Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 242.

DATED 30 Febr

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition of G. Surya narayana, late Sub-protem 2nd grade Rev. Inspector, Kistna Dt., dismissed under para 5 of C. Acts 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.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.

dispatch this & send it on to calc clerk with reference to U.S note 3/2/97 | seen & explained in person 8/2/97

Secy

Order R No: 242 dy 3d Feby 1897

Para V(3) of C Petition Rules. ~~and the petr is informed~~ that further petitions ~~from him~~ received on the same subject will not be noticed.

DD 30-1-97

To the Petitioner Des. 8-2-97

From Govindukuri Suryanarayana
Late Sub-protem 2nd Grade
Rev. Inspector of Gudivada Taluq
Kistna Dt.

No.

Dated

Received 21-1-97

Registered 28-1-97.

Enclosures 1

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be restored to the post of Rev. Inspector

note The petrs case was finally disposed of (vide G.O No 1762 dy 21-2-96 and notes thereunder) and this is the 4th time he petitions Govt. He has been sending printed copies of his original petition with such additions. He adduces no new facts.

By marking 'duplicate' on the copy of petn disposed of in Routine G.O

The coll clerk will explain why the direction given in G.O. 1930 dy 10-10-96 was not complied with

DD 30.1.97

Explained in person
US wants that a separate Register should be maintained of all petitions sent in 1897 in duplicate

ASD 29/1/97

no 1930 d/ 10-10-96, he induced a belief that the original had been sent through the proper channel. It was a copy of this old petn sent for the second time and by 'duplicate' he probably meant nothing more. The present petn also has not been received through the official course

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No	Department.	Date.
"	1930R	Rev.	10-10-96.
"	7629	RD.	21-2-97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

This is the 4th Memorial submitted.
The horrible injustice done to the Memorialist is to be seen from the petition

PETITION
No 968
REVENUE DEPT

To

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE RIGHT HON'BLE
THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
THROUGH THE COLLECTOR & BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.

The humble appeal petition of GOVINDULURI SURYANARAYANA *late Sub-protem 2nd grade Revenue Inspector of Gudivada Taluq Kistna District.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

1. Petitioner was (until the Collector has recently reduced him to the grade of a Taluk Gumastah) permanent 2nd Gumastah on Rs. 20 in the Bander Taluk and Sub-protem 2nd Grade Revenue Inspector of Gudivada Taluk in the District of Kristna.

The facts of the case in which your Excellency's humble petitioner has been made the victim of great official rigour and injustice are as follows :—

Your Excellency's humble petitioner, Revenue Inspector of Gudivada Taluk Kistna District in the course of his duties, inspected the Village of Chinapalaparru on the 23rd of March 1895. On examining the Village Adungal for F. 1304 petitioner found an entry by the Curnum of the Village to the effect that he had in his own occupation a piece of Village site bounded by a mud wall about 3 feet in height measuring 7 cents, of which 4 Cents were occupied with permission and 3 without permission and he (the Curnam) prayed for a grant of title deed for the extent encroached upon.

Ord 29/1/97

2. Believing the Curnam's recorded note in the Adungul to be correct, your Excellency's humble petitioner made a remark that the grant prayed for, might be made.

3. But shortly after learning that the Curnam's entry in the Adungul was false, made with a view to facilitate the grant, petitioner, on the very same day, measured the site in question and found that it covered only 4 Cents, which were already granted to him. After censuring the Curnam for his false entry, the petitioner, scored out the remark he had made a few hours ago and in liew of it recorded just below it, that no fresh grant of site need be made but a title deed might be issued only for 4 Cents granted to him for building purposes by the Tahsildar on the 16th January 1894.

