

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 2152

DATED 22nd Nov.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition from S. Ramaswami
Sagar, late Sub-Inspector of Salt and
Shikari Dept., praying for a recon-
sideration of his case, disposed of
under para X of C petition 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.
CNo	11040/97	10238	20-1-98				

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 9822.



Secy 22/11

Cnos 9729 & 9822797 From H. A. Sim Esq. Sec. Private Secretary to H. E. The Governor.

Order R. no. 2152 of 22nd Nov. 1897. Para X of C Rules.

19.11.97 21/11/97

No.

Dated 11 "November" 97

Received 13

Registered 15

Enclosures 0

Spare copies

To the pet'r. with Encls. Note. The pet'r's appeal was disposed of in G.O. No. 26568

1.7.97 This is a review petition which should be submitted thro' the Head of the Department. As regards the applicability of para X. to review petitions, please see precedent in G.O. No. 1001 of 12.5.96.

18/11

Flagged A. SUBJECT.

Transfers a petition without date from J. Rama-Saundhi Esq., late Sub-Inspector of Salts, Cuddalore Circle, praying for a re-consideration of his case.

(By order)

Flagged B.

Private Secretary

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

*Petition
No 895
Rev. Sep 4*

His Excellency the Right Honorable
Sir Arthur Elibank Hazelock
G. C. C. G., G. C., I. &
Governor of Fort St. George
in Council.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

May it please Your Excellency,

I your humble petitioner in
submitting a copy of my Review petition
submitted this day, most humbly pray
that Your Gracious Excellency may be
pleased to have a kind perusal of the
same, to reconsider my petitionable case
and do justice to me who have been
thoroughly undone for no real cause
and thus relieve me from the miseries
into which myself and my five children
with my wife and my old father are
completely sunk by restoring me to
my appointment as 3d Grade Sub-
Inspector Salt and Akkari Revenue.

I most humbly pray
to be

Your most Gracious Excellency
most humble servant
Lace of Lamer
8.11.97

① ————— ②

③ ————— ④

0
18 4,000-19-7-97.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 9429.

From

J. Ramaswami Chygar
Late Sub-Inspector of
Taluk & Abhari Rev.
Cuddalore Circle
South Arcot Dist.
No. (now residing at
Madras)

Order

Dated 8 Nov.

Received 11/2

Registered 12/2

Enclosures/.

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Praying for reconsideration
of his case.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Duplicate



To

His Excellency the Governor in Council,
Fort Saint George,
Madras.

The humble Review Petition of T. RAMASAMI AIYAR,
late Sub-Inspector, Cuddalore Circle, now
residing in No. 74, Vinaithirtha Mudali Street,
Pursewalkum, Madras.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY IN COUNCIL,

I, the Petitioner, put in an appeal to the Government—(Vide my printed appeal petition copy enclosed marked A) and the Government declined to interfere. I most humbly beg that Your Gracious Excellency in Council will kindly be pleased to review that order and do me justice, entering upon the merits of the case.

2. The grounds of Review are, that I have since that order secured copy of a document which I had not obtained when I first addressed the Government. This document which I enclose marked B proves clearly that I am quite innocent. The copy was obtained only on the 15th July 1897 as will be seen from the certificate of dates thereon.

Similarly it was a most unfortunate thing that I did not submit, with my first appeal to Government, the Assistant Inspector's deposition in the Magisterial Court.—Vide the list of records given in Enclosure A. This is a most important document and I now enclose it marked C.

These two documents, among others, conclusively prove that the Assistant Inspector either got up or connived at his informant named Amir Rahiman Merkayer,—my enemy—getting up a false case against me and that I am quite innocent. Under these circumstances I earnestly pray for a kind Review of the order in the light thrown upon the case by these two documents.

3. The case against me is that I and a number of Pariahs committed theft of Salt at about 8 p.m. on the night of the 7th August 1895.

I was put to the disgrace, anxiety, annoyance and expenses of a criminal prosecution and I was acquitted—Vide Enclosure D being the Judgment in the case, as also D 1, being a printed extract from D for facility of perusal.

