

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 1369

DATED 22nd July 1897.

[Despatch Abstract.]

INFORMING *Ramunja Pillai*, late *Karnam*,
of *Periapolicam* Village, *Tiruvallur* Taluk, *Chingleput*
District, that, under section 28 of Madras Act III of 1895, as amended by Act of 1897, no appeal lies
to Government.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.



From H. A. Sim Esq. & Co.
Ag. Private Secretary to
H. E. The Governor.

Order R. No. 1369 of 22nd July 97

The petitioner is
informed that, under
Sec 23 of Act III of 1895,
no appeal lies to Govt.

No.

Dated 15. July 1897

Received

Registered

Enclosures 13.

Spare copies

11/11/97

List

19 July 97

To the pet.

with enclosures.

Note

The first order in the
Case of was passed in
Jan'y 1896 - i.e. after Act
III of 1895 came into force.

11/11/97

SUBJECT

Transfers a petition of 7th July
1897 from Ramanuja Pillai,
late Karam of Periapolam,
Tiruvallur Taluk, Chingleput Dt.
praying for re-instatement in
his former post.

(By order)

W. H. M.

Ag. Private Secretary

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

(1)

To

PETITION

573

REVENUE DEPT.

His Excellency Sir Arthur Elibank
Havelock G. C. M. G., G. C. I. E.,
Governor of Madras.

The most humble and respectful
Appeal Petition of Ramanuja
Pillai, late Karam, of Peria-
poliem Village ^{No 192} Tiruwallur Taluk,
Chingleput District.
Most humbly and respectfully sheweth:

2. That your Excellency's
humble petitioner who was
holding the office of Karam
for the past 10 years in the
Village of Periapoliem No 192
and by his late father Thera-
vayada Pillai for about
40 years without any
complaint or fault whatever,
was dismissed the service
from the 11 March 1896
as per Fardid in Tamil
Signed by the then Revenue
Inspector Mr. B. Ramanuja
Chariar.

Charriar a/c, resolved by
the District Collector of Tiruvallur
Division in his Proceedings
No 44 of the 7 January 96.
(Copies herein enclosed marked
A & B for your Excellency's
perusal).

3. That your Excellency's
Petitioner was dismissed on the
following charges:—

- (a) That your Excellency's petitioner
was grossly negligent;
- (b) That he attempted to
defraud Government;
- (c) That he did not note the
Cultivation properly in several
cases;
- (d) That he omitted to charge
water rate on 1 acre & 82 Cents.
- (e) That he omitted to bring
to account the cultivation of
2nd crop on 181 E.

4. That your Excellency's
humble petitioner most
respectfully begs to invite
your Excellency's attention
to the latter part of the
Proceedings

(2)

Proceedings of the District Collector
from which your Excellency
will kindly see that the
said District Collector Mr. P.
Krishna Rao a/c relied
mostly upon the statements
of the Revenue Inspector
Messrs Ramanuja Charriar,
and the Village Munsiff
Messrs Jeevanantham
Pillai who are your petitioner's
dead enemies, and to say
that the charges a, b, & c are
too general and vague to be
explained. Your Excellency's
petitioner's unblemished service
of 10 years without a single
fine or warning from his
superiors as well as the similar
service of his father for 40 years
alone will suffice to show
whether he or any of his
family, has been capable of
defrauding Government or
to be negligent in their
work in any way. If at
all

all there be any charge
against your humble
Petitioner, it is due to the
animosity of the Village
Munsiff above referred to
owing to your Excellency's
petitioner having given evi-
dence against one Wootthooj Valukhooj
in a Criminal Suit.

5. That as regards (d)
charge, a kind reference to
Cultivation account, in Tamil
herein enclosed marked C
will entirely satisfy your
Excellency that your
humble petitioner has never
mitted to charge the water
rate in question but, on the
other hand, he has ~~enjoyed~~
in the said Cultivation act,
that those 1 acre 482 Cents were
irrigated from the Palladar's
own well as was the case when
your Excellency's humble
petitioner

(3)

petitioner inspected the culti-
vation; but after your
petitioner's inspection of the
Cultivation and entry in
the account, the Revenue
Inspector mentioned in para
4 Supra, went on Azimath.
When he found that govern-
ment water was also used
by the said Palladar for the
same lands, and directed
your petitioner to levy excess
of water rate, which was
accordingly levied and collected
too.

6. That in respect of charge
(e), which, in the opinion of
the Divisional Officer is taken
to be the grosser one, your
Excellency's petitioner respectfully
begs to represent that it is
not so, and it is not a
charge at all since there
has been no loss to the
State on that account.

Your

Your Excellency's Petitioner
did not at all omit to
note the 2nd crop cultivation
as surmised by the Divisional
Officer. The Village Munsiff's
statement that the crops
were raised is utterly false
and inconsistent with the
first statement which he
made before the Revenue
Inspector to the effect
that he did not know
whether it was first or second
crop. Ever since your
humble petitioner gave
evidence against the said
Wootchindy Kaloo Woodly (ref
to in para 4 supra in a criminal
suit, he was waiting for
opportunities to ruin him;
now taking advantage of
this, he prevailed upon
the Village Munsiff to depose
before the District Officer quite
inconsistently

* your Petitioner

(4)

inconsistently to what he
deposed before. The District
Officer, relying upon your petitioner's
evidence, dismissed
your Excellency's petition.

