam from Madras about the middle of November 1865, he sought my aid now and then in carrying out certain reforms in the District, and I heartily assisted him as well as I could. I did nothing more than simply carrying out the orders which that gentleman issued in the several Official Memoranda addressed to me.

A. I beg to submit, for the perusal of the Board, a Memorandum from Mr. Chase (A), from which they will see that he was of opinion that some *humbug* was going on in the office.

12. When Mr. Thornhill returned from Ganjam in about February 1866, the Collector's Serishtadar did his best to poison the mind of that gentleman against me. The first attack upon me was a report about some delay in a salt case. The matter was made to assume a very important aspect, and it was also insinuated that I was concerned in some mercantile dealings. Mr. Chase, who was again in temporary charge of the District after Mr. Thornhill took leave on the 27th May 1866, reported, however, on receiving my explanation, that there was no foundation for such a charge. That gentleman observed on that occasion as follows:—

"Had he once stepped aside to do wrong, I feel he would have endeavoured to make friends at "all events in the Cutcherry; but so far from this being the case, I find nearly all the highest "Cutcherry officials are opposed to him, and that a great deal of enmity exists between him and "them."

The Board disposed of the case, acquitting me fully of any improper motives in the salt transactions, and warning me for my carelessness in the matter. Had it not been for the liberal and impartial consideration of the Board towards me on that occasion, I would have then only fallen a victim to Mr. Thornhill's severe displeasure, and the intrigues of his Cutcherry.

13. After Mr. Thornhill's return from leave towards the end of July 1866, the chief servants of the Cutcherry took every opportunity to carry tales against me. It was represented to him that I had concern with some of the anonymous petitions sent to the Board against that gentleman. In fine, the mind of Mr. Thornhill was completely poisoned against me. I could get no access to him to explain any matter. The Cutcherry servants took advantage of this, and I was now and then furnished with Telugu Memoranda calculated to annoy me. I submitted to everything with patience. When I was thus in a disturbed state of mind, I received a Telugu Memorandum from Mr. Thornhill, calling for my opinion in reference to the transfer to the General Deputy Collector, a relation of the Collector's Serishtadar, of a portion of the talook tappal business under my charge. Considering the time and the displeasure of my superior towards me, I should have been very cautious and careful in replying to his call; but unfortunately for me, I submitted to him a reply, which, I afterwards found, was calculated to irritate him. This opportunity was taken, and I was at once handed over to the Board and Government. The perusal of the somewhat hasty letter I wrote, accompanied by severe remarks against me by Mr. Thornhill, necessarily created an unfavourable impression towards me in the minds of the superior authorities, and I am now suffering its consequences. I freely admit and confess that I was not prudent enough in writing a letter of the description to my superior, particularly at the time when I was under his displeasure.

14. The people in the Cutcherry did not feel contented with the misfortune that had befallen me by the unfavourable orders passed by the Government which caused my removal from the District with the reduction of pay; but wanted to go further in view to insure my downfall and utter ruin by making up some case against me, affecting my character. They accordingly endeavoured their best to prevail upon *people*, who are ever ready for such work, to bring false suits against me in the Court. Their object in doing this, was to give some material to Mr. Thornhill before he left the District, on which to ground a complaint to the authorities at Madras, affecting my character while reporting on the Board petition, regarding the appointment of Vendors, which, though received in *July* 1866, was purposely kept back up to *May* 1867. The number of suits instituted against me were four in the Small Cause Court, of which, three were filed in different months while I was in Masulipatam, and the remaining one after I left the District. It should be here remarked that the suits referred to, were all filed against me after Mr. Thornhill reported me to the Board for writing a disrespectful letter. These suits were all dismissed as false and malicious, except one, relating to the demand of commission, &c., for the Promissory Notes purchased, which was decreed against me. The circumstances connected with this case will be fully explained elsewhere. I beg to enclose an extract from a letter received from my Vakeel

B. marked B., from which it will be seen that the Judge declared in the open Court that the suits brought against me were false, and that it was done through enmity.

15. I have now laid before the Board the plain facts connected with my case, facts which can be proved to their satisfaction if a fair trial is allowed, which I am prepared to stand. I will now proceed to submit my explanation, regarding the transaction alluded to in the two enclosures received with Mr. Thornhill's letter.

16. In the Enclosure No. 1, an abstract of the depositions of eight individuals noted in the margin is given. I would notice them seriatim. The first man, Venkaya, is a relation of the Collector's Serishtadar. I entirely deny that I had anything to do with him. He is an Ummedwar for employment. For the distribution of the Relief Fund, the Collector's Serishtadar employed him, and I had occasion to report him to the Collector for misappropriation of the fund. This man had, apparently under the instruction of some one, written a letter to my brother at Madras, in order to draw a reply from the latter with a mention of my name. But my brother discovered the dark intention of the writer, and informed me of it, and also addressed him a reply, stating among other things that my name should not have been mentioned in the letter. This dodge was played at the time that the Collector was reporting me to the Board in the salt case for delay, and was alluding for the first time to the allegation that I recommended merchants to trade with my brother. Venkaya, who was really a beggar, brought a suit that he had lent me 50 rupees. It was thrown out as false at once. A perusal of the records, and an inquiry as to the party who propped him with the payment of the cost of the Court, will show to the Board who was the prime-mover of all this annoyance, and also how improbable it is that I should borrow money from an Ummedwar, whom I once reported to the Collector for misappropriation of the Relief Fund. The suit was filed against me after I left Masulipatam. This is an extraordinary invention without the least foundation.

1. K. Venkaya.
2. T. Nagaboosham.
3. S. Nagaboosham.
4. V. China Ramasawmy.
5. S. Payadaya.
6. T. Padmanaboodoo.
7. T. Sreeramoloo.
8. M. Kolilungam.

17. The second had been a Vendor of postage-stamps long before the introduction of the Discount system. After the cyclone, there were reports that he, in concert with the Head Shroff, (his relation,) was vending in his house, damaged stamps which were missing in the Treasury office. I took the Tahsildar with me and searched his house, but intimation had reached him before I left the office, and made my efforts to detect unsuccessful. He also did not lose this opportunity of annoying me by a suit for some 20 or 15 rupees; but his case met with the same treatment as the other at the hands of the Judge.

18. The third and fourth have answered that they had no dealings either with me or my brother, and I have, therefore, no remarks to make. I must, however, say that at times I purchased from them petty articles, such as candles, &c., and paid for them. When I left the District, I appointed one of them, No. 3, to sell my chairs, &c.

19. The fifth is the only Stamp Vendor who happens to have had any concern with my brother at Madras, and that too was on only one occasion. It is true that the party did send gram and obtained spirits in return. But there is an alloy of an untruth in his statement. He was instructed to add, I fear, to my injury that he was told by me that my brother would send him, at low rates, whatever things he wanted from Madras. This, I never did; I do not understand why my brother should send anything at a low rate to his own disadvantage. My brother has furnished to me the original letter of this man, which I beg to enclose (marked C) with translation, and which he had addressed my brother when he sent the gram. By this the Board will be pleased to perceive that my name would not have been omitted in the letter, if I had had any little concern in the matter, or if the gram was sent at my recommendation.

C.

20. No. 6 deposes that he had no dealings with me or my brother, but that his brother was frequently visiting me, though he did not know on what business. His brother, No. 7, corroborates this fact, and acknowledges, on being questioned, that he had advanced me 280 rupees, receiving an order to the Cashkeeper for the same amount which was the balance of my pay. I admit that No. 7 was my agent, who usually supplied provisions for my house. When I left Masulipatam on the last occasion, I settled all my accounts with him, and received an advance of Rupees 280 from him on the eve of my leaving the District, and gave him an order to the Cashkeeper for the same amount, which was the balance of my pay. I hope the Board will find that there was nothing irregular or improper in the transaction, particularly at a time when my connection with the District had ceased.

21. No. 8, or the last one, is a Moonsiff of the Petta, and joint partner in an Arrack Shop. He was originally a Vendor, and his name was accordingly included in the list prepared for Mr. Chase's consideration upon his orders. But that Officer, on examination, rejected his name on the ground that a Moonsiff could not be a Stamp Vendor too. I never asked him to speak to his relation Appasawmy to get supplies from my brother. He says that Appasawmy wrote to my brother, but got no answer. This is strange, and what is still more strange is the allegation, that I asked No. 8 to arrange to send money in advance to my brothor, and that I deprived him of the Vendorship, because he refused to send the money without some security. This is altogether a trumped-up story, to which no credence could be given even under probabilities.

22. From the foregoing circumstances, the Board will be pleased to judge with what object Mr. Thornhill submitted Enclosure No. 1 in connection with a "brief report" called for by the Board upon a petition presented to them by a Stamp Vendor, who wanted to be the sole Vendor in that large town of Masulipatam. I need hardly draw their attention to the notorious characters brought by my enemies to act in the play, and to the indifferent statements given by these men as abstracted by Mr. Thornhill. If even these circumstances were true, there was nothing criminal in them. For the last four years, I have been in the Kistna District, and it is wonderful that I should, about the time of leaving the District, be a defaulter for the trifling several sums of Rupees 15, 20, and 50, for which the suits were brought, and which were summarily dismissed by the Judge. I must not trouble the Board with further comments on the matter, but leave it for their benign and judicious consideration.

23. I shall now proceed to state, briefly, the facts of the suit referred to by Mr. Thornhill in his Enclosure No. 2. I shall place before the Board the plain facts as far as I recollect. About the middle of the year 1864, my brother at Madras wrote to me to say that he purposed to purchase Government Promissory Notes for 1,000 rupees from one of his fellow-merchants at Madras, provided I paid him the amount through the merchant's agent at Masulipatam. I consented to it, and spoke to that effect to the plaintiff,* and told him that if a receipt of my brother was produced, I would pay him the amount by instalments. To this, the plaintiff agreed, and about two months after, he produced a receipt signed by my brother, showing the amount I should pay upon it, namely, 1,000 rupees. This was in June 1864, when the liquidation commenced. In five months, I believe, I paid the whole 1,000 rupees by several monthly instalments, the last being in October 1864, when, I think, about 400 rupees were paid at once on its being urged by the plaintiff that he had to meet calls upon him from elsewhere. After the whole amount was paid, the receipt, which was carefully kept by the plaintiff, was delivered to me for return to my brother at Madras.

* He is no Stamp Vendor, nor has he any connection with the office.

24. These are the facts of the case. Every time the payment was made, it was noted on the back of the receipt produced, and taken again on each occasion by the plaintiff or his son. I was not aware of any charge having been made for commission, &c.; nor was any demand ever made to me, as the purchase was arranged by my brother. If any such sum was really due, it would have been noted on the receipt of my brother, or the merchant would not have returned to me the receipt after the whole amount of 1,000 rupees entered in it was discharged.

25. All on a sudden, after a lapse of two and half years, a suit was filed to my surprise and without my knowledge, for some commission, &c., as due from me. This case was decreed against me, not from inquiry of the merits of the case, but upon the oath of the plaintiff who being a merchant of respectability, my Vakeel hastily thought, would not declare an untruth in an open Court to please others. But the old man (plaintiff) swore from pressure outside, and I had to pay the amount.

26. Should my Vakeel have patiently waited for a regular inquiry, this suit would have met the same fate as the other cases have at the hands of the Judge. The discrepancy in the statements of the evidence for the prosecution, and the absurdity of the claim, are apparent on the very face of it. The first witness, (the Head Shroff,) who appears to be more sanguine in his deposition than anybody else, states that the last demand was made a year ago, that is about December 1865. But the plaintiff says that I was repeatedly asked for the money. The former states that on the payment of the last instalment, the receipt was returned to me with a note showing that 100 rupees was still due; but the latter is silent on this point.

27. Moreover it is a fact beyond doubt that the plaintiff's son was the only man that came to me and received the 400 rupees the last instalment, and credited it on the back of the receipt with his own handwriting. (He manages his father's affairs.) The Head Shroff never came to me.

28. Further it could be proved that the plaintiff and the Head Shroff have not been in good terms for a long time, one bringing suits against the other. Under these circumstances, the Head Shroff could not have gone up to plaintiff and asked him to purchase the notes for me at Madras, as the Head Shroff states in his deposition. Even here, there is a great falsehood on important point. The plaintiff states that I spoke to him direct and asked him to purchase notes, whereas the Head Shroff says that *he* was the person spoken to by me, and that he then told it and arranged with the plaintiff for the purchase. The plaintiff does not say a word about the mediation of the Head Shroff in the matter as alleged by the latter. It is a wonderful concoction.

29. The other two witnesses for the plaintiff were his own Gumastahs. Above all, a reference to the records will show that the Head Shroff by his bad conduct, made himself so notorious, and that I had to recommend his transfer both to Mr. Thornhill and Mr. Chase. I could not have, therefore, used him in the matter to purchase notes for me, as he was not in my confidence. Should the Board be pleased to send for the receipt, the whole transaction will appear clear to them, as well as the amount I was desired to pay.

30. In conclusion, I most respectfully beg that I may be pardoned for the prolixity of this letter, which was unavoidable, as it was my anxious desire to lay before the Board the whole of the facts connected with my case. I am confident that a perusal of the papers will convince the Board that my character has been wantonly assailed, and that ordinary things were made matters of importance through sheer malice and with an intent to injure me wholly. However, I had the misfortune unintentionally of incurring the severe displeasure of Mr. Thornhill, and ultimately the disapprobation of the Board and Government. I therefore most humbly beg that the Board will be pleased to view my unfortunate case with leniency, and relieve me from my present degraded position, by recommending to Government to restore me to my former grade and position. I beg to assure the Board and Government that I shall make it my constant study to discharge the duties that may be assigned to me with every care and precaution, and to the satisfaction of my superiors.

ENCLOSURE No. 1, A.—Memorandum from Mr. Chase.

ENCLOSURE No. 2, B.—Extract from a letter.

ENCLOSURE No. 3, C.—Letter from a merchant with translation.

Forwarded to the Acting Collector of Madras, for his observations.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Secretary.

To the Acting Collector of Madras,
with enclosures to be returned.

Exd. J. Wright.

6. His explanation is offered in the letter under review, and it does not appear to me that it requires many observations, as, although very lengthy, it does not contain any satisfactory explanation on either point.

7. Paragraphs 5 to 8 show that I disapproved of his appointing a large number of Vendors from the first, and directed the discontinuance of all but two, but that during my absence the original number was re-appointed.

8. Paragraph 10 relates to the receipt and disposal of the petition reported on in my letter of the 17th May 1867.

9. The petition was sent by me to the Deputy Collector for explanation, and, when returned, the petition and his explanation were put by me into my drawer and overlooked. They were not, as stated by the Deputy Collector, given by me to the Head Clerk, and by him to the Serishtadar; and it was only on finding, at a later period, that the petition was still on the file as undisposed of, that I searched and found it in my table drawer. No one but myself is to blame for the delay in its disposal.

