Revenue (189) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 2338.

DATED 15th Dec. 1897.

[Despatch Abstract.]

~~Statement~~ Declining to interfere on behalf of Pangaparambil Kannan Gunnatah of Havalaji praying that he may be restored to his post.

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. 1039.

4/1312/97

From

Rangapah
Kali Kannam-gumastah of
Havaligi,
No. Gooty Taluk,
Anantapur Dist.

Order R. No. 2338 d/15.12.97.

The Govt declines
to interfere

GA 15/12/97

Dated 6 Dec
Received 8 "
Registered 9 "
Enclosures 3.
Spare copies.

Lr
Petitioner
Note
} Secs. 17-12-97

This is a petition from a dismissed kaifiyat-gumastah in the Anantapur district. Act III of 1895 applies only to hereditary village offices and the appointment of kannam-gumastah is not hereditary.

CA.
14 Dec 97

SAV/13/12/97

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be restored to the post of Kannam of Havaligi.

SAV/16.12.97

...APERS.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date
98/97.			

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

3870

REVENUE DEPT.

SECRETARIAT 17 JUL 97 REV. DEPT.

To

His Excellency Sir Arthur Havelock
G. C. I. E & G. C. M. S.
Governor in Council of Fort-
St. George and its dependencies
Madras.

May it please your Excellency,

The humble petition of one Rangapah, late Karnam Gumasta of Havaligi, Gooty Taluq, Anantapur District, respectfully sheweth:—

That this is an appeal against the proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 14th October 1897 No. 3870 dismissing the appeal made by the appellant against the order of the Collector of Anantapur dated 19th May 1894 confirming the order of the Deputy Collector Gooty Division dated 24th January 94

whereby the appellant was dismissed from the post of the Karnam of Gumasta of Amaligi, Gooty Taluq.

2 The orders of both the Deputy Collector and the Collector and also copy of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue are herewith submitted.

3. The Board of Revenue ordered that "the Board sees no reasons to interfere on behalf of the petitioners and dismissed the appeal on its merits". It seems that the Honorable members of the Board of Revenue have passed the above orders without perusing the whole records connected with the case.

4 The facts of the case which gave rise to the appeal are as follows.

One Gowni Narasimhaiah in Fasli 1303 applied for the assignments of fields Nos 650A, 722, 723B and 727B. The appellant on this application sent a Durkhast Memorandum

BACK PAPERS.

		Date.

On the 10th November 1893 to the Deputy Tahsildar of Urwakonda recommending this assignment on the 17th, when he found that there were small shrubs of the value of Rs 5 on the lands to be assigned he immediately brought the matter to the notice of the Deputy Tahsildar through the Reddy and Rs 5 were collected and remitted to the Treasury as directed by the Deputy Tahsildar.

5 The Charges on which the appellant was dismissed are

(1) that in the Dharkast Memorandam prepared by the appellant for the assignment of the said lands he did not make mention of the existence of the trees and shrubs above mentioned.

(2) That in the said Memorandam he wilfully omitted to make mention that these fields were applied for in the previous fasli

No.	Department.	Date.

* Nos 722, 725B. and 727B.

* Numbers are marginally noted, would be amost eight in all. Subsequently however, the appellant was given to understand that it would be safe to make mention of the thorny shrubs also, which he accordingly did immediately after he sent the A memorandum and long before any Complaint was made about the omission to make mention of the trees in the memorandum on perusance of the subsequent reports were collected as the value of the trees under the orders of the Deputy Tahsildar. The perfectly bonafide Character of the omission to make mention of the trees in the mems would thus be evidenced to Charge the appellant with fraud on his part in this Connection would be a most unfortunate error of judgment.

As to the second Charge i,e

Tahsildar at once.

Of all the Columns that were in the Memorandum, only the seventh is intended to be filled up by the names of the Darkhastdars of the current ~~Fasl~~ Fasli only. It would thus appear that the mistake committed by the appellant under the impression that it was unnecessary to mention the names of the previous Darkhastdars in a current memorandum has been much exaggerated and converted into two Charges and thus the appellant harshly dealt with.

8 The appellant begs to submit that the appellant's Conduct in the preperation of the memorandum was throughout bonafide. He has put in more than seven years Service and has discharged his duties

most Satisfactorily.

We therefore requests Your Excellency to be pleased to take the appellants' hard case into Your Excellency's favourable Consideration and direct his restoration to the post of Karnam of Havaligi.

For this act of Kindness, the appellant, as in duty bound,

Begs to remain

Your Excellency's Most humble Servant

Signed Kurnam Lingappah, Gumasta,

Dated 6th December 97

Late Kurnam, Havaligi village, Gooty Taluk, Anantapur District.

Address of the Appellant—

Lingappa,

Late Kurnam of Havili village, now residing at Vidapanakal,

Gooty Taluk,

Anantapur District.

BACK PAPERS.

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