The Department having chosen to put me before a Magistrate for theft of Salt by a public servant, the usual respect due to Judicial tribunals and the fairness and equity due to Government servants require that the Department should abide by the decision of the Court on the direct issue.

There have been many Government Orders and Board's Proceedings to the effect that if the Department choose to put their servants to the disgrace, anxiety, annoyance and expenses of criminal prosecution, rather than exercising their own powers over them, they are estopped from setting aside the Judicial decision on the direct issue and they should abide by it.

4. Deputy Commissioner's Proceedings, No. 3582, dated 22nd November 1895. The Deputy Commissioner, in passing the order of dismissal says "They have only been acquitted on the ground that the evidence against them was not sufficiently strong * * *." With deference, I beg to submit that this view of the Magistrate's Judgment is incorrect.

In para. 23 of the Judgment, (Vide D and D 1), the Magistrate says.—
"Against the last three accused in the present case, there is no evidence whatever independent of that of the three accomplices * * *."

This sentence clearly shows that the only evidence available against me was that of three para peons and that there was no other evidence "whatever."

Now I earnestly beg that Your Most Gracious Excellency in Council will see whether the Magistrate gave me the acquittal on the technical ground that evidence of accomplices could not be used when uncorroborated or whether leaving alone the technicality of the Law about the evidence of accomplices,—or in other words, supposing for a while that these three para peons were not accomplices,—there was anything in substance which made the Magistrate reject the evidence of these three para peons as worthless.

5. *Evidence of Para peons.*—Worthlessness of—No doubt, it is fully discussed in paras. 25, 26, 27 and 28 that the evidence of these para peons (*the only available evidence against me*) was that of accomplices. But it was not rejected entirely for the technical reason that it was evidence of accomplices. In truth, the Magistrate knew and has stated that there is no rule of Law to reject the evidence of accomplices on that score alone. His words in the paras. quoted above clearly show that if their evidence had not been otherwise stained and impeachable, he was ready to use the evidence against me.

The reason why he did not use the evidence against me was that those *three para peons were telling audacious lie all through*. The following few extracts from the Judgment, among others show that the Magistrate did not believe their evidence as witnesses and not as accomplices:—

(1) "*It is least likely that the Sub. Inspector and the Petty Officer would have ventured to send men into the Factory in their names for committing theft without previously taking all peons into their confidence, and it is still more unlikely that they would have staked their all by going in person and attempting to assist in the removal of the Salt when they found that the Para peons had offered strenuous opposition and resistance.*"

(2) Again the Magistrate alludes to another piece of audacious falsehood thus—*"A more deliberate piece of falsehood was never uttered by anybody * * *."*

(3) Then coming up directly to the alleged connection of mine with the offence of theft, the Magistrate points out the physical impossibility of the story.

The story is that Vetti got out of the scene of the offence, came to me and took me there. The Magistrate has found it a physical impossibility that Vetti could have got out by the way the evidence says he did, and there was no other egress available. Hence it is an audacious lie that he got out at all, and hence it was a lie that he fetched me to the place. The Magistrate says—*"When it is shown that the Vetti could not have got out of the drying ground whose both gates the Para peons had securely locked up, it necessarily follows that the object with which he is said to have gone out, viz., that of bringing the Sub-Inspector and the Petty Officer to the scene of offence would not also have been fulfilled."*

(4) In another place the Magistrate says—*"* * * give a lie to their assertion. Otherwise they would certainly not have made such an absurdly false statement and it is a question how far the evidence of these witnesses who were audacious enough to speak such an astounding falsehood could be relied on in other respects."*

6. *Falsehood of Para peon's evidence.*—(Continued).—These passages quoted above were only a few out of many expressions used by the Magistrate to show that these three para peons who were the only witnesses against me were held by the Magistrate to be *audacious liars*.

It is no wonder, therefore, that the Magistrate rejected their evidence as worthless.