4. About 6 weeks after this, 23rd of March 1895 (Vide para 2 of Collector's pro.) the Collector went to Gudivada for jamabundi and on the 30th April, the Adungul account of this Village was as usual produced before one of the Collector's Clerks for preliminary inspection. The sheet which contained the two abovementioned remarks, one scored out and the other revised, attracted his notice and the petitioner was advised to replace the sheet by a new one without scoring or erasure. This was accordingly done by the Curnam with the petitioner's knowledge as he had no reason to doubt the bonafides of the advice. The new sheet did not, of course contain the scored out remarks but was in other respects a genuine copy of the original. The Curnam got the new sheet sealed in the Taluk Office and he placed the Adungul account again before the Huzur Clerk on the 2nd of May 1895. Then, the Huzur Clerk, called for the old sheet, only, as he alleged, to compare and check the figures contained in both the sheets. He seems to have had a lurking desire of drawing the petitioner into a scrape and accordingly placed the two sheets before the Huznr Sheristadar, who called for instantaneous written explanations from the petitioner and the Huzur Clerk concerned and took statements in his own hand from the

Curnam, from the Curnam's Gumastah and from the Taluk peon in charge of the Taluk Head Accountants seal. The petitioner ordered the Taluk peon in the open office to send the Curnam to him after affixing the Head Accountants seal on one or two sheets, having been spoiled with the scored out remarks. The petitioner later on, on the same day, submitted a second and fuller explanation to the Collector but the second explanation was in some inexplicable way, delayed till the 7th May 1895, in reaching the Collector, who on that account misconstrued it, as an after thought. On the 7th of May 1895, the Collector passed an unjust proceedings inflicting upon your humble petitioner (of 14 year's Goveanment service of which 4 years as a Revenue Inspoctor) the threefold punishment of reduction from Rs. 35 to 15, suspension for a year and transfer to a remote Division:

5. Against these proceedings, your Excellency's humble petitioner appealed to the Honorable Members of the Revenue Board, who dismissed the appeal and declined to interfere without considering the petitioner's long service, the absence of all motives on his part to do wrong, and the severity of the punish ment meted out.

6. As a last resort and in full confidence that mercy will be shown to him, your humble petitioner now presents this appeal to your gracious Excellency and craves for generous consideration of the same.

7. Your Excellency's humble petitioner will next submit his explanation on each of the 3 charges brought against the petitioner by the Collector in his Proceedings No. 1597 dated 15-5-95.

1. Entering a false remark in the Adungul calculated and presumably intended to enable a Village Curnam to occupy Village site without authority.

2. Surreptitiously removing or conniving at the removal of the page of the Adungul and substituting for it another and omitting from it the false remarks contained in the original page.

3. Committing himself to falsehood in his defence.

Your Excellency's humble petitioner respectfully submits the following explanantion with respect to each of them.

The difference between the extent of the site as measured first by petitioner and afterwards by the Acting Ver Head Clerk is due to the following reasons.

The petitioner measured the site on the 23rd of March 1895 and found it to contain 4062½ square links. Six weeks after (i. e. 5th ~~March~~) under the orders of the Collector, the Acting Ver. Head Clerk measured the same site and found it to contain 5659½ square links. Even according to his measurement it would be 5⅔rd Cents but not full six Cents as stated by him Such insignificant difference of 1 or 2 Cents generally occurs in measuring mud walls of saline nature with the incorrect chain. Such slight difference can be found out every where. The petitioner suspecting the inaccurate measurement of the Ver Hd. Clerk addressed the Collector on more than one occasion to have ground re measured by another competent Officer. This, the Collector, was not pleased to do. It is possible that the Curnam, thinking that the site would not be remeasured, might have encroached on a little more or might have purposely done so by bolstering up the wall from outside with mud if not by by actual shifting as there is ample vacant Village site both on the south and western side of the encroachment. It was the Curnam who was to bebenefitted by encroaching upon the site who made a false entry in the Adungul, who misrepresentated the Revenue Inspector and who obtained the seal of the Taluk Head Accountant. The Ver Head Clerk's remark that the walls appear to be old cannot be much relied on, as in a saline soil like this, *bare ~~and~~ mud walls* exposed to the sun, wind, and rain, would look old even after a few weeks, and even the most experienced persons cannot state the exact age of such walls.

The Collector's 2nd and 3rd ~~Cents~~ are based on the first, wherein he attributes dishonest motive to the petitioner and must stand or fall with it.