10. In remarking on the replies to the questions put by me to the Stamp Vendors, and those immediately connected with them, the Deputy Collector denies his dealings with some, and acknowledges them with others. No searching inquiry was made into the allegations that his motives in granting licenses were interested as shown above in paragraph 2; but by his own showing, his brother, who never had any dealings with Masulipatam before Dhurmaroya became Deputy Collector, traded with one of these Vendors, and he himself employed the brother of another as his confidential Agent; the latter when first asked denied having any money dealings whatever with the Deputy Collector, but the fact that he had received the balance of pay due to him, and that he had been Dhurmaroya's Agent was so notorious that when questioned he could not entirely deny it.

11. In paragraph 21 Dhurmaroya rather derides the notion of Appasawmi, the brother of Kotlingam, writing to his brother for supplies; whether Dhurmaroya asked him to advance money or not I do not know, but he certainly supplied Appasawmi with his brother's address, as I saw it myself written in English in Dhurmaroya's *own handwriting* with a Telugu translation beneath it.

12. In paragraph 6 of my letter of 17th May, (Board's Proceedings, 6th July,) I wrote that "it would appear from the replies to the queries that the petitioner's allegation was not groundless," and I do not think that anything T. Dhurmaroya has now advanced is calculated to alter the opinion I then formed.

13. With respect to the transaction in connection with the purchase of the bond, I have only to refer to my abstract of the case published in Board's Proceedings, 6th July 1867. Dhurmaroya states in paragraph 25 of his letter that the case was decreed, not on its merits, but on the oath of the plaintiff. The Board will, however, see that the complaint was supported by the evidence of plaintiff and three witnesses; the third witness produced the account of the plaintiff's agent at Madras to show the amount originally charged for the notes.

14. The Deputy Collector states in paragraph 25 that the plaintiff swore from pressure from without, I can only say that I know no one less likely to enter into a suit of this nature to further the ends of others. He is a man of very considerable wealth, and very cautious in all his dealings; as shown in my letter of 17th May, paragraph 8, he was formerly Head Shroff in the Collector's Treasury at Masulipatam, and is father-in-law to the first witness against Dhurmaroya, who is now Head Shroff himself.

15. It is true, as stated by Dhurmaroya in paragraph 29, that he complained to me against this man, and asked me to transfer him to another post, but he was never able to substantiate any charge against him, and I never heard a complaint against him from any one else.

16. There is nothing I venture to think in the explanation of Dhurmaroya to cause me to modify the opinion that I expressed in paragraph 11 of my letter of 17th May.

No. 6,757.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 17th October 1867.

Read again letter from Deputy Collector Dhurmaroya Moodelly, dated 11th September 1867, recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 3rd October 1867, No. 6,296.

Read also the following letters:—

From W. WILSON, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 26th August 1867, No. 298.

Board's Procs., 15th August 1867, No. 5,290.

1. I have the honour to enclose, in original, the papers called for in paragraph 1 of the Government Order, No. 1,751, dated 31st July 1867.

2. These are (first) explanation given by T. Dhurmaroya Moodelly, and (second) a list of Vendors approved by Mr. Chase.

3. There exist on record no orders of Mr. Chase passed on this subject: the matter seems to have been settled in personal conference between the Collector and the Treasury Deputy Collector.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 and 2.—Original papers.

From T. A. N. CHASE, Esq., Collector of Kurnool, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated on Circuit Markapore, 28th August 1867, No. 264.

In reply to Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 5,290, dated 15th August, I have the honour to inform you that, beyond appointing, during the time I acted in 1866 as Collector of the Kistna District, several Stamp Vendors, of whom some, I forget how many, were appointed to Guntoor, I have no recollection of anything else on the subject which took place.

From G. THORNHILL, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Sydapet, 9th October 1867, No. 333.

1. I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Board's Proceedings, dated 3rd October 1867, No. 6,296, forwarding to me, for my observations, a letter of explanation addressed to the Board by T. Dhurmaroya Moodelliar. The letter is a reply to a call for explanation of certain enclosures in a report submitted by myself as Collector of the Kistna District on a petition referred by the Board, and entered in Board's Proceedings, dated 6th July 1867, No. 4,235.

2. The petitioner alleged that Dhurmaroya Moodelliar had, from interested motives, appointed a large number of persons as Stamp Vendors. My inquiry into the matter was limited to questioning a few of the persons immediately concerned; the late Deputy Collector had left the District, and a more formal inquiry was not, under the circumstances, possible.

3. In the course of inquiry mention was made of certain suits which were brought against the Deputy Collector before he left the District.

4. One of these suits related to the purchase of a Government bond by the Deputy Collector through his Shroff, and the refusal to pay the proper premium on it, and I was therefore led to examine the record, and to furnish an abstract of it for the Board's information.

5. On these two points, namely, the improper appointment of Stamp Vendors, and the transaction relating to the purchase of the bond as reported by me, the Deputy Collector was directed to give his explanation.

No. 4,006.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 12th June 1866.

Read the following letters:—

From G. THORNHILL, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Nizampatam, in Repalli Taluk, 28th April 1866.

1. I have the honor to forward copies of correspondence regarding the late rise in the monopoly price of salt, between myself, the Deputy Collector in charge of Treasury, and the Salt Deputy Collector.

2. On the occasions of my absence from head-quarters, the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury has general instructions to open all public telegrams to my address, and, when necessary, to take immediate action on them.

3. On the 25th of March, I was at Rapilly on Jummahbundy. A telegram from the Secretary to Board was received at Masulipatam late in the evening of the 25th, (as stated by the Deputy Collector in his letter,) stating that the monopoly price had been raised, from 24th instant, to one Rupee and eleven Annas per maund. The telegram* was forwarded to me, under cover, by the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, with a red pencil remark, to the effect, that the requisite orders to the different Salt Divisions had been issued by him, at once. It only, therefore, remained for me to communicate the intelligence to Mr. Marjoribanks, the Deputy Collector in charge of the Salt, who was at that time at Chinna Ganjam, in the extreme south of the District.

* Original enclosed.

4. A few days later I was informed, that great delay had occurred in the transmission of the orders issued by the Deputy Collector, directing the levy of the increased rate; and that several heaps of salt had been purchased, at Mungenapudy and Buntumilly, at the old rate, between the receipt of the telegram, at Masulipatam, on the 25th, and its promulgation at the above-named stations.

5. I, at once, directed the Salt Deputy, who had, in the meantime, returned to Masulipatam, to ascertain and report to me the date, and hour, at which the orders of the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury had reached the salt stations, and the extent of the sales which had taken place between the 25th, and the receipt of these orders.

6. Mr. Marjoribanks informed me, that the orders of the Deputy Collector had reached Mungenapudy late on the evening, 9 P. M., of the 27th, and Buntumilly on the morning of the 28th; and that sales, as below, had taken place on the 26th and 27th:—

At Mungenapudy.

On 26th... ... ... 2 heaps;
On 27th... ... ... 2 heaps;

At Buntumilly.

On 26th... ... ... 1 heap;

besides the ordinary retail sales.

7. I then called on the Treasury Deputy Collector to explain the cause of the delay, in the transmission of the orders. His reply is enclosed; and is, I must say, in my opinion, a most unsatisfactory document.

8. Adverting to his insinuation against the Superintendent of Mungenapudy, I directed Mr. Marjoribanks to ascertain the relationship existing between the Superintendent and the purchasers. His reply, and the statement of the Superintendent, are enclosed; and I concur fully with Mr. Majoribanks in exonerating the Superintendent from blame.

9. The Board will observe that the Deputy Collector in charge of Treasury, T. Dhurmarow Mudelliar, places much stress on the fact that the orders were duly posted on the 26th, and makes a considerable show of the inquiries made by him at the Post Office. It does not appear to have occurred to him, or if it occurred to him it was not acted on, that the only proper course in a matter of that kind, was to send out orders to the neighbouring Salt Divisons, at once, by special messenger.

10. He received the telegram late on Sunday evening, the 25th, informing him that the price had been raised from the 24th. Any one, with ordinary foresight, must have been sure that the intelligence might be known early next day to the merchants, and had he, as was clearly his duty, despatched orders to Mungenapudy, a distance of *five miles only*, and Buntumilly, a distance of only sixteen miles, by special messenger early on Monday morning, the rise in price would have been known to the Superintendents, before any of the applications for purchase were made, and the Government would have been saved the loss of the extra price on the five heaps sold on the 26th and 27th, amounting to Rupees 1,125.

11. The entire blame of this loss, in my opinion, rests on the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury.

12. Any inquiry as to how the merchants became possessed of the knowledge will probably be fruitless. They may have received intelligence direct from Madras; but the fact that the merchants proceeded to Mungenapudy early on the morning following the receipt of the Government telegram, as pointed out in paragraph 6 of Mr. Marjoribanks' letter, leads to the assumption that the knowledge was obtained, either from the Telegraph Office, or from the Deputy Collector.

13. However that may have been, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion, that had the Deputy Collector, T. Dhurmarow Mudelliar, taken the simple precaution of sending out the orders by express, the Government officials at the salt stations would have known of the rise in price before the public, and the Government would have been saved the loss which has followed.

Taking this view of the matter, I request the Board's instructions for my further guidance.

14. A Collector is necessarily often absent from his *head-quarters*, and, at such times, must have the conduct of many things to the discretion of the Deputy Collector *in* charge of the Treasury, and, unless the individual who holds that post is possessed of a fair amount of common sense and judgment, the interests of Government will be constantly liable to be sacrificed, as they have been in this instance.

—

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From T. DHARMAROW MUDELLIAR, Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, Kistna District, to the Collector of the Kistna District, dated Masulipatam, 13th April 1866.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated 9th instant, and to forward, herewith, the telegram as therein directed. I beg to bring to your recollection that, To avoid delay I have issued the Circular at once, and published it in the Gazette. after the necessary orders have been passed, the telegram was sent to you, with a remark as you have returned it to me with your initials. noted in the margin, on the same day, and that

2. In reply to your several queries, I beg to state, that the telegram in question, though it is said in it that it should take effect from the 24th, is dated 25th, and it was delivered to me on the night of the 25th, (Sunday,) at 9 o'clock. Next morning, *i. e.*, on the 26th, I took it to the office; there, that is in my room, orders were prepared thereon, and despatched then and there. All this was done, to the exclusion of all other business, under my eye and personal superintendence. I beg to refer you to the post despatch book. Hence, there was no room for any dilatoriness in the despatch to the post.

3. On the 28th, the Superintendent of Mungenapudy reported to me, that the order in question was received by him on the night of the 27th, at 9 o'clock, and as I heard, in the meantime, that certain merchants, relations of the Superintendent, were allowed to purchase salt at the old rate, I, at once, sent for the Mulky* writer and examined him, and then went over to the Post Office, and there examined the writers in the presence of the Inspecting Postmaster, Mr. Honner. The evidence could not specify what covers were despatched, on the 26th, to the address of the Mungenapudy Superintendent, as no such information is forthcoming in the Post Office. However, for further information, an order was posted then and there to the Superintendent of Buntumilly, to report when his order had reached him.

* He says that he despatched, on the 26th, four covers to Mungenapudy.

4. When satisfactory information could not thus be arrived at, I went up to the Superintendent of Police, Captain Hoskins, and consulted with him whether my examination of the merchants alluded to above could be legally sustained. The result of the interview resolved itself into the following conjectures:—

I. It might be possible that merchants might have received telegrams direct from their agents at Calcutta and Madras.

II. Or, they might have, without any knowledge, made the purchases as usual.

III. Or, the Mungenapudy Superintendent being a relation and party interested, as such, might have assisted the merchants by not giving publicity to the order on the day of its receipt.

On these several points, I have not abandoned my inquiries. A full report will be submitted at their close with the record, when only, I fear, we will be able to state whether there was really a loss to Government; for sales according to the old rate, must have taken place between the date of receipt of the telegram at the head-quarters, and the date of the receipt of the orders in the interior, not only in Mungenapudy and Buntumilly alluded to above, but also in other Cotars of Chinna Ganjam and Nizampatam in this District, as will be the case in other Districts, as there was no delay here in the despatch of the orders.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

—

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From J. A. MARJORIBANKS, Esq., Deputy Collector, in charge of the Salt Department, to the Collector of the Kistna District, Bapatla or elsewhere, dated Mungenapudy, 20th April 1866, No. 46.

1. With reference to your letter of the 17th instant, I have the honor to enclose a statement taken by me from Chinnam Krishnamah, Salt Superintendent of Mungenapudy, regarding his relationship, and other points connected with the sale of salt, &c.

2. You will observe from the statement that one of the merchants is a Brahmin, and that none of the others are relatives of the Superintendent, but are merely distantly connected with him by marriage between members of their respective families.

3. That this slight connexion would have actuated the Superintendent "in assisting the merchants by not giving publicity to the order on the day of its receipt," even if he had really received it a day before its acknowledgment by him, I do not for one moment believe from my knowledge of the man's invariably upright conduct for the past five years that he has served under me.

4. The time at which the order to raise the price of salt was received at Buntumilly, (2 A. M. of the 28th ultimo,) taken in connexion with the time it reached Mungenapudy, (9 P. M. of the 27th ultimo,) will of itself, I think, convince any impartial mind, that the orders could not have been despatched from the Post Office till the evening of the 27th ultimo.

5. My own impression is, that the orders were not put into the Cutcherry letter box till after the box had been brought back from the Post Office, on the afternoon of the 26th ultimo. If that was not really the case, the Post Office Mulky writer must have delayed forwarding the orders for a day. I can arrive at no other conclusion.

6. But, I beg to draw your attention to the fact of the man calling himself the brother of Tadapilly Sriramulu coming to the Salt Superintendent about 7 A. M., on the 26th ultimo, for two heaps of salt, only ten hours after the telegram had been received by the Treasury Deputy Collector, and certainly many hours before the Deputy Collector's order, according to the Deputy Collector's own showing, could have been received by the Salt Superintendent in ordinary course of post, the post leaving Bunder for Mungenapudy and Buntumilly late every evening.

7. That Tadapilly Sriramulu's brother might have come "without any knowledge to make purchases as usual," is most improbable. Bunder merchants, generally, take one heap of salt at a time; but this man wanted two, and offered sovereigns in payment, silver coin not being, I suppose, just then available to him. When the sovereigns were declined, no time was lost in his hastening back to Bunder, and returning with cash and currency notes. All this, to my mind, betokened an eagerness to secure at once, at the old rate, as much salt as he could provide money for. It is also remarkable, that on the same day, 26th ultimo, one heap of salt was taken, at Buntumilly, by Palacrutti Rajalingum, who, I understand, is the father of Palacrutti Sriramulu, the merchant on whose behalf Tadapilly Sriramulu's brother bought the two heaps of salt at Mungenapudy.