7. *Analysis of evidence.*—It will thus be seen—

- (1) That there were only three witnesses against me—three para peons.
- (2) That the Magistrate has found them all—all the three to be *audacious liars*.
- (3) That the Magistrate rejected their evidence as worthless and as *audacious and astounding falsehood*.
- (4) That the Magistrate rejected their evidence also on the score that it was *uncorroborated evidence* of accomplices.
- (5) That the Magistrate found that these para peons had a *very strong motive* to shift the blame on me.
- (6) That there was *no other evidence whatever* against me.

8. *Mistake of fact.*—It will thus be seen that the Deputy Commissioner's view that I was "*acquitted on the ground that the evidence against me was not sufficiently strong*" is not correct, and that I was acquitted for *want of evidence, i.e., for absolute absence of evidence* and not for *insufficiency* of evidence as held by the Deputy Commissioner.

9. Under these circumstances, I earnestly pray that the order of Dismissal passed by the Deputy Commissioner on this mistake of fact or misapprehension of the Judgment be cancelled and I be restored with back pay.

10. *Slack Supervision.*—Having thus shown that there is absolutely *no evidence* at all to show that I committed theft or was privy to it, I beg to submit a few words with reference to the side remarks or *Obiter dictum* of the Magistrate.

(1) That I must have been privy to the offence, or (2) That I must have been slack in my supervision.

11. *Magistrate's "Side remark" about my being "privy to the offence."*—In para. 31 the Magistrate draws certain inferences which evidently do not possess the value of a Judicial decision or Judgment, but are mere casual side remarks or *Obiter dicta*. No doubt in July 1857 it was laid down by the Government of India that "*In the cases of public servants who*

*"are dismissed in consequence of facts or inferences elicited at a Judicial trial * * * this procedure (viz., that the charge against a public servant should be reduced to writing, his defence should be either taken in or reduced to writing, etc.), may be unnecessary or impossible."*

This rule was misunderstood it seems and in 1833 the Government of India laid down the following rule:—

"Doubtless trials may occur in which the conduct of some public servant is so mixed up with the matter under adjudication that any after-enquiry into it by the head of his Department would be superfluous, but what oftener happens is that *some censure* is passed on a public servant in a side remark from the bench, which he has no opportunity of answering, or which the presiding officer may not have thought of sufficient importance to require verification. It would be extremely hazardous and unfair to accept such a remark as a deliberate Judgment, and there seems no safe general rule except that a public servant, unless himself convicted at a Judicial trial, has a right to defend himself departmentally against any imputation that he may have therein incurred."

Now under this rule of the Government of India, I, not having myself been convicted at the Judicial trial, have a right to defend myself Departmentally, and yet the Deputy Commissioner was not pleased to give me an opportunity of explaining away the side remarks or *Obiter dictum* of the Magistrate, which, by the bye, seem to be almost a contradiction of what has been stated in the preceding 30 paras. of the deliberate Judgment and is quite a surprise.

12. *The Magistrate's side remark No. 1.* In para. 31 of his Judgment, the Magistrate draws a violent inference from one circumstance alone. His words are as follow:—

"If the Sub-Inspector and the Petty Officer had not been privy to the theft, how could the para peons have intended to explain away the absence of seals on those heaps to them on the following day."

This difficulty of the Magistrate, he never asked me, as 10th accused or of course as Sub-Inspector, to explain away. With due deference I beg to submit that a moment's thought will show that the absence of the seals on the heap argues (if anything at all) more in my favour than against me. The supposition that I was privy to the theft is quite inconsistent with the absence of seals on the heap. For if the salt had been taken out on my permission, I should have, to save appearances and to avoid observation and detection next day, arranged to seal up the heaps at once after the removal of the salt. The fact that the heaps tampered with remained unsealed shows that I had had no hand in it.

The theory of my defence is not that no theft took place. My theory is that my enemies, the Assistant Inspector's informant named Amir Rahiman Markayar in particular, arranged for a theft themselves. The para peons had no difficulty at all to explain away the absence of seals on the heaps any more than what they had to explain away the perceptible deficit in the heaps. Their only explanation for the deficit in the heaps and for the absence of seals on them next day they must already have had cut and dry. The theft was not stealthy pilfering: it had been organized on the scale of a daring robbery by an open attack on the watch peons. The Magistrate himself says that the three para peons (whom he finds to be real offenders or thieves have exaggerated the number of thieves and the quantity of salt—*Vide para. 30 of the Judgment Enclosure D*). So it is clear that they had their explanation cut and dry to the effect that the number of thieves was so large that they three were overpowered. This was their explanation for allowing the theft. This same explanation serves for the absence of seals.