If your Excellency believe the honest plea that the old sheet was replaced by a new one under the advice of the Huzur Clerk, for the sake of neatness, there can be no dishonesty ~~of~~ connivance of dishonesty in the act. If there were any dishonest motive on the part of the petitioner, the sheet in question would have been removed between the date of the original entry 23-3-95 and 30th April 1895, when the Adungul account was first produced before one of the Collectors Clerks for inspection (Vide para 1 of Collectors Pro.) The petitioner humbly submits that if the sheet ~~were~~ was not removed with the knowledge and under the advice of the Collectors Clerk, he could not have detected an interpolated sheet containing the usual remarks in a book containing hundreds of pages. If the thing were done dishonestly, Your humble petitioner would have taken care (as men of ordinary prudence do) to destroy the old sheet without leaving it with the Curnam, and the fact that the removed page was left with the Curnam without destruction as a thing immaterial, would clearly show that the petitioner did it not wfth any dishonest motive.

As to the Collector's remark in paragraph 8 of his Proceedings, the opinion of the Board recorded in Boards Pro. No. 3940 8-8-95 Mis. that the petitioner was guilty of repeated falsehood, the petitioner humbly submits that during the long service of 14 years and odd, the only occasion in which your humble petitioner was found fault with, was, in connection with a mishap, which occured in 1893. The petitioner entered in his diary that between the 28th June and 1st July 1893, he visited the Villages of Bantumilli and Cherukumilli which are close Masulipatam, Head Qrs. of the Taluk.

Even men of higher education cannot say what took place yesterday. In such a case what value might be attached to the statements given after a week, by the Village Munsiff of Bantumalli, who rarely lives in the Village

during the day time and to that of an ignorant dull headed washerman M. Lakshmudu peon, that the petitoner was in Bander from the 28th June 1893. On the report of the Tahsildar charging the petitioner with the false entry in the diary, the Acting Head Qr, Dy. Collector who was in charge of the Dn. addressed the Collector in his letter No. 884 dated 13-9-93 (Public Copy is hereinenclosed) recommending the cancellation of the petitioner's Acting 1st grade given to him for 2 months and his reversion to his permanent appointment on Rs. 35 as 2nd grade Rev. Inspector. On this, the present Collector reduced the petitioner to a post of a Taluk gumastah on Rs 15.

On the intercession and strong representation of the permanent Head Qr. Dy, Collector, the Collector has taken a favourable view of the petitioner and reinstated him in course of about 3 months as 2nd grade Rev. Inspr. The Acting Head Qr. Dy. Collector in his letter says that the petitioner ought not to have come to Masulipatam without leave. Petitioner submits that no leave is necessary and whenever work compells him to attend he can come as the petitioner will have much work to attend to but could not exactly remember whether he had been to Cherukumulli or Masulipatam on the 30th June and 1st July as the petitioner had unfortunately lost his note Book. The petitioner never meant to falsify his diary and made no secret visit to Bander, on the occasion as it was done only in connection with his official duties as Bander being the petitioner's Head Qr. station of the Taluk. Whatever view the Collector might at first have taken of petitioners short visit to the Taluk Head Quarters, petitioner submits that it is hardly fair to punish him again for an offence for which he has either been punished before, or as the petitioner hopes on a right understanding of the incident, was thoroughly condoned.

In conclusion therefore Your Excellency's humble petitioner humbly prays that your Ecellency in Council, may be pleased to grant a generous consideration to all the facts above represented and restore the petitioner to the Revenue Inspector's post and order cancelment of his suspension.

Petitioner begs to remain
Most Honored Sir,
Your most obedt. &
humble Servt,
G Lingamurty

Confidential

To

Lord Hawlock
Esquire.
His Excellency, the
Right Honorable,
The Governor in
Council, Fort-
Saint George.

The humble Memorial
of Govindulu Lingamurty
Varupula, Late
2d Grade Revenue
Inspector of Gudivada
Taluk, Kistna Dt.