8. The merchants have taken their own time to clear the five heaps thus hurriedly bought by them, at Mungenapudy, on the 26th and 27th ultimo. But three heaps have been entirely removed up to this date, and portions of the other two still remain on the platform. This shows, at any rate, that the demand for salt was not very pressing.

9. I take this opportunity of bringing to your notice, that the copy of the telegram signed by you, and intended for my information, was not sent to me till the 9th instant, on which date I received it at the Cutcherry.

10. This telegram was considered of such importance by the Board, that they did not mind sending it on Sunday, and, I think, it should have at once been communicated to the different Salt Superintendents, not by ordinary tappal, but by express, or by special messenger. This, I believe, is the usual course adopted on such occasions, and it appears to me a matter of regret that it was not followed in the present instance.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

STATEMENT *made by* CHINNAM KRISHNAMAH, *Salt Superintendent of Mungenapudi.*

1. As you have called upon me to state my relationship to certain merchants of the Town of Masulipatam, who purchased salt heaps in my Division on the 26th and 27th March last, I beg to say that the first party, Palacrutti Sriramulu, and the second party, Majaty Nagabhushanam, are not directly related to me. They are only distant connexions. Sriramulu's elder sister (deceased) and my step-sister's daughter married two brothers, sons of Jungala Bapanah, and Nagabhushanam's sister was given in marriage to my wife's grand-nephew; the third party are Vadapilly Sriramulu and Guggala Subbaroydoo. The former is a Brahmin, the latter is father-in-law to one of my sisters. The two first merchants are in the habit of purchasing salt heaps both at Mungenapudy and Buntumilly.

2. I further beg to state, that, on the morning of the 26th March, about 7 o'clock, while I was storing salt on platform No. 2, a man, whose name I do not recollect, calling himself the brother of Tadapilly Sriramulu, came to me and wanted to buy two heaps of salt at the wholesale rate, inquiring at the same time whether I would take sovereigns in payment; I told him I could not take sovereigns, and that if he came back with cash to the Division Cutcherry at noon he could have the heaps, after paying the money at the then prevailing rate. He accordingly came, paid cash and currency notes for two heaps, and took passes in the name of Palacrutti Sriramulu, stating that he came on behalf of that merchant. Tadapilly Sriramulu is not my relation.

3. Again at noon, on the 27th March, the second party, Majaty Nagabhushanam, and a little while after the Brahmin, Vadapilly Sriramulu, accompanied by a son of Guggala Subbaroydoo, came to me; the former party purchased two heaps, and the latter a single heap at the old rate. I had not received up to that hour (3 P. M.) any order from the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury or elsewhere, or any news from the merchants, about the increase of the rate of salt: a rumour, however, either accompanied or followed the merchants that the rate was raised, but the said rumour could not be relied upon in the absence of any direct order. Late in the evening, about 7 o'clock, one of my Division Peons, Kona Ramaswamy, who came from the village of Kona, via Pettah, informed me that the rate of salt was increased to Rupee 1-11-0 per Indian Maund. I am sure that, till that moment, not one in the village here knew any thing of the matter, since many of the villagers of Tavishapudy and Mungenapudy and the neighbourhood, being retail customers of my division, who usually buy one or two parahs of salt to gain a pittance by hawling it about, would, had they had notice of the rise in the rate, certainly have flocked in to buy salt; but they were really as ignorant of the matter as myself, and no salt whatever was sold by retail on the 27th of March. On the 26th, the sale by retail amounted to 270 Maunds.

4. Further, I received no covers by tappal on the night of the 25th or 26th ultimo. On the 27th March, at about 9 o'clock P. M., a packet containing a single cover was delivered to my office by the Mulky runner, and, as usual, on my opening it the next morning, the 28th, I found in it the Treasury Deputy Collector's Circular Order, No. 81, regarding the increased rate. The Circular states that a telegram, dated 23rd March, was received from the Revenue Board Secretary, while the Circular itself is dated 26th, and was received by me as stated above. The great delay in the delivery of such an emergent order embarrassed me very much, and I forthwith reported the hour of the delivery of the order at my Division to the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, and also posted my Arzee to you, at the Masulipatam Post Office.

5. I beg to state, in conclusion, I have honestly laid before you all that I am aware of this matter, and pray that, after full inquiry, you will grant me justice, by enabling me to redeem my character, unblemished, from any imputations that may have been cast upon it.

(Signed) CHINNAM KRISHNAMAH,
Salt Superintendent.

Taken by me, on the 19th April 1866, at Mungenapudy.

(Signed) J. A. MARJORIBANKS,
Deputy Collector.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

ABSTRACT.—Original telegram from Board of Revenue.

From T. DHURMAROW MUDELLIAR, Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, Kistna District, to the Collector of the Kistna District, on Circuit at Nizampatam, dated Masulipatam, 4th May 1866.

1. I beg to request that you will be pleased to forward this letter to the Board in explanation of your letter to that authority, dated the 28th April 1866, complaining against me for delay in communicating the Orders of Government to the Superintendents of Salt.

2. In connexion with my letter to you, dated the 13th April 1866, I beg to state how, on inquiry, that suspicion attaches to the Salt Superintendent, Chinnam Krishnamah, as you will be pleased to observe from the circumstances below.

3. The following are the names of the merchants who are entered in the list of sales as having purchased salt at Mungenapudy, on the dates below. My orders were issued to the Salt Superintendents on the 26th.

The wholesale purchasers are—

		No. of heaps.	
On the 26th.	1. Palacrutti Striramulu....	2	On this date there were retail sales.
On the 27th.	2. Majati Nagabbushanam.	2	
	3. Vadapilly Sriramulu, }	1	On this date there were *no* retail sales.
	4. Guggala Subbaroydoo, }		

The first appears from the Arzee, dated 21st March 1866, No. 14, from the Superintendent of Buntumilly, to have presented currency notes for the purchase of salt and refused, unless money was paid in cash. Five days afterwards that very merchant appears to have presented the same notes at Mungenapudy, and purchased the salt. Hence this merchant does not appear to have been actuated and come for making the purchase on that occasion only. Further, I find that this individual is an ordinary trader in salt.

The second, Majaty Nagabhushanam, is likewise a Komaty by caste. He is noted by the Superintendent in the list of sales as having purchased two heaps.

This merchant is not generally a trader in salt, but when Benjaries come down from the west, generally in the cold season, he makes purchases for them, and that too very seldom; for he is a known dealer in money, and cashes hoondies from Hyderabad for them. But the real fact is something else, and that is, on this occasion, this Majaty Nagabhushanam was not the principal purchaser, but he was taken by another man (Komaty) merchant Cherrukury Surveysa, who is the maternal uncle of the Salt Superintendent. This man's name was omitted in the sales' statement. Both these persons did go to Mungenapudy in the same cart on that day to the Superintendent, and made the purchase.

The third is the Gumastah of the fourth individual Guggala Subbaroydoo. This Subbaroydoo married his son to the sister of the Superintendent of Mungenapudy. The real fact is that Subbaroydoo did not go to Mungenapudy on that occasion, but his son, and his name was not entered in the list of sales. Further, it is to be remembered that Subbaroydoo or his son is not considered a trader in salt. These were the only individuals who purchased salt on those dates of 26th and 27th as above shown.

4. I beg to submit respectfully to the Board whether I was not justified in making the conjecture as I did, which is pronounced in the Collector's letter under explanation as an insinuation towards the Superintendent, while I knew that his relations were the exclusive enjoyers of the benefit.

5. The Collector is pleased to observe that an inquiry will be fruitless, though I offered in my letter, dated the 13th April 1866, to the Collector to make a full inquiry and report on the subject. Why the matter should be left unsifted, and still it should be conjectured that the purchases must have been made either from intelligence from Madras direct, or from the Telegraph Office, and yet condemn me for delay.

6. The Collector is also pleased to observe that I could have sent the orders by express. I beg respectfully to state that no practice of the kind exists in this District. There had been several telegrams of equal importance received by the Collector, and myself in his absence, and orders issued thereon, and yet there was not a single instance of delay. Even there was an instance in which I established an "Express," when the Collector was out on circuit, in view that all important communications might soon reach the Collector, and in which, on the representation of the Tahsildar that there was a scarcity of peons, it was abolished under Collector's orders. I did not suspect that the present Superintendent of Salt, who had been the Head Clerk for a long time under the Salt Deputy Collector, and who had his confidence, and was promoted to the present post by that officer, would have dared to take advantage of this occasion, nor did I know that he had so many relations in a town so contiguous to the station in which he is posted, by which he could profit them.

7. The Collector has been pleased to observe that I was devoid of common sense and judgment, taken for granted that I was to blame for the delay. Mr. Thornhill and during his absence, Mr. Chase, entertained a high opinion for my energy and intelligence. The former, immediately after the cyclone, thought that I was the only Native officer of the Cutcherry that was up (in spite of my own distress) with him, with my counsel among the European Officers around him. There are also several instances on record that I was the first person after the cyclone, that discovered and reported to my Collector in matters in which Government interest was involved, and large amount of money was at stake; and even at this very station of Mungenapudy, where an embezzlement of upwards of 700 Rupees took place, it is I that discovered and brought it to the Collector's notice, though the Salt Deputy Collector and others, whom it concerned more than myself, had ample opportunity of knowing and checking them beforehand. Knowing all this, I am sorry that Mr. Thornhill has been pleased now to say that I have no sense; yet, I assert with greatest confidence, that he would have changed his opinion, if he had waited a little for my report after inquiry, which I promised in my letter under date the 13th April 1866; for there are many instances in which his first orders issued upon certain information (otherwise than truthful) were afterwards cancelled on my personal explanation, which I am sorry I have had no opportunity of making on this occasion.

8. Moreover, I beg to bring to the consideration of the Board that I was the first person that noticed the delay of a day in the matter under consideration, and it is on this public notice and examination, which I instituted immediately afterwards, that, I believe, the information reached the Collector, (before I informed him,) but in a different form, by which he seems to have been vaguely appraised of the telegram as having reached me about the 23rd or 24th, and that my order was issued on the 26th, which led him to infer that a delay of two days had taken place, as apparent in Collector's letter to me. With what object the informer had made this false information, it is easily inferrible. For it is easily proved that there were four packets sent to the Superintendent of Mungenapudy on that day, *i. e.*, the 26th from the Post Office. On this matter, I do not know what inquiry the Salt Deputy Collector had made. His letters were not shown to me, though my letter was sent to him.

9. I trust that, after considering the several points of the case, the Board will not reprimand me for a delay which I have not committed, and the real cause of which, the Board will now be able to see, lies in another direction. Supposing I did send a man specially with the order, certainly he would have reached Mungenapudy before 6 o'clock on the 26th. But that could not in the least prevent the Superintendent from doing a dishonest act, if he was so disposed. For it was all in his power to make a credit without cash in the accounts, and debit the heaps in the quantity, and then note down that he received the telegram order at such an hour afterwards, replenishing the cash in the meantime. If he had no hand whatever in the matter, the very fact of his having perceived an unusual flow of his relations for purchase, he should have naturally suspected it, and told them to wait a day. Above all, as the purchasers were all his near relations, with the exception of one, if they had come there of their own accord, only hearing from other quarters; even in that case, he could not have been ignorant of their intentions to defraud Government of its interests, he is himself a Government servant and a responsible officer. Why did he allow it?

10. I am fully confident that if I were able to lay all this before my Collector, he would not have disposed of his Treasury Deputy and Personal Assistant, who has labored under him conscientiously at all times, in those angry terms in which he has done in a public document to the Board, the superior authority under hypothesis, and exonerated the Superintendent; but he would

have blamed him in my place. If the merchants received the intelligence from my office, from Telegraph Office, or from Madras direct, the Board will be pleased to observe how strange it looks that the intelligence should have reached the Superintendent's relations *only*, and not the regular salt merchants, who are many in this town, and of different other castes, who would naturally and with greater alacrity have taken advantage of it, if there was any shadow of the report of the kind in the town.

11. Hence, it will be clear to the Board that I received the telegram at 9 P. M., on the 25th March. Next morning I issued the order to the Superintendents, and the orders sent to the Post Office on that very day, and four packets were despatched from the Post Office on that evening to the Mungenapudy Superintendent, which must have reached him on the evening of that very day, and that the merchants who made the purchase were the Superintendent's relatives *only*, with the exception of one who had attempted five days before to make the purchase.

12. I beg most respectfully that you will be pleased, at your earliest convenience, to forward this letter to the Board, so that they may have these facts also, before they come to a decision.

Memorandum.

In forwarding the above to the Board of Revenue, with reference to his letter of the 28th April 1866, the undersigned has the honor to state, that further inquiry will be at once instituted into the charges brought by the Deputy Collector against the Salt Superintendent.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

NIZAMPATAM,
6th May 1866.

To the Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

Read also the following letter from G. THORNHILL, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 24th May 1866, No. 162 :—

1. I have the honor, with reference to my docket covering letter* from the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury to my address, to forward a summary of evidence taken in the inquiry into the conduct of the Salt Superintendent of Mungenapudy, with my decision and remarks.

* Dated 7th May 1866.

2. I think it right at the same time to call the attention of the Board to the statement of the fourteenth witness, regarding the commercial transactions said to have been lately established between the brother of the Deputy Collector, Dhurmarow Mudelliar, and certain merchants of Masulipatam, with the knowledge, if not through the intervention, of the Deputy Collector himself.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—List of Witnesses.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Referring to the letter addressed by the Deputy Collector to me, dated 4th May 1866, and the charge made by him against the Salt Superintendent of Mungenapudy, the witnesses named in the accompanying list were examined with the following result :—

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE.

1. MUNAGUNTY PURUSHOTTAM, *Deputy Collector's Clerk.*—The first witness stated that the Deputy Collector came to office between 11th and 12th on the 26th ; that witness waited on him at 12, as usual, to read the Arzees to him. On entering the room the Deputy Collector took the telegram, ordering an increase in the price of salt from a bundle of papers, and directed the witness to prepare orders in accordance with it for the four Salt Divisions. The orders were prepared, signed, and despatched by the hand of the fourth witness to the despatching clerk (fifth witness) with instructions that they were urgent, and should be despatched at once. This was about 1 o'clock.

2. GOVINDU VENKAT ROW, *Vernacular Head Accountant.*—The second witness.—Stated that the orders were brought to him by third witness for signature, and signed as usual ; that he read the orders, and noted the contents. There were four orders, one for each Salt Division.