If the para peons had intended to defend themselves by saying that no salt was removed, then only—and not till then—they would have had the difficulty of explaining away the absence of seals on the heaps. But they plainly admit theft or rather *daring robbery* and removal of salt. Hence they never felt the want of an explanation for absence of seals.

The Magistrate's inference on the point is therefore incorrect; and it is clear from the perusal of the Judgment that the Magistrate has no other reason at all or evidence at all to infer that I must have been privy to the offence.

I appeal to the most gracious heart of Your Excellency in Council to see and decide whether from the single circumstance of the absence of seals on heaps which have been admittedly robbed in an *open daring manner*, an inference that I must have been privy to the offence is a legitimate deduction, or at all fair to a public servant of 19 years' unblemished service under Government.

13. *Magistrate's inference about slack supervision.*—In the same para. 31 and from the same circumstance, viz., absence of seals on the heap, the Magistrate alternatively infers that my supervision over the Factory was so very careless that there was room to pass off salt without my knowledge.

If salt was carried away stealthily or clandestinely, then it may be a question for enquiry as to whether I had not made sufficient and efficient arrangements to prevent such theft. In this case the prosecution itself has proved that the Factory had been properly guarded and that the watch peons knew and protested the theft. In fact, it was a daring violent robbery by force and resistance. How then can I be said to be slack in my supervision? If the allegations were that the drying ground had not been properly locked, or that there were no para peons or such laches, then an inference of careless supervision may be legitimate. Here there are no such allegations. The allegations are that a large number forcibly carried away salt under my orders and with my help.

The Magistrate has found that I could not have helped so and the quotations given above about the falsehood of witnesses prove it.

13. (a) Under these circumstances, the supposition of carelessness on my part is strongly negatived by the facts embodied in the Judgment.

If, for instance, it be in evidence that I was leaving my seals in charge of others, which would facilitate clandestine seals, I might be held to be careless. But it is in evidence on the other hand that I was very careful to have the seals always in my sight. *Vide* also Enclosure B.

14. Under these circumstances, I earnestly pray that I may be acquitted of the charges.

- (1) Of being privy to the offence, and
- (2) Of careless supervision.

15. *No Departmental Enquiry.*—It is a pity that no Departmental enquiry was held after my acquittal by the Magistrate, although, under the rule—the safe rule—laid down by the Government of India quoted above, I am entitled to have such a Departmental enquiry. If such Departmental enquiry had been held, I could have proved to the satisfaction of the Assistant and Deputy Commissioners.—

- (1) That a certain licensee at whose misdeeds I could not and would not connive, combined with certain peons, etc., got up a theft;
- (2) That it was a very easy thing for a licensee dealing always with Pariah coolies and for peons always hand in glove with licensees and their Pariah coolies, to get a handful of men to carry away salt;
- (3) That they could easily induce some Pariahs to carry away salt by making them believe that the Sub-Inspector had given sanction to the deed and that they need not fear;
- (4) That Mr. Colquhan, the Assistant Inspector, a very thick friend of the licensee, who was dissatisfied with me connived at such combination and dodge of theft actively or at least was duped to believe his friend's version against me;
- (5) That, in short, the whole was a premeditated dodge by which (1) a theft, nay a *daring robbery* took place at so early an hour as 8 P.M. (2) the Assistant Inspector about 2½ miles away had timely intimation *before* the event, just in time for him to arrive at the scene of offence to catch the thieves in the very act;
- (6) That, as noticed by the Magistrate, the introduction of empty gunny bags as if they contained salt while no salt was ever put into them and all such Romantic events were indications of a dodge of theft.
- (7) That the *Defacto* thieves did not steal for their benefit but merely to implicate me and the Petty Officer—their enemies—into theft.

