

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 2162

DATED 22nd Nov

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to interfere on behalf
of Ananthavarayana Iyengar, Salem
Dt., praying for restoration to the
post of village munsiff of Maraman-
galam, 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.

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

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 9049

From

Ananthanarayana Ayyar
Lathi Village Munsiff of
Maramangalam
Salem Taluk & Dist.
No.

Dated 9 Oct.

Received 18 Nov.

Registered 19

Enclosures 4

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Praying for reinstatement.

Order R. No. 2162 of 22nd Nov 97

The Govt declines to interfere

List

Tattupet with emb.

Note

Village offices in
the Salem district
are not hereditary.

PA.
20 Nov 97

PA.
20 Nov 97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



PETITION

0904

REVENUE DEPT

His Excellency Sir Arthur
Clibank 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 began
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
dated 7th March 1896, removing the
humble memorialist from the Service
of the Village of Laramangala

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 State
- (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 Land 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 the 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.

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-
we

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 against 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 brought over by the Complainant he deposed before the Tahsildar that Rs 26-4-0 was paid to ^{me} by the memorialist.

That it will not be for

of place for the memorialist to state that if it be a fact that ~~that~~ the memorialist paid to the complainant the amount alleged to have paid to him by the Complainant, he would not have paid the amount with the 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 memorial-
-list, further complains that there is a flat
in the Village in the name of his father who
had since died, and that of another ryot,
by name Chintamani Gounden, the total
assessment of which is 52-5-0, and concludes
that, in virtue of a joint flatadar, his
father ought to have paid only half
the assessment 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 flatadar
one Rupee less namely 25-2-6 in accord

accordance with the accounts of the
Tahsildar's Office, ^(has been 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 bying authority to ascertain
whether the Complainant has to
pay 27-2-6 or not; but this request
was thrown aside, and the bying autho-
rity 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 necess-

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) is 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 of unity be

made in the receipt of the 2nd fiattadar?
The memorialist had collected only Rs.
25-2-6 from the 2nd fiattadar, 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
fiattadar 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
past 10 years, and that the second
fiattadar had or has no cause to
complain against the memorialist of
any excess collection.

13. That the fact, that the
2nd fiattadar 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 fiattadar, and the
party receiving the same viz. the memorialist;
but to add to the misfortune of the memori-
list the 2nd fiattadar was not at all cal-
for, nor enquired into by the trying authority
who was prejudiced by the complainant
attaching a peculiar meaning, to the receipt
of the 2nd fiattadar, 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 false-
hoods 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

10.
can be exp.ained only by the party having
the amount up, the 23rd of the 2nd and the
party receiving the same the 23rd of the 2nd
but to add to the importance of the memorial
that the 23rd of the 2nd was not at all
for, but the 23rd of the 2nd was not at all
who was requested by the complainant
to bring a letter in support of the
of the 23rd of the 2nd was not at all
and the 23rd of the 2nd was not at all

11.
that the memorialist states
that it will clearly appear from
the memorial that the memorialist
of the memorialist is a friend of the
the complainant, the memorialist
the memorialist is a friend of the
crimes of the memorialist to him.

12.
That the memorialist further
begs to state that he has been for
a period of 20 years or more serving as
the village headman, during which
time he has performed his functions
sincerely and faithfully.

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 trailing 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 } *James G. [unclear]*
Memorialist.

That under the above circumstances
 the Board of Directors will have to
 report to the shareholders and the
 directors of the company the results
 of their management and the
 progress of the business during the
 year ending 31st March 1891.
 The Board of Directors will also
 report to the shareholders the
 results of their management and the
 progress of the business during the
 year ending 31st March 1891.
 The Board of Directors will also
 report to the shareholders the
 results of their management and the
 progress of the business during the
 year ending 31st March 1891.

The Board of Directors will also
 report to the shareholders the
 results of their management and the
 progress of the business during the
 year ending 31st March 1891.
 The Board of Directors will also
 report to the shareholders the
 results of their management and the
 progress of the business during the
 year ending 31st March 1891.

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

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
 189

DATED

O BENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTERS OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DIITO

PAPERS NOT FILLED 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.

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

- Regular
- Miscellaneous No. 216307. 23- 11 of 1897.

FOR WHAT CURRENT.		To whom given.	When taken out.
No.	Year.		
57/77			2-11-97
107/97			16-12-97

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 9652.



From
The Board of Revenue
Revenue Settlement, Land
Records and Agriculture.
No. 8961 Madras.

Dated 6th November 1897
Received 10th
Registered //
Enclosures
Spare copies.

Order Endt R No. 2163

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

Intt St George, 2
23rd Nov 97

Ld.

To the F.D.

Nov 24-11-97

MA 22.11.97

The Hon the C.S.
for favor of contribution

17 Nov 97

11-11

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government
with remarks, letter from
Collector of Coimbatore
regarding the sum of Rs
sanctioned by Government
for the maintenance of a temporary
establishment for taking
for measuring the Vengal and
channels may be considered
at.

8/11/97