3. NUNDIVADA VENKATAROYDU, *Attender in Deputy Collector's Office*—Third witness.—Remembered carrying the orders to the second witness for signature, and returning them to the first witness ; it was about 1 o'clock.

4. NUNNU KHAN, *Distributing Peon*—Fourth witness.—Received the orders from first witness ; took them to fifth witness to get them sealed and entered, and then took them to the Post Office box, and put them in about 1 o'clock. Could not say who saw him do this.

NOTE.—I doubt this statement; the letters in question are shown not to have been in the box when it was opened at the Post Office, and the statements of the witness were discrepant and, apparently, prevaricating.

5. JAFFER ALLI—Fifth witness.—Stated that the orders were sent to him to cover and address ; that he did so, and gave to fourth witness to post in the box about 1 o'clock.

6. G. LUTCHMENARASU, *Mulky Writer at Post Office.*—The sixth witness.—Stated that he was at the Post Office at 4 P. M. on 26th, when the Cutcherry post box was brought ; that it was opened, and the letters for his Department handed to him ; that he sealed them and entered them in the despatch register, which shows on that day for Buntumilly one paid, and one unpaid letter, and one return Chellan ; and no service covers whatever. As Mungenapudy is not a postal station, the letters for that place are put in a separate packet, and given to the runner to deliver at the Salt Cutcherry on his way to Buntumilly. No entry in the despatch register is, therefore, ever made of letters for that place, and witness could not state how many, if any, letters were sent there. On 27th March, witness went, as usual, to office in the morning at 8; the Calcutta Mail came in, and the sorting almirah was opened ; the letters belonging to the Mulky Department were given to witness. There were eleven or twelve letters; he looked over them, and found four service covers addressed to each of the Salt Divisions. They were set apart for despatch with the others in the evening. That for Mungenapudy was sent, as usual, by the Buntumilly runner, "*Outside Tappal.*"

NOTE.—A letter box is kept in the Collector's Cutcherry ; at 4 P. M. every day it is despatched to the Post Office and opened ; any letters requiring to be posted at a later hour are sent to the regular Post Office, and put into the regular letter box

7. B. VEERABBHUDDRIAH, *Post Office Clerk.*—The seventh witness.—Attended the office at 8. P. M. on 26th. On arrival of Madras post he opened the letter box, and despatched the letter belonging to that line. The remainder he sorted, and placed in their proper places in the almirah. Amongst them were some Mulky letters. Next morning he opened the almirah, and gave the Mulky letters to the Mulky writer (sixth witness).

8. BALAJEE, *Delivering Peon.*—Eighth witness.—Took the Cutcherry letter box as usual to the Post Office at —— P. M. on 26th ; the box was opened, letters taken out, stamped, and spread out on the table by witness.

9. PALACRUTTI RAJALINGUM.—Ninth witness.—Sent his two Gumastahs, tenth and eleventh witnesses, to Mungenapudy, on the 26th, to buy two heaps of salt ; also, he sent a man to buy a heap at Buntumilly the same day. They all left his house early in the morning ; he required the salt to send to Juggiahpetta ; had not heard of the rise in the price of salt. Did not hear of it for four or five days after ; he is distantly related to the Superintendent of Mungenapudy, but has no correspondence or money dealings with him. The two heaps purchased at Mungenapudy were the joint property of himself and Tallury Beemannah ; the purchase *therefore* was made in the name of his son, Sriramulu, and not in his own name. He wished to get Buntumilly salt, but had difficulty about carriage, and so took some at Mungenapudy ; he, nevertheless, did not move the salt for twenty days.

NOTE.—It is quite evident this man must have received information of the arrival of the telegram in Bunder, as it was received by Deputy Collector at 9 P. M. on Sunday. On Monday at 7, he had despatched messages with money to buy three heaps.

10. Tadapully Pudmanabhudu, *Gumastah to ninth witness.*—Tenth witness.—Went with eleventh witness to ninth witness' house at 6 A. M., on the 26th March; received money in cash and notes sufficient to buy two heaps of salt, and started off with eleventh witness to Mungenapudy; found Superintendent storing salt on the platform, and told him they wanted two heaps of salt; Superintendent said he was engaged; but that he would attend to them at the Cutcherry at 12 o'clock. They went accordingly, paid the money, and got pass for the salt, and returned to Bunder. Witness knew nothing of the rise in the price of salt, and is not related to the Salt Superintendent.

11. S. Kotappa, *Gumastah to witness.*—Eleventh witness.—Confirmed the statement of tenth witness; was examined before by the Deputy Collector in his private house.

12. Majaty Nagabhushanam.—Twelfth witness.—Was in the Cutcherry on the 26th drawing money, but swears he heard nothing of the rise in the price of salt till six or seven days later; on the 27th, he went *with* Cherrukury Survasalingam to Mungenapudy, and bought two heaps of salt; he furnished the money; so both heaps were in his name, but in reality one was on account of Survasalingam; has no relationship, or money dealings with the Superintendent.

13. Cherrukury Survasalingam.—Thirteenth witness.—Went to Mungenapudy with twelfth witness, on 27th, to buy two heaps; twelfth witness furnished the funds; so salt was entered in his name; he is related by marriage to the Salt Superintendent, but has no dealings with him. Did not hear from him, or from any one else, that the price of salt had been raised for some days after the purchase.

14. Guggala Subbaroydoo.—Fourteenth witness.—Bought one heap on 27th; is related to Superintendent, but has no dealings, and heard nothing of the rise of price; heard in the bazar that salt dealings would be profitable, so bought it; on being questioned by Superintendent, he admitted that he had commercial dealings with the Deputy Collector Dhurmarow Mudelly's brother; that he had been spoken to on the subject by the Deputy Collector; but did not think the Deputy Collector was concerned in the trade in the same way other merchants had dealings with Deputy Collector's brother.

15. Allanky Narrainaswamy, *Salt Gumastah of Mungenapudy.*—The fifteenth witness.—Deposed that the tappal reaches Mungenapudy usually at 9 or 10 P. M., and that the packet is opened in the office next morning. No letter whatever was received on the night of 26th March. On the 27th, one service letter was received, and was opened by the Superintendent next morning, 28th. It contained the order to raise the price of salt, which was unknown before; it was remarked that the order was dated 26th, and the delay in its receipt was noticed, and immediately reported by the Superintendent.

16. Kavepurapu Kutumbaroydoo.—The sixteenth witness.—Confirmed the above; he stated that on the night of the 27th, after office hours, a rumour that the price of salt had been raised reached Mungenapudy through a salt Peon; but no certain information was received.

17. Cona Ramaswamy, *Salt Peon.*—The seventeenth witness.—Heard a rumour in Masulipatam, as he was coming from Kona to Mungenapudy, that the Government price of salt had been raised; he told the Superintendent, who said no orders had reached him.

18. DEFENCE.—The Salt Superintendent, Chinnam Krishnamah, having heard all the above statements, said, that, on going to office on the morning of the 28th, the Gumastah told him that a packet containing an order had been received by post the preceding night. The order was handed to the Superintendent and opened by him, and found to contain instructions to raise the Government price of salt.

19. The Superintendent observed that it was dated 26th, and had been received by telegraph, and taken in connexion with the large purchases of salt made the two previous days, his suspicions were roused by the delay, and he at once reported the matter to the Salt Deputy Collector and the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury; he asked for the cover of the letter, and found it dated Masulipatam Post Office, 27th of March. This cover he produced before the Collector. He stated that, on the evening of the 27th, he had heard rumours about the place, that the price had been raised; but as such orders had always hitherto been sent out by express, and as he had received no intimation on this occasion, he concluded the rumour was groundless. He afterwards heard the same report from a Salt Peon; he deposed to having sold two heaps on the 26th, and three on the 27th, and admitted that some of the merchants on each occasion were his relatives. He, however, denied that he knew any thing of the rise in price before the purchases were made, or that he had received any communication whatever with them on the subject.

DECISION AND REMARKS.

20. The facts of the case, as elicited by the above inquiry, are shortly these.

21. On the night of Sunday, the 25th March, the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury received a telegram from the Board of Revenue, directing the Government price of salt to be raised. He took the telegram with him to the office between 11 and 12 o'clock next day, and caused orders to be drafted on it to the Salt Divisions in the usual course; these orders were duly examined by the Vernacular Accountant, and sent to the despatching clerk for entry, and despatch to the post box; they were sent by the despatching clerk to be posted in the Cutcherry box by the fourth witness. An individual called a distributing Peon; he said he posted them at 1 o'clock, but no one saw him do so. The box was taken, as usual, at 4 P. M., to the Post Office, and opened, and the contents distributed. It is certain, from the statements of the Post Office officials, and from the entries in their registers, that the four orders to the four Superintendents were not in the box when opened at the Post Office. It appears equally certain that these four orders were found later in the same day in the regular post box in the window of the office; and as it is usual to send all letters from the Cutcherry, which are not ready before 4 o'clock, to be posted in the regular box, it appears certain that the four orders under inquiry were not put into the Cutcherry box at all, but were posted in the regular box, some time after 4 P. M., on the 26th; by whose instructions they were detained does not appear. These orders were found in the regular post box when it was opened during the night of the 26th, and were transferred to the sorting almirah, and handed for despatch to the District Mulky Post writer, on the morning of the 27th, and were duly forwarded by him to their destinations on the evening of the 27th, the same runner carrying the letters to Mungenapudy and to Buntumilly; the former was detained at 9 P. M., 27th; and the latter at 2 A. M. on 28th.

These two orders were duly opened on the morning of the 28th at both these stations, and their contents acted upon.

22. It appears quite clear from the above that the Superintendent at Mungenapudy did not receive the official information before the time stated by him, and that he did not, therefore, withhold it for the purpose of benefiting his own relatives. It only remains to inquire whether he received the information secretly, and communicated it to his relatives. The telegram was only received on the night of the 25th, and it has been shown that the agents of Palacrutti Rajalingum, who purchased the two heaps on the 26th, left Bunder for that purpose only on the morning of the 26th. It is scarcely possible, and certainly not credible, that the information should have travelled to Mungenapudy and been sent back in time to admit of this; while it is highly probable that the information did leak out during the night of the 25th in Bunder, and was acted upon on the morning of 26th.

23. There is nothing whatever to show that the Superintendent had any knowledge of the rise in price until the evening of the 27th, nor is there anything to show that he had any communication whatever with any of the purchasers before the sales took place.

24. The fact that some of the purchasers were his relatives is the only point at all calculated to raise suspicion against him; but in the entire absence of any proof that he either received the information himself, or held any communication with the purchasers, this cannot be allowed to go against him, and I have no hesitation in fully and entirely acquitting the Superintendent, Chinnam Krishnamah, of all blame in the matter.

25. The Deputy Collector, Dhurmarow Mudelliar, states in his letter of 4th May, paragraph 4, that suspicion attaches only to the Superintendent, and comments, at length, on the fact of the relationship existing between the Superintendent and the purchasers, but says nothing about the date on which the orders reached the Superintendent, although *he was at that time in possession of information*, which must have convinced him that the public order could not have reached Mungenapudy before the night of the 27th.

26. In his letter of 15th of April he stated that he had called on the Superintendent of Buntumilly for infomation as to the date of the receipt of the orders. In reply, the Superintendent of Buntumilly stated that the orders reached him on the night of the 27th. The Deputy Collector knew that the same runner conveyed the tappal to Buntumilly and Mungenapudy, and yet no mention whatever is made of the fact!! The primary cause of the delay, in communicating the orders to the Salt Divisions, has been shown in my former letter to rest with the Deputy Collector's neglect to despatch special messengers with the orders; but had the letters been posted, as it is stated they were, before 4 o'clock on the 26th, they would still have reached Mungenapudy on the 27th morning, and the loss on the sales of that day would have been saved. The cause of this delay is still unexplained, although it is clear that it occurred in the Cutcherry, and not in the Post Office or elsewhere.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

MASULIPATAM,
23rd May 1866.

Read also the following letter forwarded by W. WILSON, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector in charge of the Kistna District, from Deputy Collector T. DHURMAROW MUDELLY, dated 26th May 1866:—

1. I have the honor to request that you will be pleased to forward this explanation of mine to the Board on the summary and decision and remarks of the Collector sent to Board, dated 23rd May 1866.

2. I beg at first to notice the omissions in the Collector's summary, which if he had in view, he would have come to a different conclusion.

3. I place the subjects in juxta-position for clearness.

COLLECTOR'S SUMMARY.

Fourth witness, NUNNU KHAN.—"Fourth "witness received the orders from first witness; "took them to fifth witness to get them sealed "and entered, and took them to the Post Office box and put them in about 1 o'clock; "could not say who saw him do this."

"NOTE.—I doubt this statement, the letters in question are shown not to have been "in the box when it was opened at the Post "Office, and the statements of this witness were "discrepant and, apparently, prevaricating."

4. What this man stated is quite correct, for he is employed specially to carry the orders, when signed by the Deputy Collector, to the despatching clerk (fifth witness), and after registering and numbering by the latter, to take them to the letter box placed in front of the Cash-keeper in the Treasury office. It is usual for the regular Post Office Peon to carry the letter box at 4 P. M. every day, and one of the regular Post Office clerks at the Post Office appointed for the day opens it and takes out the contents, and then and there stamps, sorts, and distributes them. The regular Post Office clerk that opened the box that day, that is, on the 26th at 4 o'clock, was not examined, though the Collector was requested to do so. The regular Post Office clerk, (seventh witness,) who was examined, opened the boxes *fixed* in the *Post Office* at about 11 *o'clock* in the night. He was absent when the letter box from the Cutcherry was opened at 4 P. M. on the 26th. But the Collector says, it was shown that the letters (orders) in question were not in the box. I don't know from whose deposition this is inferred. Further, the Collector says, that there were discrepancies in the statements of the fourth witness; and that he said, that he did not know who saw him post the orders into the box.

5. From the deposition of the man marked A., the Board will be pleased to observe that there are neither discrepancies in his statements, nor did he say that no body saw him put the orders into the box. Purushottam, in the deposition, was the writer of the orders, and Moonshee is the despatching Clerk. Purushottam, after receiving the signature of the Deputy Collector, gave the orders to the fourth witness, in the first instance, to take them to the Moonshee for registering, and afterwards the Moonshee *again* gave them to the fourth witness to put them in the letter box. Thus the orders passed through the hands of fourth witness twice. From this, it will be observed that there is no discrepancy. The letter box is placed within a foot and a half from where the Cash-keeper sits in the Treasury room. So, no body could *not* have seen him put the orders in the box.