7. The real fact in this
connection is that the 10
acres of land, No. 181 E, in
question, is an enfranchised
Inam of one crop. That
in January and February
1895, its Pottadar Mr. Thiru-
selvaraya Mudr., a Christian,
who pays the State an annual
burj of Rs 7000 nearly, has
raised his first crop with
Car. This, your Excellency's
petitioner failed to bring to
account by forgetfulness.
In April 1895, when the
Revenue Inspector came to
Arizimish and asked your
petitioner to what month
the said crop related, your
petitioner erred in pointing
out

out that this land with Car
crop is the same as the other
one of 10 acres, and which
had been brought to account
in November 1894, as having
been raised with Sambha
Paddy which is a misfit
for Car Paddy. The Revenue
Inspector finding out the
inconsistency from the fact
that Car crop would not
last for 6 months on the
land from November to April
the month when the Revenue
Inspector came to Agimash,
concluded that the Car crop
should have been the second
crop but not the first
crop, while it is really the
first crop of 2 months ~~standing~~
and that your petitioner
omitted to bring to account
the second crop cultivation
to defraud Government while
he has evidently forgotten.
The

(5) 8. The extent of land
No: 181E, measuring 146 acres
56 Cents, was cultivated bit
by bit and raised crops of
different sorts of grain.
Deducting the cultivated
portion, there remained a
deficit of 33 acres. These
land of 10 acres upon which
1st crop was raised is the land
in question, referred to in
para 7 supra. Without
giving due attention
to the place of cultivation
in question, and by forget-
fulness and without consi-
dering that these 10 acres of
land with crop there on, were
brought in November 1894
to account, deposed in
haste that this was the land.
Really it is Karimlam
Cultivation and nothing
else. It does not
appear

appear by any witnesses
or records that this land
is one yielding a 2nd
crop (ie) Madippu Nilam.
The Dy. Collector without
inquiring into this matter
and fully going through
it, dismissed your Excellency's
Petitioner. Revenue

Officer (ie) Revenue Inspector
too had deposed that it
is not possible for him
to pronounce that this
land is Madippu Nilam.

9. Your Excellency's
humble Petitioner humbly
and deeply pray, that
Your Excellency would
be pleased graciously
to cause to institute
inquiries into the matter
whether

(6)

whether, in the over-
assessment case, there
is any well for cultivation
or the land being irrigated
by Government water.

The Tahsildar Mahd
ally Hazari Sub. Offr:
and the Revenue Inspector
already mentioned,

& your humble Petitioner

who both know of him
personally as to your
Petitioner's character and
behaviour and who
also duly inspected the
place, did not recommend
your humble petitioner
to a rigorous punishment
of dismissal. But the
Dy. Collector Mr. Krishna
Rao aol: who was quite
new to the District and
who was also unaware
of

of your humble petitioner's
conduct and character
has doubtfully inflicted
severe punishment of
dismissal on your
Excellency's petitioner.

10. Your Excellency's
humble petitioner, in
these circumstances,
deeply implores and
prays Your Excellency
will be most graciously
pleased to call for
the records in connection
with this case besides
going through the
papers enclosed herewith
and give your petitioner
his due, and will
graciously

(7)
graciously issue orders
as to your petitioner's
re-instatement in
his former service.
Your Excellency's humble
petitioner also most
respectfully begs to
say that, ever since he
received dismissal order
too, he has been in the
charge of his office
of Karnam, and thus
prays that your Excellency
will be graciously pleased
to cancel the dismissal
order.

11. Against this dismissal
order of the District Collector, your
petitioner made an appeal to the
Collector of Chingleput District
which was rejected by that
Office.

Officer. Whereupon your
Excellency's petitioner made
an appeal to the Board of
Revenue, Land Revenue,
to which they said that
they decline to interfere
in the matter.

List of documents
herewith enclosed for your
Excellency's perusal & favor
of return when kindly shown with.

1. Rev. Inspector's Taluk (Tang)
of 11 March 96. marked A
2. Cultivation account (Tamil)
prepared for Fuli 1304
marked C.
3. Proceedings no: 44 of 7 Jan 96.
of District of Tiruvallur Dist.
marked. B
4. Chingleput D. (Meditation)
End. no: 2067 of 23 July 96
marked. D; and that office
order against your petitioner's
appeal marked. E.
5. Copy of your petitioner's
appeal to collector against
District Collector's proceedings
marked. F.

6. Copy of a Tamil petition dated
26 October 96 to District Collector
marked G.
7. Copy of a Tamil Taluk marked
H.
8. Proceedings of Board of Revenue
Madras nos: 2176 of 12 August 96,
827 of 4 March and 1156 R.O. of
10 April 97; marked J. J. K.
respectively.

12. The faults your Excellency's
Petitioner has been charged with
are not attributable to him.
In consideration of the faults
and of Your humble Petitioner's
10 years' service, the punishment
of dismissal from service the
District Collector of Tiruvallur Dist.
has imposed upon your Excellency's
petitioner would apparently seem
to your Excellency too harsh and
very unfair. Your humble
petitioner therefore respectfully
prays your Excellency will
be graciously pleased to
show

show mercy and justice to
your humble Petitioner by
way kindly sanctioning
his re-instatement in his
former post as a very special
case.

13- For which act of
kindness and generosity
Your Excellency's most
humble and respectful
Petitioner shall as in duty
bound ever remain
grateful with his whole
family

Periopolian of Romanoff
7 July 1897

Periopolian of Romanoff
7 July 1897

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DETAIL

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.