16. *No opportunity for Ventilation.*—But most unfortunately for me no such Departmental opportunity was given me to ventilate the case fully. In the Criminal prosecution, there was no necessity to enter into such details for my defence. The prosecution itself failed to make out a *prima facie* case against me, and hence the Counsel for my defence advised me that there was no necessity at all for my citing any witnesses for defence or entering upon the discussion of the origin and truth of the case.

As, however, no opportunity was given me Departmentally to show by whom the gang of thieves was got up and how the gang was induced to steal so openly as that, I have no other alternative now than of relying entirely on whatever materials have been elicited in the Judicial trial, however meagre they may be for the purpose of giving a true idea of the case.

17. *Assistant Inspector Mr. Colquhan's state of mind.*—His sworn deposition has the following words:—

- (1) "On the 23rd July also I had received similar information."
- (2) "The information was that salt was being passed out of the Factory illegally."
- (3) "I reported the 1st information to the Circle Inspector."
- (4) "A Licensee of the Kudikadu Factory was my informant, his name is Amir Rahiman Merkayar."

Now the questions for decision are:—

1st.—Whether it is true that on 23rd July such information was at all given.

2nd.—Whether, if true, the Assistant Inspector and Inspector took statements from him then and there.

3rd.—Whether the informant stated specific instances or events, or was merely giving vague undefined rumourlike information.

4th.—What action the Assistant Inspector and the Inspector took thereon to prevent such illegal passing out of salt.

17. (a) *The most important omission.*—The Inspector and his records were not examined at all on these points. Beyond Assistant Inspector's own statement it is not in evidence that on 23rd July any such information was given at all.

The Assistant Inspector says in his deposition that the Inspector and himself "arranged to see what was going on. We were watching regularly from that day. I asked 'the Range Sub. Inspector and the informant to watch.'"

- (1) Was this true?
- (2) If true, was it enough?
- (3) Why did they not put the Police on the watch, seeing that a factory officer a Sub. Inspector was to be the thief?
- (4) If true, did the Range Sub. Inspector watch as ordered?
- (5) If he did watch, why did he not find out and report the preparations for theft on 7th August—a matter said to have been found out and reported by the other special watch, viz., the informant.

It is stated that the informant told the Assistant Inspector that "men had collected" and that they were going to "receive salt that night from the Sub. Inspector." This information is given at 7-30 P.M. over 2½ miles away. So the informant must have seen the men collected at least 30 minutes earlier to allow the informant walking over two and a half miles to give the information! If so, why did not the Range Sub. Inspector put on special guard to watch me on the first information of 23rd July, notice the "collection of men" and other preparations.

Why was not the Range Sub. Inspector examined at all? Is he not to blame for his omission?

If the informant of the Assistant Inspector, Amir Rahiman Merkayar, had not been so very moral and loyal to the Government to take all the trouble to go to the Assistant Inspector 2½ miles off and tell him of the preparations of theft, this theft was to go undetected? Was it so? If so, is not the Range Sub. Inspector to blame for not watching?

Is not the Assistant and the Inspector to blame for not having put the Police too on guard on first information.

18. If the Inspector and the Range Sub. Inspector had only been examined on these lines in the Court or Departmentally, the *fiction of the first information would have been out at once.*

19. Granting, however, that there was a first information on 23rd July as alleged, it simply strengthens my theory that Amir Rahiman Merkayar offended at my strictness with him, began to conceive a hatred from that time and was making preparations for a theft—not for his own gain but for implicating me in it.

20. *Amir Rahiman Merkayar's motive to ruin me.*—This informant is an influential licensee and the Contractor of Salt works in the Cuddalore Circle. Now that this personage figures prominently in at least three capacities in this case, viz. (1) As informant on 23rd July. (2) As the chief or practically the *only* watch set on me by the Assistant Inspector and the Inspector? and (3) As the informant of the intended theft on 7th August just a few hours before the event—it is necessary to say a few words as to his feelings toward me.

