Revenue (189/) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 2162

DATED 22nd June

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to interfere on behalf of Anantharayana Aiyar, Salem Dt., praying for restoration to the post of village munsiff of Maramangalam, Salem taluk.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

O
18 4,000—19-7-97.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 9979

9/92/11/97

From Ananthanarayana Ayyar
Late Village Munsiff of
Maramangalam
Salem Taluk & Dist.

Order R no. 2162 of 22nd nov 97
The Govt decline to interfere

No.

Dated 9 Oct.

Received 18 Nov.

Registered 19 "

Enclosures 4

Spare copies.

Lr
Ia the petr with Encls } Sw. 24-11-97

Note
Village offices in the Salem district are not hereditary.

SUBJECT.

Praying for reinstatement.

PA.
20 nov 97

PW 20/11/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION
0904
REVENUE DEPT

CHIEF SECRETARY'S GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
17 NOV 1897

REC. DEPT. 18 NOV 97

To

2225/Oct

Rec

His Excellency Sir Arthur
Elibank Havelock. G.C.S.I.
Governor of Fort St George
Through the Collector of Salem, Madras.

The humble memorial of Anantha-
narayana aiyar late-
village munsiff of Mara-
mangalam Salem Taluk
Salem District

Most Respectfully sheweth:—

That the memorialist beg
to approach your Excellency with this,
his appeal against the Proceedings of
the Board of Revenue (submitted herewith)
passed on his petition of Appeal
against Salem Collector's Proceedings
no 327 dated 22nd June 1896, Confirm-
ing Deputy Collector's order no 130 Salem
dated 7th March 1896, removing the
humble memorialist from the Servic
ension) and a
of the Villa Maramangala

2. That the charges on which the humble memorialist was dismissed are:—

(1) That he temporarily misappropriated the collection of Rs 26-4-0 of the Statedowl

(2) That he had been making for a period of 10 years, an excess collection of one Rupee every year.

3. That the facts of the 1st charge are briefly as follows:—

There was a Loan of Rs 100 taken by one Vallia Gounden under Lands' Improvement Loans act. The borrower not having completed the work agreed upon in the bond executed by him, a demand for the recovery of the full amount due, together with interest accrued thereon, Viz Rs. 114-9-6, was issued at the time when the borrower was dead. The son of the deceased Viz Chintamani Gounden paid up the amount of Rs 114-9-6 to the Acting Village munsiff (while the memorialist was under suspension) and obtained

a receipt from him therefor. When such is the case, Chintamani Gounden, after a period of 3 months, at the instigation of the memorialist's enemies, rushed before Tahsildar of Salem with a Complaint that the memorialist had collected from him Rs 26-4-0 a year ago on account of the debt due by his father at a time when it was not due, by granting him a receipt, and paid the same to the Acting Village Munsiff when he had to pay the full amount of Rs 114-9-6, in accordance with the Demand.

6. In the first place, the humble memorialist begs your Excellency to consider whether the Complainant would have paid the sum of Rs. 26-4-0 at a time when it was not due; certainly he would have not at all paid; and if it be a fact that the memorialist had collected the amount and paid the same to the Acting-

munsiff, certainly there should have been some mention made of it in the receipt granted to him by the acting munsiff for the full amount paid, but there is nothing of the sort. Would the complainant have kept quiet if the memorialist had so collected and so paid the amount to the acting munsiff? He would have at once cried down again the memorialist, and would have with no loss of time brought the matter to the notice of the authorities. Would not, the acting munsiff to whom it is alleged that Rs 26-4-0 is paid by the memorialist, have immediately reported the matter to his higher authorities? But he has kept quiet for a period of 3 months, until at last being bought over by the Complainant he deposed before the Tahsildar that Rs 26-4-0 was paid to him by the memorialist.

6. That it will not be true

of place for the memorialist to state that if it be a fact that ~~that~~ the memorialist ~~if~~ paid to the complainant the amount alleged to have paid to him by the complainant, he could not have paid the amount without taking back the alleged receipt from him if it be true that the memorialist had ever granted him one.

7. That the above facts will clearly convince your Excellency that the charge against the memorialist is a concocted one and has been set up through an afterthought at the instigation of the memorialist's inveterate enemies who have managed to secure him (complainant) a receipt in imitation of the memorialist's handwriting to strengthen the charge.

8. That the facts of the 2nd charge are briefly as follows:—

In the 2nd charge, the same individual, the complainant in the first charge seeing that the first

charge is not effective to bring ruin to the Memorialist, further complains that there is a patta in the Village in the name of his father who had since died, and that of another ryot, by name Chintamani Goundan, the total assesment of which is Rs. 52- 5- 0, and contends that, in virtue of a joint pattadar, his father ought to have paid only half the assesment Viz 26- 2- 6, but that the Memorialist had been collecting from him for the last 10 years at the rate of 27- 2- 6, thus making an excess collection of one Rupee every year.