Ninth Witness, PALACRUTTI RAJALINGAM.—"Sent his two Gumastahs, tenth and eleventh "witnesses, to Mungenapudy, on the 26th, to "buy two heaps of salt; also, he sent a man to "buy a heap at Buntumilly the same day; they "all left his house early in the morning; he "required the salt to send to Jaggiahpetta; had "not heard of the rise in the price of salt; "did not hear of it for "four or five days after; he is distantly "related to the "Superintendent of "Mungenapudy, but "has no correspondence or money dealings with him. The "two heaps purchased at Mungenapudy "were the joint property of himself and "Talury Bheemanah; the purchase "*therefore* was made in the name of his son, "Sriramulu, and not in his own name. He "wished to get Buntumilly salt, but had difficulty about carriage, and so took some at "Mungenapudy; he nevertheless did not move "the salt for twenty days."

NOTE OF COLLECTOR.—"It is quite evident this "man must have received information of the "arrival of the telegram "in Bunder. It was received by Deputy Collector at 9 P. M. on "Sunday. On Monday "at 7, he had despatched messages with money to buy three "heaps."

6. The Collector is pleased to omit these chief points in the summary. This merchant, about five days before the 26th, did go to Buntamilly to buy salt, having taken with him currency notes. These having been refused there, he sent them over to Mungenapudy, on the 26th, where he was told the notes would be acceptable. On this very point, the Superintendent of Buntumilly addressed me an Arzee on the 21st March 1866, that is five days before the 26th. The Collector is also pleased to omit in the summary the fact, that on two or three days previous to the 26th, he received letter from Jaggiahpetta, urging him to send carts with salt, and that an English vessel was at anchor at this port to carry oil. "I had," the merchant says, "agreed to supply some oil seeds "from Jaggiahpetta, and delivered them at Masulipatam, and as it was more profitable to me "to send salt up and bring the oil seeds on the "return bandies, I arranged to send up the salt." While the real facts are such, the Collector is pleased to remark that the merchant, ninth witness, must have acted from the information of the telegram. The Collector is also pleased to omit that this merchant was an ordinary dealer in salt.—*Vide* deposition B.

CHERRUKURY SURVASALINGUM.—"Thirteenth "witness.—Went to Mungenapudy with twelfth "on 27th, to buy two heaps. Twelfth witness "furnished the funds; so salt was entered in "his name; he is related by marriage to the "Salt Superintendent, but has no dealings with "him; did not hear from him, or from any one "else, that the price of salt had been raised for "some days after the purchase."

7. The Collector is pleased to omit the fact that the witness is the maternal uncle of the Superintendent. The Board are aware that maternal uncles, among Hindoos, occupy the position, in practice, of that of a father and guardian to their nephews. In this very instance, the Superintendent, during inquiry here, *was put up* with the thirteenth witness, his maternal uncle. Also, the Collector is pleased to omit the fact that thirteenth witness is no dealer in salt, and that he never bought salt before for trade. His deposition is herewith forwarded (C).

GUGGALA SUBBAROYDOO, *Fourteenth Witness.*—"Bought one heap on 27th; is related "to Superintendent, but has no dealings, and "heard nothing of the rise of price and number; "heard in the bazar that salt dealings would be "profitable, so bought it. On being question-"ed by the Superintendent, he admitted that "he had commercial dealings with the Deputy "Collector Dhurmarow Moodelly's brother; that "he had been spoken to on the subject by the "Deputy Collector, but did not think the De-"puty Collector was concerned in the trade in "the same way other merchants had dealings "with Deputy Collector's brother.

Sixth Witness, Y. LAKSHIM NARSIMHA ROW.—"The sixth witness stated that he was at the "Post Office at 4 P. M. on 26th, when the Cut-"cherry post box was brought, that it was "opened and the let-"ters for his Depart-"ment handed to him, "that he sorted them "and entered them in "the despatch register, "which shows on that "day for Buntumil-"ly one paid, one un-"paid letter, and one "return Chellan, and "*no* service covers "whatever. As Mun-"genapudy is not a "postal station, the letters for that place were "put in a separate packet and given to the run-"ner to deliver at the Salt Cutcherry on his "way to Buntumilly. No entry in the despatch "register is, therefore, ever made of letters for "that place, and witness could not state how "many, if any, letters were sent there.

NOTE OF COLLECTOR.—A letter box is kept in the Collector's Cutcherry; at 4 P. M. every day, it is despatched to the Post Office and opened; any letters requiring to be posted at a later hour are sent to the regular Post Office and put into the regular box.

"On 27th March, witness went, as usual, "to office in the morning at 8; the Calcutta "Mail came in, and the sorting almirah was "opened, the letters belonging to the Mulky "Department were given to the witness; there "were eleven or twelve letters; he looked "over them and found four service covers ad-"dressed to each of the Salt Divisions; they were "set apart for despatch with the others in the "evening. That for Mungenapudy was sent, as "usual, by the Buntumilly runner, *outside* "tappal."

8. The Collector is pleased to omit the relationship, which is, the Superintendent is the brother-in-law of the witness' son, who was the real person who went to Mungenapudy, on the 27th, to buy salt, though, for falsification, the name of the Gumastah and fourteenth witness were entered in the list of sales. These individuals are not dealers in salt, and they never bought salt for trade before. His (witness) deposition in full is herewith sent (D).

The Collector is pleased to say that this person was spoken to by me; but he does not say what I have spoken. The deposition will show it, as well as the time when the matter took place.

9. The Mulky writer says that no register having been kept for Mungenapudy, he was unable to state how many letters were sent to Mungenapudy on the 26th, but he yet says he recollects the despatch of four letters to Mungenapudy on the 27th. Even here, he says, he is not sure. Again, in the deposition taken by me in the Post Office in the presence of Mr. Honner, the Inspecting Postmaster, only two days after the despatch of the orders, he stated that he *recollected to have sent, on the 26th*, four packets to Mungenapudy, and he did not mention then anything about what he now says as having occurred on the 27th. It is more truthful to think that his power of memory would have been much stronger soon after the occurrence has taken place, than at this distant period of time. Hence the incredibility of his evidence.—*Vide* depositions E 1 and E 2.

DEFENCE.—CHINNAM KRISHNAMAH, *Salt Superintendent.*—"The Salt Superinten-"dent, Chinnam Krishnamah, having heard all "the above statements, said, that, on going to "office on the morning of the 28th, the Gumastah "told him, that a parcel containing an order had "been received by post the preceding night; the "order was handed to the Superintendent, and "opened by him, and found to contain instruc-"tions to raise Government price of salt. The "Superintendent observed that it was dated "26th, and had been received by telegraph, and "taken in connexion with the large purchases "of salt made the two previous days, his sus-"picions were roused by the delay, and he at "once reported the matter to the Salt Deputy "Collector, and the Deputy Collector in charge "of the Treasury; he asked for the cover of the "letter, and found it dated Masulipatam Post "Office, 27th March. This cover he produced "before the Collector; he stated that on the "evening of the 27th, he had heard rumours "about the place that the price had been raised; "but as such orders had always hitherto been "sent out by express, and as he had received no "intimation on this occasion, he concluded the "rumour was groundless: he afterwards heard "the same report from a Salt Peon. He deposed "to having sold two heaps on the 26th, and "three on the 27th, and admitted that some of "the merchants on each occasion were his rela-"tives; he, however, denied that he knew any "thing of the rise in price before the purchases "were made, or that he had received any com-"munication whatever with them on the subject."

10. In the first deposition given before the Salt Deputy Collector, the Superintendent state that rumours of the rise in the price either accompanied or followed the merchants that came to buy salt on the 27th. Again, in the deposition before the Collector, he said that he also heard the same rumour from a Salt Peon who passed Masulipatam on the 27th evening. According to his own account, when he was in possession of such information, it is natural or incumbent for an officer of his position to have been anxious to wait and inquire for the post of that night. But from his own deposition, it appears he was cool and indifferent, and even on the next morning, he does not make any anxious inquiry for any order in the post; but, he says, his Gumastahs gave the order to him. These cannot be the true indications of an officer in previous receipt of rumour of such an important subject, if he had no hand in the matter in question.

11. The Collector is pleased to say in the summary, "He (Superintendent) asked for the cover of the letter and found it dated Masulipatam Post Office, 27th March." This cover was produced before the Collector during the inquiry; when the Salt Deputy, and Collector, and all pronounced that the date *was not discernible*; and even on the second day, to see whether the date was visible, I used a microscope, but to no effect. The cover is even now in the office, and it may be referred to. Under such circumstances, for the Collector to say that the date was found on the cover, is unjust to me.

12. COLLECTOR'S DECISION AND REMARKS.—The Collector is pleased to end paragraph 1 of his decision, by stating that no one saw the despatching Peon put the orders in the box. I beg to state that the Board will observe, from the deposition* of fifth witness, (the despatching clerk,) that that Peon did immediately return and say to him that the orders *had been put* into the box.

* F.

13. In paragraph 2 of his decision, Collector is pleased to state that it is certain, from the statements of the Post Office officials, and from the entries in the registers, that the four orders were not in the box when opened in the Post Office. I beg to state that the Post Office officials who were examined, were only one Veerabhadraiya (seventh witness) and Peon (eighth witness). The former was not present when the Cutcherry box was opened. The proper man whose turn it was, and who opened the box was not examined, as I have explained in paragraph 4 of this explanation, and the latter, the Peon, did use the key under the direction of the clerk (not examined) on duty that day. The Mulky writer had nothing whatever to do with the opening of the box or sorting of its contents, he receiving only what was put in his hands by the regular Post Office clerk on duty each day. Regarding the entries alluded to by the Collector, it is clear that the regular Post Office officials *never* keep registering of letters delivered into the

hands of the Mulky writer, nor does the latter keep any record of the letters despatched to Mungenapudy as stated by those officials themselves. Hence, the Board will observe that the assertion of the Collector does not appear to be based upon the depositions of the Post Office officials.

14. Again, in the same paragraph, Collector is pleased to take it for granted that the orders were not put into the Cutcherry box, but carried late in the evening to the Post Office box. This he is pleased to do in the face of undoubted evidence, from a strict and severe inquiry held by himself, of the subordinate officials concerned in the despatch of the orders. That the orders were put into the Cutcherry box before 1 o'clock on the 26th, is proved beyond doubt. The Board may be pleased to call for the depositions of those parties, in which it will be apparent what sort of questions were put to those Cutcherry servants by the Collector, and what truth was elicited therefrom, nevertheless.

15. The Collector is pleased to state that the orders were found in the regular post box, when it was opened during the night of the 26th. I beg to state that the only person who appears to have opened the box, at about 11 o'clock, on the night of the 26th, was seventh witness, who clearly states in his deposition, that "I did not see the addresses, and do not remember how "many orders there were." In the same paragraph, Collector speaks of the runner delivering the packets at Mungenapudy, and afterwards at Buntumilly. Why this runner was *not* examined by the Collector, though requested by me, I don't know. This runner would have certainly thrown some light upon the actual time of receipt of the packets by the Superintendent, if examined.

16. *Paragraphs 5 and* 6.—It is for the Board to judge whether the conclusion of the Collector is tenable, as he founds it upon the merchant's (ninth witness') Gumastah going on the morning of the 26th to buy salt, as I have already explained in paragraph 6, the omission of the Collector in the summary of the several important facts elicited in the merchant's (ninth witness') deposition and the Arzee of the Buntumilly Superintendent.

17. *Paragraph* 8.—The Board will be pleased to observe that it is not possible to get any information, from the relations so closely connected with the Superintendent, calculated to injure him. But the Collector has been pleased to lose sight of the fact, that *only his relations were the purchasers on that day*; that they are not ordinary dealers in salt; that they never bought salt before for trade, though they are merchants of known reputation; and that none of the regular salt traders, who are numerous in Masulipatam, did make any purchase on the occasion. Under these circumstances, the Board will perceive that the report never left my office, and that these purchasers did not go to Mungenapudy on information received *from the town*.

18. *Paragaphs 9 and* 10.—When it came to my knowledge that the Superintendent sold to his relations only, and that these merchants were never before dealers in salt, I at once suspected that the Superintendent, the relatives, and the Mulky writer were all in collusion with each other, and I instituted the inquiry at once. The Mulky writer was not trustworthy, as will be seen from the prevaricating depositions given before the Inspecting Postmaster at first, and subsequently before the Collector.—*Vide* paragraph 9 of this explanation.

19. It is not impossible that the outside packets, both for Mungenapudy and Buntumilly, carried by the runner, could have been detained one day at Munge napudy, and Chellam for Buntumilly re-placed with a different date. There is nothing in the records of the Postal Department that could check such fearless attempts.

20. The Collector has been pleased to omit to notice these facts also. The real purchasers on the 27th were the following:—

1. Cherrukury Surveselingam.
2. Majeti Nagabhushanam.
3. Wadapally Sriramulu.
4. Guggala Subbaroydoo.

21. The name of the first, who is the maternal uncle of the Superintendent, is omitted in the Chitta of sales. The second lent money to the first for this purchase. The third, who is the Gumastah of the fourth, is put down as a merchant, and the fourth is the father of the Superintendent's brother-in-law, who was the actual individual who went to Mungenapudy on that day. The Superintendent, in his first defence before the Salt Deputy Collector, *does not speak of the purchase by his maternal uncle*, but talks of the third as a Brahmin merchant unrelated to him. The Salt Deputy Collector in paragraph 2 of his letter, dated 20th April 1866, No. 46, exonerating the Superintendent positively, states that the purchasers were not close relatives of the Superintendent, and pointing to the third as a merchant, is of opinion that the Brahmin is not related to a Komaty; but during the examination, the Salt Deputy Collector admits that he was wrong in having written so. But the Salt Deputy Collector based his arguments in exonerating the Superintendent upon this, as did the Collector, which will be apparent in Collector's letter to Board, dated 28th April 1866.

To the Collector.

"*Paragraph* 2.—You will observe from the statement that one of the merchants is a Brahmin, and that none of the others are relatives to the Superintendent, but are merely distantly connected with him by marriage between members of their respective families."

22. If the several omissions which I have now respectfully brought to notice be supplied, I trust that the Board will be pleased to arrive at the following conclusions:—

1*st*.—That the telegram was received on the night of the 25th (Sunday).

2*nd*.—That the orders were *bona-fide* prepared and put into the Cutcherry letter box, before 1 o'clock on the 26th.

3*rd*.—That the orders must have reached the Superintendent of Mungenapudy on the evening of the 26th.

4*th*.—That, on the following day (27th), the *relatives* of the Superintendent *only* having come *just before* the sunset, must have been sent for by the Superintendent.

5*th*.—That the Superintendent's object in omitting the name of his maternal uncle and his brother-in-law, and in entering the name of his brother-in-law's Gumastah, so as to make it appear that he was a Brahmin merchant, in the Chitta of sales, must be apparent, and calculated to strengthen the suspicion against the Superintendent.