Most respectfully
Sheweth -

with a firm belief
that the present
Governor is a
very able & energe-
-tic Officer & who
always aims at
justice, petitioner
most humbly begs to bring the
following few lines
into your Excellency's
kind consideration

Petitioner has already
represented his unfor
-tunate & most
lamentable case
& the gross injustice
done to him by the

B.P. No 3940 dtd
21-8-95
Ch. No 762
21-2-96

Board & to the Governm
-ment, both the author
-ities were pleased to
dispose his appeal
petitions summarily
without attempt, at
any independent
enquiry whatever,
solely basing their
orders on the one
sided reports of
subordinate Officers
& on the biased remarks
of the Collector. No
Subject of Her Majesty
has ever been punished
in this way, since the
British Administra-
-tion had been

brought into force
The policy of Govern
=ment in appointing
Collectors, Judges,
Secretaries in the
Board of Government
Offices, in different
parts of Her Empire,
not to gain Her
Subjects, but only
for the improvement
of the Country, for
the good administra
tion of justice & for
the preservation of
the peace.
Collectors Proceed
=ings of 15th 1597 &
passed against

your Excellency should
petitioner, so in one way
& the record connected
with the case as altogether
in a different way.
The learned Magistrate
given before the Mazar
Dist on the 2nd of May
1895, ran in five diffe
=rent ways, & all these
five statements were
entirely rebutted by
the statements of the
Acting Vernacular Head
Clerk, Talukdar,
learned Counsel
& the petitioner.
The Acting Vernacular Head
Clerk, just to win

the favor of the Hon'ble
Lt. Col. Koka Rasaya
Pasupati Avl. Gen., submitted
a statement to the
effect, that there is
no new encroach-
ment recently made
but the Lessee
has enclosed a
larger space, when
the walls were
originally raised.
The Lessee has
plainly admitted
in his Kaifiat that
he has made a
false entry in the
Adangal Records

that there is no en-
croachment at all
& with a view to encroach
upon the extent of 3
at some future time,
cents more in addi-
tion to four cents
already sanctioned
by the Tahsildar on
1st Inst. As the
Collector, J. H. Atkinson
Esquire, is highly
prejudiced in the
matter & as it is
to be
the natural to sus-
tain his own
Proceedings, Petitioner
earnestly Craves

Your Excellency
in Council, will
be very graciously
pleased to refer
these papers to any
European Officer
other than the Collector
of the Dt. for favour
of enquiry & render
justice to your Ex
cellency's humble
petitioner in restoring
him with arrears
of pay, cancelling
order
the suspension of the
Collector. The
Collector passed

Proceedings without
even glancing into
the Record Connected
with the Case. His
Proceedings so totally
based on the Office
note of the Sazawar
Gl. K. Narayana
Pavaim Navalur
who was the bottom
of so much Cruel
injustice done to Your
Excellency's humble petitioner
petitioner as the reas
onable to be satisfy
him (K. Narayana
Pavaim Navalur Sa
bazar Gl.) with

his unlimited hunger.

God knows the whole truth. Neither the Collector has glanced into the petitioner's papers, nor the Board nor the Government. If the statements given by the Executive Engineer & Executive Engineer & Talak peon are translated into English, & if these are then compared with that of the Collector's remarks in his Proceedings Nº 1597 dd 15-5-95, Your Excellency in Council will be pleased to observe the gross injustice done to the petitioner on false representation of the Huzur Dfr Koka Narayan Executive Engineer Gaw- If wholesome orders passed by the Collector should be, are final, what should be the fate of the petitioner. In conclusion, prays that justice might be done to him.

Begging the pardon
for the trouble
Petitioner begs to
remain
Most Honored Sir
Your most dedt
humble Servant
G Gunganaya

P.S. Copy of Appeal
petition hitherto submitted
is herein enclosed for
favor of your Excellency's
perusal.
Begging the pardon
for the trouble.
Petitioner begs to remain
Most Honored Sir,
Your most dedt
humble Servant,
G Gunganaya

1897
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Current No. 797

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.