9. That in explanation of this charge the humble Memorialist begs leave to urge that the portion of the land occupied by the Complainant and his father is more than the half of the total extent and as such he had to pay to pay one Rupee more Viz 27- 2- 6 and the other pattadar one Rupee less namely 25- 2- 6 in accord

accordance with the accounts of the Tahsildars office (Receipt Submitted) and the Village accounts. Thus the Memorialist is right in Collecting Rs 27-2-6 from the Complainant and he entered the Same in his Village Collection accounts. When such is the case, it is alleged by the Complainant that an excess of one rupee is Collected from his father.

10. That the Memorialist request-ed the buying authority to ascertain whether the Complainant has to pay 27-2-6 or not; but this request was thrown aside, and the buying authority was prejudiced to attach more evidence to the words of the Complainant than to the request of the Memorialist.

11. That the Memorialist then petitioned to the Head Quarters Deputy Collector to hold a regular enquiry of the cases and thus give him an opportunity for producing the neces-

necessary evidence and for cross examining the witnesses produced by the Complainant, but though he got an endorsement (submitted herewith) no such enquiry was held.

12. That again the Complainant has fraudulently taken the receipt of the other pattadar and has filed the same with the records and contends that Rs 26-2-6 is entered therein while that his father had paid 27-2-6 and thus the memorialist had been collecting from both of them Rs 53-5-0 instead of Rs 52-5-0, (the total assessment of the patta) i.e one Rupee more than the assessment and calls that this one rupee is the excess collection made from his father. Whereas in truth it is not the case. For the 2nd pattadar does not actually pay Rs 26-2-6 as supposed by the Complainant from the receipt of the 2nd pattadar, but only Rs 25-2-6 in accordance with the Taluk and Village accounts. Then arises the question why should the insertion [illegible] be

made in the receipt of the 2nd pattadar?
The memorialist had collected only Rs.
25-2-6 from the 2nd pattadar, crediting the
same with the full particulars, in the receipt
and inserted the symbol unity without any
particulars whatever, below the figure 25-
in the receipt to make a total of Rs.26-2
and thus satisfy himself and the
pattadar with the fact that he is
a joint pattadar but that he has paid
one rupee less in virtue of his holding
less than half the extent of the land. The
same thing had been continued for the
last 10 years, and that the second
pattadar had or has no cause to
complain against the memorialist of
any excess collection.

13. That the fact, that the
2nd pattadar pays only 25-2-6 in
accordance with the Taluk and Village
accounts and nothing more and that
the insertion of one rupee without any
particulars below the figure 25-2-6
to signify that he is a joint pattadar

can be explained only by the party paying the amount Viz. the 2nd Pattadar, and the party receiving the same Viz the Memorialist; but to add to the misfortune of the memorialist the 2nd Pattadar was not at all called for, nor enquired into by the taxing authority who was prejudiced by the Complainant attaching a peculiar meaning, to the receipt of the 2nd Pattadar, that Rs 26-2-6 had been collected from him.

14. That the memorialist hopes that it will clearly convince your Excellency that these diabolical falsehoods and peculiar interpretations of the Complainant, the ring-leader of the memorialists inveterate enemies, are aimed at the memorialist to ruin him.

15. That the memorialist further begs to add that he had been for a period of 20 years or more serving as the village munsiff, during which time he had performed his functions rendering complete satisfaction to

his superiors.

16. That under the above circumstances, the humble memorialist with full hopes of winning justice and redemption at your Excellency's hands submits this with heart-rending cries for his misfortune and prays your Excellency will be gracious enough to reinstate him and thus give him an opportunity of hailing your Excellency with full joy and pride,

leaving the humble memorialist to pray for your Excellency's long life and prosperity.

Salem
9-10-97

Memorialist.

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

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

C ... RRENT 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.

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

~~Regular~~ ~~Miscellaneous~~ No. 21627. 23. 11 of 189 7.

FOR WHAT CURRENT.		To whom given.	When taken out.
No.	Year.		
5	7		2-11-97
107	8/97		16-12-97

Revenue (189 7) Department.

CURRENT No. 9652.

Ist Reminder

REVENUE DEPT. 17 NOV 97 MADRAS

Order Endt R No. 2163

Transferred to the Financial Dept for the issue of the necessary orders

Fort St George, 23rd Nov 97. 18/11/97.

Rept.

To the F.D. 22.11.97

Recd. 24-11-97

The Hon the C.S.

for favor of countersignature

C.R. 17 Nov. 97

Examined 11-11

S.W. 15/11

From The Board of Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture.

No. 8961 Mad. Mis.

Dated 6th November 189

Received 10-

Registered //

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Submitting & Govt. with remarks, letter fr. Collector of Coimbatore s. ing that the Sum of Rs. sanctioned by Governme the maintenance of a temp establishment for taking le for reducing the Vaigai and channels may be [illegible]