23. In the face of such undoubted evidence, if the Collector is pleased to acquit the Superintendent from all blame, I must throw myself entirely under the protection of the Board to do justice in the matter, after perusing the depositions of the parties. I have only to bring respectfully to the favorable consideration of the Board, that there has not been one instance in which I was censured for delay, or want of zeal, when the interest of Government is at stake. The Collector thinks that I could have sent the order by a special messenger, but this did not occur to my mind, as I was taken up with the language in the Government telegram, viz., "To issue immediate orders." Even had I sent a messenger, it would by no means prevent the Superintendent from resorting to malpractice, if he was so disposed, by at once debiting the heaps and crediting the value in the Chitta as having sold the salt, replenishing the amount afterwards, which is not impracticable. The Board will also take into their consideration the fact, that, while there was not a single day in which the retail sales took place, there were none on the 27th, but wholesale dealers, who were all his close relatives. In this very station of Mungenapudy, where there took place an embezzlement of Government revenue, the sale proceeds of salt last year, it was I that first discovered it, and saved Government of upwards of 700 Rupees, though it was more the duty of the Salt Deputy Collector to have found it out, as he had all the information requisite in his hands.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue, as requested by Treasury Deputy Collector T. Dhurma Row Mudelly.

MASULIPATAM,
27th May 1866.

(Signed) W. WILSON,
Acting Sub-Collector in charge of the Kistna District.

A.

Fourth Witness, NUNNI KHAN, *Mulky Runner and Distributing Peon, Collector's Cutcherry*, sworn.—I received four orders from the Munshee with orders to put them in the tappal box at 1 o'clock. I do not know the date or the month.

In former deposition, he said he received the orders from Purushottam to give to the Munshee; he now states the latter to be correct.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

F.

Fifth Witness, MIRZA JAFFER ALLI, *Mulky Writer*, sworn.—The four orders regarding the price of salt were sent to me on the 26th at about 1 o'clock. I do not know who brought them. I went to Purushottam to ask if there were more orders; he then told me the orders sent were very urgent, and must be despatched at once. I went back at once, put them in covers and gave to Nunni Khan to put in the box; he came back and said he had placed them in the box.

In former deposition stated that Nunni Khan brought them and said they were urgent, and said nothing of going to Purushottam.

I do not well recollect but I certainly went to Purushottam, and was told by him that the orders were urgent, and must be sent at once.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

B.

Ninth Witness, PALACRUTTI RAJALINGAM, *Komaty of Masulipatam, age* 40 *years*, sworn.—I sent Tadapilly Padmabhudu and S. Kotayya to Mungenapudy, on 26th March, to buy two heaps of salt. They started at 6 or 7 A. M. with Rupees and Bank notes; they returned at 4 P. M. I purchased the salt to send to Jaggiahpetta. I had not heard that the price of salt was about to be raised. I am in the habit of buying salt by wholesale and by retail also for trade.

I am distantly related to the Superintendent of Mungenapudy, but not closely. I am not in the habit of writing or receiving letters from the Superintendent. I have no money dealings with him.

Question by Treasury Deputy Collector.—I sent Bank Notes to Buntumilly about seven or eight days previously to purchase salt, the notes were refused; the Superintendent told him he had no orders to receive them.

By Mr. Marjoribanks.—I sent B. Balakristnammah with Rupees to Buntumilly at the same time that I sent to Mungenapudy to buy one heap of salt there also.

By Collector.—I bought one heap at Buntumilly because the Jaggiahpetta merchants wrote for Buntumilly salt I could not get bandies to bring all the salt from Buntumilly; so I bought the rest at Mungenapudy.

By Mr. Marjoribanks.—I bought the Mungenapudy salt in the name of my son Sriramulu. I do not know in whose name my Gumastah bought the Buntumilly salt. A man named Tallury Beemannah had a share in the Mungenapudy salt; so I entered it in my son's name. No one else had any share in that salt, nor in the *Buntumilly* salt.

Question by Superintendent.—You stated above that you took salt at Mungenapudy, because you could get bandies to take it from that place and not Buntumilly. Why, then, did you not remove the salt for twenty days?

I could not get bandies at once to take it away. I meant to say above that I believed I could get bandies more readily for Mungenapudy than Buntumilly. I bought the Mungenapudy salt on my own account, and sent it to Jaggiahpetta for sale, and not for merchants.

By Collector.—Did you ever buy three heaps in a day before? No. I happened to have funds available.

By Mr. Marjoribanks.—Did (you) not send sovereigns first to buy the salt at Mungenapudy? No, I did not.

By Collector.—I heard that the price of salt had been raised four or five days afterwards. I bought one heap and ten bandies of salt at Buntumilly after the price was raised. I had agreed to supply some oil seeds from Jaggiahpetta and deliver them at Masulipatam, and as it was more profitable to me to send salt up and bring the oil seeds on the return bandies, I arranged to send up the salt; the seeds have been delivered accordingly.

Before purchasing this salt, I had endeavoured to borrow a Government Promissory Note from M. Bapannah to purchase salt, but had failed.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

C.

13th Witness, CHERKURRY SUVESALINGAM, *Komaty of Bunder*, sworn.—About a month or fifteen days ago Nagabhushanam came to me to arrange for bringing salt with Ramaswamy. I agreed to purchase two heaps of salt. I had no ready money. So Nagabhushanam provided the funds. I knew nothing of the rise in the price of salt. I have not been in the habit of buying salt by the heap for some years. I calculated in getting profit by the transaction in the ordinary way of trade.

The Salt Superintendent, C. Krishnama, is my elder sister's son. I heard nothing from him of the rise in price. I was not recommended by him to buy salt when I went to Mungenapudy. I spoke to him on ordinary subjects.

He did not write to me about it. I had no communication at all with them on the subject.

By Treasury Deputy.—I have constantly had money transaction with M. Nagabhushanam. I have a regular money account with him; we have not settled lately; our transactions amount to 10,000 or 16,000 Rupees a year.

I cannot say when I last took a large sum from him. My nephew can tell.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

D.

GUGGALA SUBBAROYDOO, *14th Witness*, sworn.—I bought a heap of salt at Mungenapudy on the 27th March. I sent W. Sriramulu, my Gumastah, and my son, Sastrulu, with money and notes to buy the salt. I heard in the bazar that merchants had bought salt on the 26th, and that there would be profit in the sale of salt, so I bought it. I did not hear of the increase in the Government rate three or four days after I had purchased it. I am related to the Superintendent. My son married his sister. I do not correspond with him, and have no money dealings with him. I had no intimation whatever from him of any rise in the price of salt.

By Deputy Collector.—I have not purchased salt for the last *ten or fifteen years.*

By Superintendent.—I did not come to Cutcherry on the 26th.

Superintendent's question.—Have you dealings with the Treasury Deputy Collector's brother? Yes. I have dealings and many others have for the last three or four months.

I have received letters from his brother, who resides in Madras, about merchandize, and the Deputy Collector has spoken to me on the subject. The Deputy Collector asked me to enter into dealings with his brother; he told me I must conduct the business correctly and carefully.

By Collector.—It did *not* appear that the Deputy Collector was *personally concerned* in the transactions. The Deputy Collector has not seen my accounts of the transactions between his brother and me; the transactions have only recently commenced, and no settlement of accounts has as yet taken place. Kota Venkatrayalu and some of the Tattavaru people also were (? had) opened mercantile dealings with the Deputy Collector's brother.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

14th May 1866.

E 1.

DEPOSITIONS *given by* YEMMADA LAKSHMINARSIMHA ROW, *Mulky Writer at Bunder, 28th March* 1866.

Q.—Were you at the regular office when the box, in which the covers which came on the 26th from the Huzur Cutcherry were put, was unlocked?

A.—I was present when the box in which the covers of the Huzur Cutcherry were put on the above date, was brought to the regular office and unlocked. The said box was unlocked by one Balajee, Peon, attached to the regular office. The said Peon took the covers out of the box and separated the service packets when the writers, namely, Ariperala Venkata Ramanna, Badheraju Verabhadraya, Munchalla Venkata Ramadoss, and Adharaparapu Hanumanta Row, were sitting in front. It is Adharapurapu Hanumanta Row's day's turn to sort the said covers. He separated the covers to be sent to Taluks, and handed them over to me. It was then about half past 5 o'clock.

Q.—State how many covers, and to whom addressed, were given that day?

A.—I cannot state from memory how many covers, and to whom addressed.

Q.—You have stated that it has been usual to despatch the packet of the covers by out-tappal to Mungenapudy and Buntumilly. Did you so despatch the covers of the night of the 26th to Buntumilly and Mungenapudy?

A.—I recollect that I despatched, on the evening of that day, a packet of four covers to Mungenapudy. I despatched, to Buntumilly, one paid and bearing letter only. To Buntumilly no official packet was despatched.

Q.—Did you despatch to Buntumilly any covers officially on the 27th?

A.—I despatched to Buntumilly on the 27th one service, one paid, and one bearing letter.

Q.—When did the covers said to have been despatched to Buntumilly come to you?

A.—These covers were in those which I have above stated were given yesterday morning from the Masulipatam Post Office.

(Signed) Y. LAKSHMINARSIMHA ROW.

(True translation.)
(Signed) T. DHARMAROW MUDELLY,
Deputy Collector.

E 2.

Sixth Witness, Y. LAKSHMI NARSIMHA ROW, *Mulky writer, in Bunder Post Office*, sworn.—On the 26th of March, I was in the Post Office when the Cutcherry post box was received. It was taken as usual into the office, and was opened by Balajee, letter box peon, and in the presence of the Head Clerk, Ramadoss Puntulu, Ariperalu Venkataramannah, Hanumanta Row, and others; the letters were sorted, and those belonging to the Mulky post were handed to me. I entered the number of service, paid, and bearing letters, as usual, in the register. If I see the register I can tell. I sorted the letters for despatch to the different Taluks, and entered them in the despatch register. On referring to this register, I find one paid, one unpaid, and return Chellam despatched to Buntumilly. The Mungenapudy letters are always made up in a separate packet, and sent by the Buntumilly runner *outside*. The packet is addressed to the Salt Divisions, but as it is not a station, no entry is made in the despatch register of the Mungenapudy letters. I cannot, therefore, say how many letters were sent to Mungenapudy on the 26th March.

On the 27th, I went as usual to the office in the morning; about 8 o'clock, the Calcutta Mail came; the sorting almirah was opened, and the writer, Veerabadriah, gave me some Mulky letters which had been placed in the pigeon hole set apart for letters to be distributed in the town, and for Mulky letters'; there were ten or fourteen letters. Two covers superscribed "On a Bearers' service." So, I looked over the whole carefully at once. I took steps to despatch the bearers' letters without delay, and the remaining letters were kept for despatch until the evening.

There were four covers for the salt Kotaurs and others I am not sure about. I sent the Buntumilly letters as usual in a packet; it contained one service, one paid, one bearing, one return Chellam. There was a service cover for Mungenapudy only. So gave it without putting it in another packet to the runner to deliver. The runner left the office at 7 o'clock P. M.

2. In your former deposition, you stated that the letter was enclosed in a fresh cover; the Salt Superintendent also produces the address of such an outer cover; was that address written in your office? It is a long time ago, and I may have forgotten. The address was written by the second writer, and is the same as is always affixed to such packets. It seems date of despatch 27th. The cover of the letter now produced is similar to that despatched to Mungenapudy on the 27th. I believe it to be the same.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Collector.

(True Copies.)
(Signed) T. DHURMAROW MUDELLY,
Deputy Collector.

---

1. The Board request the Acting Collector will be so good as to call on Dhurmaroyen Moodeliar to explain what trading transactions are carried on by his brother in partnership with the fourteenth witness, Guggala Subbaroydu, (*vide* Mr. Thornhill's summary of the evidence,) and what foundation exists for this witness' statement that the Deputy Collector asked witness to enter into dealings with the Deputy Collector's brother. The Deputy Collector will also state whether he has any personal interest in the business carried on by his brother and Guggala Subbaroydu.

2. The Acting Collector will also forward the cover referred to in paragraph 19 of Mr. Thornhill's summary, and will ascertain and report whether the Deputy Collector's order of the 26th April to the several Salt Superintendents arrived at the remaining two stations* by the post from Masulipatam of the 26th, or by the post of the 27th April. If the Post Office registers prove, as in the case of Buntumilly, that the orders were not actually despatched from the Post Office till the 27th, it should be so stated.

* Nizampatam, Chinna Ganjam.

(True Copies and Extract.)
(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary.

To the Acting Collector of the Kistna District.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 4,924.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 19th July 1866.

Read again Board's Proceedings, 12th June 1866, No. 4,006.

Read also the following letter from T. A. N. CHASE, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 21st June 1866, No. 216:—

1. In reply to the Board's Proceedings, No. 4,006, dated 12th June 1866, I have the honor to forward Deputy Collector Durmaroyen Mudaliar's explanation, in which he denies altogether having any mercantile connexion whatever with his brother, and states there is no foundation whatever for G. Soobrayadoo's statement that he (the Deputy Collector) asked him (G. Soobrayadoo) to enter into dealings with the Deputy Collector's brother.

2. I consider there is a great deal of truth in the latter part of the Deputy Collector's explanation, for not being a Brahmin, would of itself, had he been concerned in mercantile affairs, been a sufficient inducement for others to have brought a case against him long before this. Had he once stepped aside to do wrong, I feel he would have endeavoured to make friends, at all events in the Cutcherry; but so far from this being the case, I find nearly all the highest Cutcherry officials are opposed to him, and that a great deal of enmity exists between him and them.

3. I herewith forward the cover referred to in paragraph 19 of Mr. Thornhill's summary.

4. The Post Office Register shows that, on the 26th April, three letters left this office for Nizampatam, and one banghy service letter for Chinna Ganjam, and on the 27th April, three letters were despatched to Nizampatam, and one for Chinna Ganjam.

5. Letters are put into the Cutcherry office box, which is sent to the Post Office at about 4 P. M.; these have to wait till the arrival of the Northern tappal, when they are sent on to the post station at Ventapollem, whence they are distributed to Nizampatam and Chinna Ganjam.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From T. DHARMAROW MOODELLY, Deputy Collector, to the Acting Collector of the Kistna District, dated Masulipatam, 21st June 1866.

In reference to the Board's Proceedings, No. 4,006, dated the 12th June 1866, I beg to state that on inquiry I find that my brother who is in Madras, does not trade; that is, he does not purchase in this or any other District articles for sale in Madras or elsewhere for profit. Nor does he hold any partnership with the fourteenth witness, G. Soobrayadoo, in his trade. I never told G. Soobrayadoo to enter into mercantile dealings with my brother. There is no foundation whatever for him to say so. No conversation ever took place on the subject.

