Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 15-85

DATED 23 Sept.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing A. Venkatappayya, Kistna Dt. that under section 23 of Act III of 1895 no appeal lies to Govt.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

0/18 4,000—19-7-97.

Revenue (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 1065

Shown to Petitioner 23-8-97

Order (Roy) No 1588-d/23 augt 97 **From** N. Venkatappayya, Vizianagram St.

The petitioner will be informed that under section 23 of Act III of 1895 no appeal lies to Government.

No.

Dated 10th August 1897.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Praying that the order dismissing him from the post of karnam may be Cancelled

Issd
27-8-97

Note

The petitioner who was karnam pumastah or acting karnam, was dismissed from his post by an order of the Dy. Collector dt 9.10.96. This order was on appeal upheld by the Collector.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

The petitioner then presented an appeal to the Board and the Board rejected it on the ground that more than one appeal is inadmissible in the matter of punishment of karnam gumastahs. He now appeals to Govt. No appeal lies to Govt. under Act III of 1895 & a Memo is submitted accordingly. The Bd's endorsement seems open to question. The petitioner's appointment as acting karnam or karnam gumastah either was, or must under sec 18 of the Madras General Clauses Act I of 1891 be held to have been, made under cl. 4 or cl. 5 of sec. 10 of Madras Act III of 1895. The order dismissing him should also have been passed under sec. 7(1) of this Act. If so, he has the right of a second appeal to the Board under the proviso to sec. 23(1) of the Act. For orders as to whether the Bd may be asked to explain under what authority it holds that a second appeal is not admissible in the matter of punishment of karnam gumastahs.

(P. Cash 1897)

Karnam Gumastahs are ministerial officers & that they are appointed under the Act.

13/8/97.

PETITION
9068
REVENUE DEPT.

GOVT. ORDER ISSUED REV. DEPT.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS * CHIEF SECRETARY * 13 AUG 1897

To

His Excellency
The Governor in Council
Fort St. George

Madras.

The petition of Kandiyana Venkatachayya inhabitant of Chandalapalli village in Cocanada Taluk Ramayanapeta Gandam Zemindary Vizagapatam Dist.

Most Humbly Sheweth,

That petitioner submitting herewith Copy of proceedings No 2331 dated 9-10-96 of the Head Deputy Collector Rajahmundry, dismissing petitioner from service & proceedings of the Collector Rajahmundry dated 24-2-97 No 801 also rejecting petitioner's appeal & copy of proceedings of the Board of Revenue No 1435 dated 18th May 1897 rejecting petitioner's appeal petition on grounds that more than one appeal is inadmissible that petitioner submits herewith copy of petitioner's appeal petition to the Board of Revenue dated 6-5-97, now to the Board of Revenue, upon your Excellency's Hon'ble petitioner appeals on the following grounds.

1. That your Excellency's Hon'ble petitioner having stated all his grounds of appeal in his appeal petition to the Board of Revenue (copy of which is herein enclosed) he has not re-capitulated them here.

2. That the Board's resolutions & the proceedings

that the petition is rejected as more than one appeal is inadmissible, & quite contrary to Law & justice.

3 Petitioner thinks, that it is the duty of the Appellate authority when an appeal was preferred personally into it to render justice to parties - If not, when the Lower Courts dismiss the humble petitions into the case fully, in what other way can the parties obtain justice -

4 That the Board were not even pleased to send for the record & hence it is not known whether any enquiries were done or not by the petitioner -

5 That the petitioner is not in any way to blame in the matter as he stated what really occurred - He admitted before the Dy Collector that he even now admits of having received some money from village servants as a loan (when they all came & stood) viz for Jamabandi as he was then in want of money, he having expected what he brought from his Lands because he was advised today as the Head Asst (for a long time) on condition of making it good in the next month but he has not received it as a humble man he wanted to put off payment - As to the alleged absence of the abovementioned Carnamen

& the Revenue Inspection the case was brought against him - But the subjoined by the petitioner, no enquiry was made by any Officer personally into the merits of the case - Petitioner was only on duty for 5 months - during which the alleged 20 years old accounts could be done & examined all his future pay was stopped therefore - If Your Excellency also the opinion after perusing the whole connected with the case, that petitioner is guilty of the offence with which he was charged, Your Excellency's poor & humble petitioner begs, that Your Excellency may kindly be pleased to cancel the dismissal order passed by the Head Dr Y Collector & confirmed by the Dist Collector & also a resignation & call for his future services any where - For which act of mercy petitioner, shall as in duty bound ever pray.

Pattukottai
10/8/97

He begs to remain
Your Excellency's most
humble & obedient servant

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____ } 189 .
When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.								
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.								
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.								

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