(a) *His hatred.*—His irregular scraping and my prohibition. On or about the 26th May 1895, when I was there he began scraping salt at 7-30 A.M., an unauthorized hour, in my absence, without brine test in the salt beds which had been rejected the previous day for over density of brine beyond 30° U. P. and also in other beds on the pretext that the higher the sun rises the stronger the density would grow. I strongly opposed this procedure and put a stop to it. After a strong persistence and only after 9 A.M. he was allowed to scrape only in a few beds of reasonable density which gave him only 35 maunds as estimated for the day. This is the only man that scraped that day and no others, the others having scraped the previous day. I totally refused the other beds to be scraped. This irritated him very much.

(b) *His undue influence with the Asst. Inspector.*—The antecedents and the subsequent events show that such irregular scraping by him had the connivance of the Asst. Inspector, who was a great friend of the licensee.

Proofs for friendship.—At this stage, it is not possible to give better evidence than these few circumstances.

1st Circumstance.—The Asst. Inspector placed so much faith in this Licensee's words on 23rd July, that he and the Inspector *are said* to have at once believed his words without the least attempt at verification of such an important information affecting Salt Revenue by means of independent information.

2nd Circumstance.—The Asst. Inspector did not think it necessary to give information to the Police about what he heard on 23rd July. He thought he could safely rely on this Amir Rahiman Merkayar.

3rd Circumstance.—The Asst. Inspector at once believed the information of 7th August and never thought it fit to inform the Police. He relied so much on Amir Rahiman.

4th Circumstance.—Three days after I offended this Licensee in Cuddalore Range in the matter of the irregular scraping, the Assistant Inspector at once got me transferred to Kudikadu for no official reason. The Assistant Commissioner had not sanctioned it and I had been in Cuddalore only 2 or 3 months and in the ordinary course I was not to have a transfer so soon. The object of the transfer was that I offended the Licensee and was to be put into his possession entirely.

(c) His character in this case.—He is said to have given the information on the 7th August and also given a written statement in P. 12. (The departmental information Register) before the Assistant Inspector.

As a witness before the Court he denied having given any such information in P. 12 and added that he did not know what the Asst. Inspector wrote down.

Now either he must be a liar or his friend the Asst. Inspector.

Vide P. 12 and their depositions. His own household servant too denied all knowledge of the matter. The whole turned out to be a fabrication of the Asst. Inspector. Vide para. 29, Enclosure D.

The truth is (1) that both the Licensee and the Asst. Inspector resolved to ruin me.

- (2) That I was therefore transferred to Kudikadu where the Licensee has pans and greater influence than at Cuddalore.
- (3) That the Licensee with, or perhaps without, the connivance of the Asst. Inspector, got a few Pariahs to steal Salt, with the help of peons
- (4) that by a pre-arrangement of hours, the Asst. Inspector arrived
- (5) that the whole blame of theft was thrown on me.

21. *Fabulousness and Romance of the story of the 7th August 1895.*—It is in evidence that the Assistant Inspector who acted on this important information received at 7-30 P.M. on the 7th August 1895 sent only his men in advance on foot to the scene of offence $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles off, and himself starting for the place $\frac{1}{4}$ of an hour later in a dog-cart, met his force with the alleged thieves and stolen property ready for him by the time he reached. The coincidence of time and possibility of circumstances on this point alone would, if considered, lead to the detection of the truth.

22. The Assistant Inspector on his arrival at the place neither examined the peons nor questioned the accused at the outset—(Vide Enclosure D); nor did he, in his very first report to the Police, make any mention of my name or designation which must have been the foremost in his mind, taking into consideration the alleged information he was then in possession of, and also the alleged statement of the para peons directly implicating me; nor did he do so in his report to the Inspector that night—nor did any of the para peons (witnesses against me) volunteer any such information to the Assistant Inspector. He would have done this had the story against me been true; nor was I asked at any time for any explanation, or at least after the enquiry by the Police Inspector the next day at 1 P.M. But I was merely handed over to the custody of the Police to be prosecuted, and the guarding peons who were solely responsible for the safety of the salt in their charge, and who were therefore to be arrested and prosecuted were taken as witnesses to give evidence against me. It is a peculiar procedure in my case and is most significant.