Paragraph 1.

The facts are, that my brother was an Accountant in the Collector's Office at Madras. Hearing that I had a prospect of being transferred into the Madras Collectorate, and thinking that it would be inconvenient to public service to have a brother in the same office, he left it and entered into partnership in a Commission Agency, with certain persons in Madras. This Agency does not trade, but buys and supplies articles from Madras, and receives commission for its trouble. It seems to have similar correspondence with people in the Godavery, Vizagapatam, and other Coast Districts. Even in this matter, I have not the least concern, nor have I or have had any personal interest in it.

Enclosure in the Board's Proceedings dated 19th July 1866.

1866. Department.

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 12th June 1866.

No. 4,006.

Requesting further information from Collector of Kistna district regarding delay of Treasury Deputy Dhurmaroyen Moodelly in circulating Telegram from Board raising monopoly price of salt, and directing that he be called on to explain what trading transactions are carried on by his brother in partnership with Guggala Subbaroyda.

Should you think that my brother should not have even in this way, any concern whatever, I shall ask him to withdraw it, and go back in search of a Government employ.

In conclusion, I beg to inform you that if I had had any shadow of concern, or interference in the matter of the alleged trade, I would not have been spared by those who have brought about all these *false* things, and subjected me to undeserved trouble and sorrow. They would have made a good case against me. There would have been hundreds of petitions flying about me, to blow me off.

---

1. The foregoing papers relate to the non-issue to certain pans in the Kistna District, of the Orders of Government directing an increase in the price charged for salt, owing to which a loss of Rupees 1,125 has been incurred. It appears that the Order was received by telegraph at Masulipatam on the evening of Sunday, 25th March, by the Deputy Collector in charge of the Treasury, Durmaroyen Moodelly, and that he forwarded a copy of the Order to the Collector, who was then on circuit, with an intimation that the necessary orders had been sent direct to the several salt pans of the District.

2. From the Deputy Collector's own showing, it appears that he took no steps whatever to give any such instructions until 12 o'clock on Monday the 26th, at which hour he went to office, and prepared and signed the necessary orders to the Superintendents of the several salt pans. The evidence relied on by him also goes to show that the orders were countersigned, sealed, and placed in the Office Post box before 4 P. M., at which hour the box is taken to the Post Office.

3. It seems pretty clear, however, from the evidence of the Post Office Clerks, that the covers containing these orders were not put in the Office Post box, but were posted in the ordinary letter box at the Post Office at some later hour on Monday afternoon or evening. The result of this delay was, that the orders did not reach the salt stations of Munganapudi and Buntumilly until late on Tuesday night, instead of late on Monday night, as would have been the case if the Deputy Collector was correct in his assertion that the covers were placed in the Office Post box before 4 P. M. on Monday.

4. It appears that two heaps of salt were sold at the Munganapudi pans, and one heap at the Buntumilly pans on Monday, and that two more heaps were sold at the former pans on Tuesday. Even, therefore, if the Deputy Collector was correct in his view of the case, the sale of three salt heaps on Monday, at the lower rates, was entirely owing to his own carelessness in omitting to despatch special messengers to the Munganapudi and Buntumilly pans early on Monday morning. These pans are distant from Masulipatam five and sixteen miles respectively, and it is difficult to understand how an officer of the Deputy Collector's experience could be so negligent as to forward the telegraphic instruction, which he had received the evening before, by the ordinary post, which he was well aware would not reach either of those places till very late on Monday night: thus leaving the whole of Monday to those persons of Masulipatam who might have received intelligence of the rise in price from Madras, or from the Telegraph Office, or the Cutcherry, to make purchases at the lower rates.

5. The Board are of opinion that the attempts made by the Deputy Collector, to cast imputations upon the Superintendent of Munganapudi, are also discreditable and improper, and they quite concur with the Collector and Mr. Marjoribanks in acquitting this officer of all blame in the matter. The evidence of the Post Office Writer, Y. Lakshima Nursimha Row, to which the Deputy Collector adverts as being in support of his view of the case when given on the 28th March before the Deputy Collector, is, in the Board's opinion, conclusively in favor of the Superintendent. In his depositions marked E. 1 and E. 2, attached to the Deputy Collector's letter, dated 26th May 1865, above recorded, one of which was given before the Deputy Collector on the 28th March, and the other before the Collector at a subsequent date, this writer distinctly states that no service letter was sent to Buntumilly by the mail of the evening of Monday 26th March. It is evident, therefore, that one of the four service covers, containing the orders for raising the price of salt, was not then in the Post Office, and this being the case, it is excessively unlikely that the other three should have been there. The two orders for Munganapudi and Buntumilly would, of course, reach the Post Office at the same time, and would be despatched by the same mail.

6. The Board acquit the Deputy Collector of any improper motives; but the Collector will inform him that his carelessness, and the want of judgment displayed by him in the matter, which has resulted in a large loss to Government, is deserving of grave reprehension.

7. The Board are glad to be able to record their opinion that nothing has been elicited in this inquiry, which goes to show that the Deputy Collector is in any way connected with the mercantile transactions in which his brother is said to be engaged, or that he has in any way taken advantage of his official position to forward those transactions.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

To the Collector of the Kistna District,
with original telegram and letter returned.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

No. Rev: 4405/66.

1866. Department.

Encl. in the Pro. of the Bd. of Rev. to this day's Govt. order dated ... /65 No. 3093.

Dated 19th July 1866.

Pro. 15th Aug/67 No. 268.

No. 4,924.

Acquitting Deputy Collector Durmaroyen Moodelly of Kistna district of any improper motives in delaying to issue to certain pans the orders of Government directing an increase in price charged for salt, and requesting Collector to inform him that his carelessness in matter is deserving of grave reprehension.

Bd's Pro. dated 17th Oct. /67 No. 6757.

Memo. for Orders.

The papers now submitted by the Bd. contain the information called for in G.O. No 1,757 of 31st July /67 with reference to the conduct of Dharmaroya Mudali, late Deputy Coll. in the Kistna District & now doing duty in the Bd's office.

Dhurmaroya Mudali first entered Govt. service in 1852, & has subsequently held the following posts—

	Sub. Coll's Clerk	Augt. /52
	Talug Sheristadar	June /53.
	Tahsildar	April /54
	Sub Coll's Sheristadar	Nov. /56
	Naib Sheristadar	May /58
never took up this appt.	Deputy Coll. 4th Class, Kistna	March /59
	do 3rd " Inam Comn.	June /59
	do Tanjore	Jany /61
	" Salem	Novr.
	" Malabar	Oct. /62
	" Madras	April /63
	" Kistna	Dec /63

Reduced to 4th class & removed to Boards office January /67.

Pro. B.O.R. of 17th Augt. /61 No. 4,628.

In Augt. /61, 7 months after he had been appointed to the Tanjore District the Bd. recommended the removal of Dhurmaroya Mudali on the following grounds:

1º That he had been engaged in some pecuniary transactions with the public servants of the District.

2º That his letters to the Coll. were disrespectful & contained much that was insubordinate & reprehensible

3º That as he did not know how to obey he was unfit to control others.

G.O. 5th Oct. /61, No. 1,927

Govt. concurred in the view taken by the Bd. of his conduct & directed his removal from the District.

He was then sent to Salem to act, but created an unfavourable impression there. Mr Brett the then Coll. states in a demi-official letter —

"Dharmaroya Mudali while in Salem showed a bad spirit & was disliked & feared by most of the Coll's subordinates. I do not think he is fit to hold a Deputy Collectorship in any of the Depts."

In Pro. of Govt. for Jany./67 No 123

From Salem he went to Malabar. There is nothing on record to show what his conduct was there.

I am under the impression that Mr. Ballard was not dissatisfied with him — [illegible] I rather think Mr. Ballard was much dissatisfied with the way in which D. Mudali left his registers of sale of [illegible] [illegible]

In April /63, the services of Dh. Mudali were placed temporarily at the disposal of the Coll. of Madras to carry out the reduction of assessment, but in Decr. of the same year the Coll reported that Dh. Mudali had not completed the work of one Talug & that he did not possess the qualifications viz. Revenue knowledge, tact & energy, for the special work."

In Pro. B.O.R. datd. 4th Dec. /67 No 7,645.

In the same month he was appointed to the Kistnah Treasury Deputy Coll.

In 1866 the Coll. of the Kistna handed up Dharm. Mudali to the Bd. for gross carelessness in re a salt Telegram. The facts of the case were as follows: On the evening of the 25th March Dharmaroya Mudali (the Coll. was out in Camp) received a Telegram from the Bd. to say that Govt. had raised the price of Salt from the 24th inst. Dh. Mudali took no steps to issue any instructions to the Salt Stations till the following day at 12 o'clock, & owing to this delay & his further carelessness in despatching the orders, they did not reach the ×2 Salt Stations till the evening of Tuesday the 27th inst. During Monday & Tuesday i.e. subsequent to the receipt of the Telegram by Dharm. Mudali 5 heaps of Salt were sold & Govt. were losers of the sum of Rs 1,125. Dharm. Mudali made attempts which the Bd. stigmatized as "discreditable & improper" to throw the blame of the Sales on the Superintendent of the Salt Station, but entirely failed. The Bd. however acquitted Dh. Mudali of any improper mo[illegible] [illegible] marking [illegible] ut were

Pro. B.O.R. datd. 12th June /66 No 4,006

× one Station is five & the other 16 miles from Masulipatam.

Pro. dated 19th July /66 No 4,924.

Pro. dated 8th Nov. /66 No 8,093

In Novr. /66 the Bd. forwarded to Govt. a letter from the Coll. of the Kistna District complaining of the conduct of Dh. Mudali & expressed their opinion that "Dharmaroyas Mudali's letter to the Coll. is grossly offensive & impertinent both in ~~the~~ ~~his~~ regard to the motives he presumed to impute to the Hd. Asst. Coll. & in his sneering comments on Depy. Coll. Vencatachellum's letter;" & they recommended that he ~~they~~ should be removed & punished.

In Pro. dated 19th Sept. /66 No 6,685

At the same time the Bd. forwarded a letter from the Accountant General complaining of the incapacity (notwithstanding his former study in the Bd's Office) & frequent negligence of Dharm. Mudali, & the Bd. expressed it as their opinion that he was unfit for the post of Treasury Depy. Coll.

G.O. 15th Jany. /67 No 123

In their order thereon Govt. reduced Dhurmaroya Mudali to the 4th grade of Deputy Coll. & directed him to join the Bd's Office to learn his work.

On the 24th Jany. the Coll. reported direct to Govt. some fresh impertinence on the part of Dharmaroya Mudali in writing a very improper letter to the C. & S. Judge, but Govt. in their order, deemed it unnecessary to take further notice of his additional misconduct.

G.O. 24th Jany. /67 No. 230.

In Pro. B.O.R. dated 6th July /67 No 4,235.

On the 17th May the Coll. in reporting to the Bd. on certain petitions brought forward fresh charges of misconduct on the part of Dharm. Mudali to the following effect: —

1° On the introduction of the Stamp discount system the Coll. ordered Dh. Mudali to prepare a list of persons as Stamp Vendors for Masulipatam. He authorized 6 persons to sell. The Coll. thinking this too many revised the list & reduced the number to two. Mr Thornhill shortly after went away on leave & 4 days after Mr Chase the Actg. Coll. arrived the Depy. Coll brought the matter of the Stamp Vendors before him, & the result was that one of Mr Thornhill's nominees was struck out of the list & the other Vendors reduced by Mr T. were reappointed.

Encl. 1. of Mr. Thornhill's letter

Q.O. 31st July/67
Nos 1, 757

In Pro. B.O. Rd. 17th Oct/67
No. 6, 757.

On his return from leave Mr. Thornhill questioned these Vendors as to their connection with Dh. Mudali & elicited the following replies:—

No. 1. Dh. Mudali urged me to trade with his brother in Madras. He borrowed R 50 from me but failed to pay. I sued him unsuccessfully.

No. 2. No dealings with Dept. Coll's brother. Dept. Coll. owes me money. My suit against him was thrown out.

Nos. 3 & 4 No dealings with Dept. Coll nor his brother

No. 5. Dept. Coll. asked me to trade with his brother who would supply me at low rates. I sent gram to & received spirits from his brother.

No. 6. No dealings with Dept. Coll. My brother (No. 7) used to visit him.

No. 7. I advanced money to D. Coll. & received an order for the balance of his pay.

No. 8. I was at first a Stamp Vendor. Dept. Coll. asked me to speak to my relative named Appaswami & get him to obtain supplies from his (Dept. Coll's) brother. I did so. Appaswami wrote but got no answer. Then Dept. Coll. said we must send money in advance. We asked for security. Thereupon Dept. Coll. deprived me of Vendorship.

2°

2° charge. That in 1864 he applied to the Head Sheristy his own subordinate asking him to obtain through his father-in-law, a Soucar at Masulipatam Promissory notes for ₹ 1,000 that these notes were so obtained & that the D. Coll. evaded payment of interest & commission for 2 years, on which a suit was filed & a decree passed against him.

3° That as soon as Dharm. Mudali had quitted the District several suits for various sums were brought against him within one month.

4° That during Mr. Thornhill's absence on Jamabundi on direct contravention of his orders Dh. Mudali appointed 5 Vendors in Beg Gunter, one in Beywada & two more in Masulipatam.

The Bd. submitted this to Govt. with a letter from Dh. Mudali stating that he had submitted an explanation to Mr. Thornhill & ceased to be employed as Stamp Vendors

In their order thereon Govt. directed the Board (1) to obtain the explanation referred to by Dharmaroya Mudali, & a copy of Mr. Chase's orders (2) to request Mr. Chase to report what he remembers to have taken place as to the appointment of the Vendors, & (3) to furnish Dh. Mudali with the enclosures of Mr. Thornhill's letter viz Statements of the Stamp Vendors to the Coll, & Abstract of evidence in the Civil Suit for such explanation as he might desire to offer.

The Coll. of the Kistna now submits the paper referred to by Dh. Mudali as an explanation & a list of Vendors with Mr. Chase's signature attached. Mr. Wilson states that there exist on record no orders of Mr. Chase's on the subject. The "explanation" is, the Bd. remark, a mere statement of what took place when the 6 Stamp Vendors were appointed by Mr. Chase, & it contains no sort of explanation of the Deputy Coll's conduct in the matter. In the list signed by Mr. Chase one name is erased viz. that of No 8 in Mr. Thornhill's list given above.

Mr. Chase says that "beyond appointing several Stamp Vendors," he has "no recollection of anything else on the subject which took place."

