Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 1687

DATED 8 Sept 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing Renganayagiar, late Kurnam of Muthupalay
Taigore Zt. that the Govt declines to interfere on his behalf

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

$\frac{O}{18}$ 4,000—19-7-97.

Revenue (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 7633

From Rengaiengar.
Late Karnam of Mattupalayam
Tanjore Dt.

No.

Dated 27th August 1897.

Received

Registered.

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Appealing against his dismissal from the post of Karnam

Order (Rou) No 1687 dy 8 Sept 97

The Government declines to interfere.

8/9/97.

Lrsl
To
The Petitioner
with an enclosure.
} dd 13-9-97

Note. The village offices in Tanjore not being hereditary, the Madras Act III of 1895 is not applicable in the present case. But please See notes under

6 Sep 97 G.O. No. 561 dy 8-2-96.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

COURT FEE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
27
SEP 97
CHIEF SECRETARY
31 AUG 1897
REVENUE DEPT

PETITION of The Government of Madras.

Most Humble petition of Rengaiengar, late Karnam of Mattuppalaiam, Truttypundy Taluk, Tanjore Dt, appealing against the Order of the Board of Revenue confirming the order of the Collector of Tanjore.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

The petitioner's father was the Karnam of Mattuppalaiam for 18 years and his son the petitioner was for 8 years. On the whole the petitioner was in his family for 26 years. He was dismissed by the Collector of Tanjore in January 1896 for more or less misconduct and neglect of duty in not furnishing forthcoming security or from the Talukdar or from the Divisional officer before or after the petitioner appealed to the Board of Revenue against the order of the Collector setting forth proper and sufficient reasons for the several grounds of

the Collector for his dismissal. The petitioner regrets to say that no proper justice has come forward, for the Board confined the order of the Collector without properly giving their attention to the Several explanations given by the petitioner. Now the petitioner humbly submits the Several proper & apt explanation & submits against each of the Collector's remarks quoted as a cause for his dismissal. The government is highly requested to be restored to his orginal post of the Kurumbur with the pay for the period of his dismissal from service.

The memo of the Collector is presented submitted containing 4 Statements

Causes of the Collector for dismissal

I The cultivation noted in the margin was omitted to be brought to account by the Karnam and the omission was discovered on Revenue Inspector's inspection and the accounts relating 39 cents in S No 140 were shown by the Kurumbur as cultivated while the land was waste & 3 cents in S No 574 (wet) were brought by the Kurumbur under fresh faits while no Second

Survey No 79 D-30 & 36	
84 A, not less	
than 10 cents.	
84 D more than	
half the area	
3 cents 90 cents	
86	10 cents

Explanation of the petitioner for them

I The cultivation of S No 84 A, 84 D and 86 having been made After the 25th September which was the closing day of the was the cultivation for September and before the 15th October, the day of the Rev Inspector's inspection, can only be brought to account and included in the cultivation account of October last. S No 79 D was also duly brought to account to the month of October. Besides the cultivation of 84 A + 84 D was made with Samba-

[illegible] the Revenue Inspector but he did not seem to take any notice of the remarks which the Karnam had made in connection with reference to having removed [illegible] was closed. The necessary Corrections have been made before the Rev Inspector's

[illegible] and no loss of Revenue to Government would have occurred if the Revenue Inspector had recorded his observations in the Accounts which has been duly brought into the Accounts. The Revenue Inspector has inspected nearly a fortnight before the closing of that month. It will be evident that the Karnam has no motive as the cultivation of castor oil has been duly recorded,

The cultivation of 94 D to the extent of 6 cents had

[illegible] cultivation on dry lands [illegible] in Accounts

did not tally with that shown in accounts Nos 1 & 2 & should be explained why the discrepancy was that the latter held in the Taluk office. The discrepancy was due to 6 cents of S. No. 93 A having been entered twice over, once against Nº 25 and again against ryot Nº 2. When the error was found the Karnam partly altered S. No. 93 A against ryot Nº 2 into S. Nº 94 D and left the Connection unaffected. The only made matters worse so far as he was concerned. The correction was perfectly unauthorized and moreover was unjustified for it was charging ryot Nº 2 with cultivation which does not appear in the Adangal.

III. The total extents charged with water rate for ryot Nº 19 was erroneously shown as 44 cents instead of 44 cents. Account Nº 6 has since been rewritten correctly and brought in accord with Nº 2.

---

been duly noted in the cultivation accounts. I and the Correction there of was not fraudulent nor is unauthorized for, the Correction was made with reference to the entry in account Nº 1 and there is no bearing Reference to the Government thereon. The Karnam has no motive in leaving out the entry of 6 cents, while the Karnam has given for the Charge of water rate in Account Nº 6 Rs 8 or about $20 in Fasli 1306.

The water rate had been correctly calculated upon the 44 cents and had been already in the original account Nº 6 included in the total water rate and there is no loss of Revenue (Vide original Statement Nº 6). The entry of 44 for 44 was only a slip of the hand. Account Nº 6 was rewritten only with reference to the extents of 44 cents and 6 cents referred to. The original Account Nº 6 may also be perused.

IV. The Karnam should not submit till March 98 a Memorandum for 5 cents cultivated in September 1895 on S. Nº 95 for which he said he has been in the habit of reporting such cultivation properly. The omission of the cultivation of S. Nº 79 D to account for dry waste would have resulted in loss of Revenue to Government if the Revenue Inspector did not discover the omission.

The omission to submit a Memo for 5 cents in S. Nº 95 was in order to the order of the Dy Collector Nº 1672, communicated to me in 12-9-95 Tahsildar's order Nº 517 95 dt. was only received in the Cultivation account for September & had been included in Account Nº 7 before the checking of the Account.

VII. The flat culvert has been broken by the Karnam & the drop accidently caused & not by the Tahsildar as stated. It is replaced by a new one.

The Board's appeal order is herewith returned which is communicated to the petitioner through the Tahsildar.

Ans Nº 1719 of 97

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 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