

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 1534

DATED 13th Aug.

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Petition from B. Krishnayya, Cuddapah
Dt., disposed of under Para I of C. Rules.*

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
C No 11010/97 = G.O. 28 R 7.1.98.							

Revenue (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 6630

From

B. Krishnappa,

Cuddapah St.

No.

Order R. No. 15348 / 13th Aug. 97.

Para X of C. rules.

1/11/97
12/8/97

Dated 25th July 1897.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

To the pet with Encl.

Dec. 17-8-97

2/18

SUBJECT.

Praying that the
Collector's order that the
petitioner should not
be reemployed in the
St. Mary be cancelled

10. 11/9.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

REVENUE DEPT

To.

The His Excellency The Governor
in Council Fort St. George.

The humble memorial
of B. Krishnappa of Pulivendla
Pulivendla Taluk Cuddalore
District, most respectfully
sheweth.

That your honor memo-
-rialist was acting as Taluk
Gumastah of Pulivendla Taluk
in the year 1896.

2. That in the month of
March 96 there was a complaint
against one Sungaramsingh
the then Taluk head-accountant
of Pulivendla that he misre-
-presented the fact of his
having joined the duties
on the 29th of February 96
after 7 days casual leave when
it was alleged he actually
joined the duties on the 30th idem.

3. That the Divisional officer held an enquiry on the subject and the petitioners gave a statement that the said head-accountant joined the duties on the 29th February 96.

4. That similarly The Tahsildar, Stationary-Sub Magistrate, The Taluk Sheriff and 2 more gumastaks gave statements that the said Sungaramsingh joined the duties on the 29th idem.

5. That the Divisional officer held that it was untrue that the said Sungaramsingh joined the duties on the 29th.

6. That the collector thereupon passed an order that the memorialists acting appointment should cease and he should not be re-employed during his stay in the District. (An authenticated copy of the order is herewith submitted for perusal).

7. That since passing of the said order the same collector has confined on the said Sungaramsing the principal culprit, if at all he is one, a more responsible place is Serastadar and 2 ~~magistrate~~ magistrates.

8. That the Tahsildar who at the time of the enquiry was only holding an acting appointment was made permanent since passing of the ~~order~~ said order.

9. That your Memorialist was employed in the famine as Head Mastery on Rupees 15 per Month.

10 That the collector having been informed of the same ordered his immediate removal and called for an explanation from the Tahsildar as to how the memorialist was employed without the matter being brought to his notice even though he was employed outside the Revenue department.

11. That in consequence of the order of the collector the petitioner is starving in these famine days though his supposed offence is considerably less heinous than that of the two responsible officers above referred to. (The head-accountant and Tahsildar who were actually promoted).

12. That the Memorialist then memorialized the famine commissioner who stated that that was not a subject with which the Board was concerned.

13. That the Memorialist begs to submit that the Government orders are very clearly as to the re-employment of the dismissed servants that they are ineligible only when orders to that effect are published in the Fort St George Gazette.

14. That if the collector

had really thought that the supposed misconduct of the memorialist was so very grave he would have recommended the removal of the two more responsible officers above mentioned.

18. That the Memorialist therefore prays that the arbitrary orders passed by the collector in his case may be reversed and he be declared a free man to seek employment anywhere in the District even during the stay of the present collector.

For such act of kindness the Memorialist shall as in duty bound every pray.

B. Lohrayya
Petitioner 25/7/1976.

*had thought that the [illegible] [illegible]
of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
have recommended the removal of the
two more [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
189
[illegible] that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
the [illegible] in his [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
he is [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
even during the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]*

*2/1/1890
[illegible] [illegible]*

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

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING WANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

S.E.—

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