The Deputy Coll's defence is to the following effect—

Charge 1. On the receipt of Bd's instructions as to the introduction of the Discount system Mr. Thornhill sent them to me with an order to carry them out. I accordingly appointed 6 Vendors & submitted their names to the Coll. The Coll. sent orders to reduce the no. to two. I thereupon sent for the Vendors but as they asked time to sell off their stock of Stamps I granted it. The Vendors then petitioned Mr. Thornhill who asked me about it & seeming satisfied with my explanation did not insist on the reduction: but did not cancel his former order. When Mr. Chase came the Vendors

petitioned Mr. Chase, who decided that there should be six Vendors. Mr. Chase was aware of Mr. Thornhill's order. [There is nothing to show this.] One of the Vendors then petitioned the Bd. who sent the petition to the Coll. for report. Mr. Thornhill sent it to me for an explanation which I submitted [noticed above] together with Mr. Chase's order to the press. [The list above referred to?] These papers were given to the Sheristadar & were by him purposely kept back till May/67.

On this Mr. Thornhill remarks—
"The papers were not given to the Sheristadar but were put by me in a drawer & forgotten. It was only at a later period that I found it. No one but myself is to blame for the delay in its disposal."

Dharmaroya Mudali then proceeds to state how, when & where Mr. Thornhill's mind was poisoned against him, treats the Salt affair (above mentioned) as very unimportant & states that his impertinent letter to the Coll. was the result of a disturbed state of mind.

He then disposes of the statements made by the Stamp Vendors to Mr. Thornhill as follows:—

No 1. Is a relation of the Sheristadar. I had nothing to do with him. I had to report him to the Coll. for misappropriation of relief fund. He is an Umedwar. How could I borrow money from such a man?

No. 2. After the Cyclone, hearing that this man was selling damaged stamps I searched his house, but found nothing. His suit for Rs 200 or 15 was rejected.

No. 5. It is true this party did on one occasion have dealings with my brother, but I never said my brother would send things at a low rate. I enclose his letter to my brother [In the letter he ~~speaks~~ repeats of his business transactions with Dh. Mudali's brother as something new, & speaks of many future dealings.]

No 7, was my agent. When I left Masulipatam, I settled my accounts with him, received an advance from him of R 280 & gave him an order for the balance of my pay.

No. 8. Mr. Chase rejected this man on the ground that a Moonsiff (Village) could not be a Stamp Vendor too. His story is altogether a trumped up one.

Mr. Thornhill remarks as follows:—
No searching enquiry was made into the allegations that Dharmaroyen's motives in granting licences were interested, but by his own showing, his brother who never had any dealings with Masulipatam before Dharmaroyen became Deputy Coll. traded with No. 5. Dharm. Mudali certainly supplied Appaswami (see No. 8) with his brother's address, as I saw it myself in the Dep. Coll's own handwriting.

Dharmaroyen's account of the suit (Charge No. 2) is as follows:—
In 1864 my brother wrote & proposed to purchase Govt. Promissory notes from a merchant at Masulipatam, provided I paid the amount (R 1,000) through the agents. I agreed & spoke to the Plaintiff who is not a Vendor & has no connection with the office. After 2 months he produced a receipt signed by my brother showing the amount I had to pay viz. R 1,000. In 5 months I paid that amount, obtained the receipt & sent it to my brother. [He does not send it, however, with the merchant's letter.] I was never aware of any charge for commission etc. nor was any demand ever made. After 2½ years to my surprise & without my knowledge a suit was filed & on the oath of the Plaintiff decreed against me. Had my Vakeel waited for a regular inquiry this suit would have been dismissed.

There seems no reason [to] doubt that the 1000 Rs was paid. but there was much delay - & the whole transaction shows the disposition to use the influence of official position to facilitate private arrangements.

Mr. Thornhill remarks as follows:—
The plaint was supported in Court as will be seen from the* abstract of the case by the evidence of Plaintiff & 3 witnesses, the 3rd of whom produced the accounts of plaintiff's agent at Madras to show the amount originally charged.

* In Pro. B.O.R. of 6th July/67 No 4, 235

Commenting on the 1st Witness, the Head Shroff, Dh. Mudali says "He made himself so notorious by bad conduct that I had to recommend his transfer both to Mr. Th. & Mr. Chase.

It is true, says Mr. Thornhill, that Dh. Mudali complained to me against the Shroff but he was never able to substantiate the charge, & I never heard any one else complain against him.

The Plaintiff, says Dh. Mudali, swore from pressure from without.

I know no one, says Mr. Th., less likely than the Plaintiff to enter into a suit of this nature to further the ends of others. He is a man of considerable wealth & very cautious in his dealings. He was formerly Head Shroff & is father-in-law of the 1st Witness, the present Head Shroff

As to Charge 3. Dh. Mudali says — The number of suits instituted against me were four, 3 of which were filed whilst I was in Masulipatam, & one after I left. All but the one above-mentioned were dismissed as false. [He then refers to a private note from his Vakeel which does not seem entitled to much weight.]

Charge 4 was not communicated to Dh. Mudali.

The Board in submitting the above make the following remarks — It is difficult now to ascertain positively whether or not the Depy. Coll. deliberately took advantage of Mr. Chase being new to the District to induce him to set aside aside the known views of Mr. Thornhill. They concur with Mr. Thornhill in thinking that the Deputy Coll. has entirely failed to clear himself of the charge of taking advantage of his official position & of having attempted to evade the payment of money justly due. They consider it to be established that the Dy. Coll. did endeavour to obtain business at Masulipatam for his brother at Madras & that he used his official influence to oblige some persons who were connected with his brother in this manner & others who had pecuniary transactions with himself.

They are further of opinion that his conduct in connection with the purchase of the promissory notes, & his refusal to pay what was justly due by him is highly reprehensible, & that he has committed a breach of the orders of Govt. Even from the Depy. Coll's own account of the matter it is clear that he received either for his brother or himself a considerable advance of money from a Soucar who resided in the Town when he was acting as Depy. Coll. & who was the father-in-law of the Head Shroff employed under him, a proceeding which was in direct contravention of the orders of Govt.

JHW
2.10.67

This man has given more trouble & dissatisfaction than any Dy. Colr. on the List. Censure & even punishment produce no apparent effect on him. I don't think he is corrupt, for I believe he is so generally disliked by his subordinates that he wd. be denounced at once. But he has evidently no sense of what is due to his position & he is conceit personified. As a public servant he is useless so far as my experience of him goes. At the present moment & in fact since January last he has been doing really nothing for his pay. + for working in the Bd.

+ This is meant as a kind of holiday for him. [illegible] 5 Nov/67.

For orders

Depy Collr Dunnaway Moodelly

I have to regret my inability to agree with the Revr Board in regard to the specific matter of complaint which they consider established against Depy Collr Dunnaway Moodelly.—

It is not denied by Mr Thornhill that the Deputy Collr was authorized, when Mr T— was on circuit in the Westcoast, to appoint vendors of stamps to carry into effect the discount system which the Bd of Rev had required the introduction.

Dunnaway nominated six vendors. Mr T— disapproved of so many being appointed and required their reduction to two. For effecting this change, it is obvious that time was unfortunately necessary, as the vendors, once supplied with licences & with their stock of stamps laid on could not by an arbitrary operation be made at once to surrender their licences unless compensation had been offered and accepted. There was thus, it is alleged by the Dy Collr, some delay and that the matter was in some manner "allowed to drop" & not debated by Mr Thornhill.

Mr Thornhill then granted the vendors for two months on leave of absence, and it is asserted, after an interval during wh the Bd appointed Wilson was in charge, by Mr Chase.

Mr Chase, as would naturally be the case, is appealed to by the licensed vendors desirous of retaining their licences, and by the one of them, C. Basavakavdoo, who was anxious to be the sole vendor for the town of Masulipatam.

The upshot seems to have been the retention of the six vendors and that

Mr

Mr. Chase must be held responsible & solely responsible for such selections, as, I think, will clear, from among all the original papers sent up by the Board, is one on which the names of the Lexington appear, signed by Mr Chase, the heading showing that the names are those of persons who have received licences & all stamps -

It is of course possible & probable that the Surrogate may be ready to represent the matter to Mr Chase, that that Gentleman fell into the Deputy's views of the question & whether there were to be Lexington or only two. - But there is positively no thing whatever to show that that Officer took an undue advantage of his position, and it would be establishing a very awkward precedent to punish a Native Officer for high discretion for acts done & the head of the Department - because it has been felt that the one was talked over by the other.

In respect of the arrangement actually effected for the sale of stamps at Massulipatam, I am of opinion that the want of salary & plan could not have been commonly entrusted to the agency of only two persons; and if I had been acting as Collector there, I must undoubtedly should have been inclined to license a larger number.

Now, as to the benefit which the Deputy Collector is said to have received in the various ways which Mr Thornhill Examined eight persons to prove. I must say that their statements are of little or no value to my mind, & certainly they prove nothing.

The Deputy Collector appears to have a brother

in

in some commercial concern at Madras, and taking the statements made on the point at the utmost they are worth, all that is ~~[illegible]~~ shown, is, that the Deputy Coll.r endeavored to throw a little business into his merchant brother's hands. But I cannot find that in so doing, he received any improper consideration, or was prompted by any dishonest motive.

As regards the purchase made for the Deputy Coll.r of 1000 Rs. Govt. Stock, the Board and Mr. Thornhill seem both to err in assuming that the Cutcherry Head Shroff made the purchase, acting as the Dy. Coll.rs broker. It is clear from the deposition given in the S.C. Court by the Sett, late Head Shroff of the Collectorate, that he was applied to by the Deputy Coll.r to get the Stock and arranged to get it. The subsequent disagreement as to a charge for premium, interest and brokerage is one that might any day occur between any Civilian in the Service and a broker here; and the fact that ~~the~~ obstinate adherence to an idea had forced the matter into a Court for adjudication, would no more affect the character of the Civilian, than the circ.s of the Dy. Coll.rs employment of the Plaintiff in question ought to affect Durmaroy Moody's character.

These three points are, I think, the only points newly arising out of the papers now before Govt. for orders.

On a review of Durmaroy's career there

There are abundant grounds for regarding him as a most difficult person to work with. He seems to be plausible and self willed and probably might become dishonest if his temper were under better control. But as yet he has gone on making enemies and would thus be embarrassed in any attempted system of corruption. In fact no dishonesty has been imputed to him & I apprehend he will be compelled to remain honest unless he changes tactics and alters in disposition. It is, however, very inconvenient that the Government should so frequently be called on to adjust differences and squabbles arising solely from the peculiarly intractable disposition of one of its native subordinates; and as we have no guarantee that Durmaray Naidu will not be at issue with some one again, directly he is re=placed in the independent position of a Depy Collr, and as beyond doubt every Collector in the country will be averse to being saddled with him as Depy Collr, it may be advisable to arrange for his being reduced to the grade of a first class Tahsildar, by which, though lowered in rank, he will lose no salary.

On looking over the list of the offices he has held, it is sufficiently clear, I think, that he was too early promoted to high rank.

25 Nov 67 [illegible]

Rev

R.D

38

No. 2972

Pro: of the Madras Govt.

Under date the 13th December 1867

Read again Pro of Govt. d/ 31st July 1867, No. 1751.—

Read also the following Pro: of the Bd. of Rev.

Submitting with remarks correspondence on the subject of appt. of certain Stamp Vendors in Kistna Dist. by Treasury Dy. Collr. T. Dhurmaroya Mudelly.—

H.C. 14th Octr./67 No. 6757

N.

W.R.H.

W.A.

The Govt. observe that Dhurmaroya Mudelly having been appointed to the public service as a clerk in 1852 – became Talook Sheristadar in 1853 – Tahsildar in 1854 – Sub Collr.'s Sheristadar in 1856 – Naib Sheristadar in 1858 – Dy. Collr. 4th class in March 1859 – and promoted to 3d class in June following on transfer to the Inam

Main Court's department.—

In Jan.y 1861— he was sent to Tanjore as a Dy Coll.r on the regular estab.t for general duties— and in August following his removal for misconduct was recommended by the Board and sanctioned by Govt. in GO. dated 5th Oct.r 61, No. 1927— In Nov.r following he was appointed Dact in the Salem Dist.t where he did not give satisfaction— In Oct.r 1862 he was sent Dact in Malabar when the Govt. have reason to know that his performance of his duties was not efficient.—

In April 1863— he was sent to do special duty in the Madras district connected with some partial revisions of assessts— and in the Dec.r following

57

his incompetency for the task was reported to Govt. with the request that another officer might be sent in his stead— In the same month he was transferred to the Treasury charge of the Kistna Dist.t from which he was again removed in Jan.y 64 for incompetency— and unsatisfactory conduct in a matter relating to the change in the Govt. price for salt, when at least his negligence involved a loss to Govt. and he was at the same time reduced from the 3d. to the 4th. Class of Dy Coll.rs.— About the same time very improper conduct on the part of Dhurma roya Modelly in writing privately to the Civil and Sessions Judge— reflections on the Board— the Coll.r of the Dist.t— and

and the superior officers
employed in it – was brought
to the notice of Govt. – but
they deemed the punish-
ment they had already
awarded to him to be suf-
ficient for the requirements
of the case as it then stood –

The correspondence
now before Govt. originated
in certain petitions to the
Board and the facts proved
and admitted by Dhur-
maroja Mudelly indicate
a spirit of insubordination
and a laxity of conduct
in pecuniary matters
of much the same kind
as formerly came to light
in Tanjore – which in the
opinion of Govt. stamp
Dhurmaroja Mudelly
as altogether unfit for
retention in the influ-
ential and responsible
post of Dy. Collr. ~~to~~
which

~~which he has proved
by his conduct that he
was raised before he
deserved the promotion –
His rapid advancement
from the low grade of
office in which he was
originally employed is
shown by the results
to have been ill advised.~~

The Govt. resolve
accordingly to remove
Y. Dhurmaroja Mudali
from the appointment
of Dy. Collr. – but they
desire to ensure his
~~will not object to his~~
re-employment in a
more subordinate office
~~should any Collr. or other
head of an office or de-
partment think fit to
employ him.~~ &
[initials]

& ~~desire~~ the Bd. of Rev.
with & consider & report
how this can best
be effected &
[initials]

14 / To Bd. of Rev. with 7 Enclosures Despt. 14
6 Acct. Genl. d.
3 Exr. of Claims d.
1 Y. Dhurmaroya Mudali G.O. only

[signature]

Pro 15th January 1867 Nos 248-250

Revenue 1867 Dcsptch
Pro of Govt of Madras

No 2972.

Pro of the Madras Govt
Dd 13th December 1867

Pro of the Boards of Revenue
& March 1868 No 1020

Further Bacwd Pro: 6 March 1868
No 1020.

Nos 248 & 250.