23. It is also pointed out by the Magistrate in para. 30 of his Judgment (Enclosure D) that, in the morning the Cuddalore Party, the Petty Officers and peons were independently conducting the business of transporting salt without the interference of any of the superior officers. This is a procedure against the Salt Commissioner's rule, and yet it was approved of by the Assistant Inspector. This was done simply to aid in their nefarious object against me with the apparent consent of the Assistant Inspector.

24. I beg respectfully to submit that I have put in a total service of 18 years under Government, whereof for the last 13 years I had been employed in this department and my service had been altogether of an unblemished character. My special services have been noticed in 1886 for detection of over 500 Salt and several Abkari cases, in the inspection

report of the Manambady factory by Mr. Rundall the Deputy Commissioner, who then promoted me from the 5th to the 4th Grade. Again in 1887 my special services in having (in the month of October 1887, when I was specially deputed and transferred to Nellikuppam from Chidambaram), detected 14 large smuggling cases on the French frontier (60 gallons of French liquor) after a hard fighting and at the risk of my life, and in having detected 200 salt cases during the year, were specially reported about by Mr. G. T. Thornhill in November 1887. Again in 1890, when I was in charge of the Kattumavady factory, Adirampatnam Circle, I was sent out on preventive duty for a month, during which period I detected 50 salt cases and brought to light 4 earth salt cases which the Kattumavady party let off, and secured convictions in them both under the Salt and Abkari Act and under the Penal Code for escape from custody, and got the peons and petty officers concerned punished departmentally. In 1892, in the Vallam Range, Tanjore Circle, I detected 250 salt cases and several Abkari cases, and I got in recognition thereof promotion from the 4th to the 3rd grade. In February or March 1893, while I was in Villapuram Circle for about a month and a half, I detected 11 Abkari cases, two of them being inland smuggling cases from low rented areas into high rented areas, and the Inspector, Mr. Calder, made special mention of the same in his report to the Assistant and Deputy Commissioners. I beg to submit that the record of Petitioner's services whereof the aforementioned were only a few has not been that of a dishonest or careless public servant.

25. I therefore pray that Your Most Gracious Excellency in Council will be pleased to reinstate me in my appointment as 3rd Grade Sub-Inspector with arrears of pay from the date of his suspension to the date of restoration, for which act of justice I, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

*James James
Sub-Inspector
of Salt & Abkari Revenue
Cuddalore Circle*

To

PETITION

1882

GENERAL DEPT

The Honorable Mr Henry William Bliss

B. & C. I. E. I. C. S

Councillor to the Government of
Madras

Most Honorable Sir

I the petitioner, in submitting
a copy of my petition submitted this day
most humbly pray that your Honor
may be pleased to have a kind
perusal of the same, to reconsider
my poor case and do justice to me
who have been made to suffer for no
fault of mine and thus protect me
and my large family consisting of 7
souls who have ^{nothing} left for subsistence.
By ordering my restoration to my
appointment as 3rd Grade Sub-Inspector
of Salt and opium Revenue. I beg to
say that I have secured 18 years
service of unblemished character.

I remain
Your Honors most humble and
obedient servant
Rama Saniar 8/11/97

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

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

MENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

A A A A A A A

N.B.—

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

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Record-keeper.

Routine Regular Miscellaneous No. 2152822-11 of 1897.

FOR WHAT CURRENT.		To whom given.	When taken out.
No.	Year.		
1040/97		K 2	6.1-98
5121/95		P 2	2.5-95
153			2.11/97
2528	97	P. B. V. V. V.	21-11-97

0 18 4,000-19-7-97.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 99/11.

SP 2/11(5)

From

*The Honorable the Principal
Collector of Customs
Colombo*

Order R. No. 2153 of 22nd Nov. 97.

Forwarded to the
Board of Rev.

No. 332.

KO
20th 197

Myself

Dated 12 Nov.

Received 18

Registered 19

Enclosures/.

Spare copies.

List

To the Board of Rev.
Dec. 24-11-97

SUBJECT.

*Submitting a Rev. Return
week ended 30 October 1897.*

18/11/97

12/11/97