

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

Regular
Miscellaneous No. 3229 of 1897

FOR WHAT CURRENT.		To whom given.	When taken out.
No.	Year.		
92 9159/97		N - M - M -	27-10-97
6316/98		A. L. C. C. G.	23-9-98

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 303

DATED 11th Feb. 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to interfere on behalf of Subramaniza
Aiyar Kate Karmam of Melaparthi Kudi watham
Mayawaram Taluk, Tanjore Dt. in the matter of
his restoration to his former 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.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1178



From

H. A. Siva Sanyal J.L.
 As Private Secretary
 to the Governor.

Order R No. 303, d 11 Feb. 1897

The Govt. de-
 clines to interfere.

No.

Dated 5 February 1897.

Received 8th

Registered 8th

Enclosures /

Spare copies -

SUBJECT.

Transfers a petition from Subra-
 mania Aiyar late Baruan of
 Melaparthi Kudi Vatham, Maye-
 Varan Taluk, Tanjore Dist.
 praying to be restored to his
 former post.

list

La tte petr
 with Encls

15-2-97

Noti

Village officers in
 Tanjore are not here
 duty

(R.
 10 Feb 97)

/By order

H. A. Siva

Private Secretary

e. 11/2/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Mayavaram
PETITION 28th January 1897

To REVENUE DEPT

His Worship The Governor of Madras

The humble appeal petition of Subramania aiyar late Kurnam of Malaparuthi Kudi Vattam, Mayavaram Taluk, now residing in Tirumanjana street, Tiruvilander, Mayavaram. Tanjore District.

Most respectfully sheweth,
That your petitioner was until the 28th April 1895, the Kurnam of Malaparuthi Kudi on which date he was dismissed the service by the Sub Collector of Kumbakonam in his order dated 9th April 1895. your petitioner has been in the Government service as Kurnam for the last 35 years in several Vattams during which period he has always discharged his duties satisfactorily and efficiently and had acquired a reputation as one of the best Kurnams.

2 The charges brought against your petitioner by the Revenue Inspector of the Range which entailed on him the dismissal are:—

(1) That some fields actually waste were shown as cultivated and vice versa. (2) That fields cultivated with first crop were shown as cultivated with second crop and vice versa.

(3) That dry cultivation was shown as wet cultivation and vice versa. (4) That a masonry house built 5 years ago on pogramboke land (cattle stand) was not brought to the notice of the superior officers.

(5) That certain taxable trees were not brought to account. (6) That a serious mistake was committed in respect of a Bar Hast memorandum. The Sub collector dismissed your petitioner and directed a prosecution against your petitioner on a charge of having given false information.

(3) The 2nd & 3rd Magistrate of Mayaveram before whom the prosecution was instituted convicted your petitioner. There was an appeal against the conviction in which the Sub Divisional Magistrate of Datukota acquitted your petitioner and directed the fine paid to be refunded.

refunded. your petitioner appealed to the Collector of Tanjore against the order of dismissal. The Collector of Tanjore having dismissed the appeal, an appeal was again prepared to the Honourable members of the Board of Revenue which was also met with the same result. your petitioner now appeals against the Proceedings Board No 3026. Mrs. dated 2nd July 1896 (enclosed)

4. your petitioner begs here to take charges No 1, 2 & 3 together and submit his explanations. your petitioner like the other Hurnams of the taluk had not the sub-division shapers with him to guide him in regarding cultivation month after month. He had to guide himself only with reference to the Village Map. The Vattam consists of 198 entire and 800 sub-divisions of the survey numbers. Out of this huge number, the mistakes that the petitioner committed were in respect of only 58 sub-divisions in 30 entire survey numbers. The difference in assessment as returned by your petitioner and as estimated by the Inspector in his

his inspection is only Re 1-5-0. This could be easily verified, your petitioner begs to submit from a reference to the inspection list prepared by the Revenue Inspector. Almost all the survey subdivisions of entire numbers are interchanged owing to the wrong merging of Paimash numbers in the respective survey numbers for want of shape books at the time. your petitioner got the shape books late in the Masli viz, in February 1895 by which time cultivation had to be recorded and accounts sent up. As soon as he got the shape books he verified his cultivation accounts with reference to the shape books, and had kept ready the corrections to be inserted. your petitioner was not the only Muvinnam that did so. From a perusal of the inspection lists of the Vattams of the Taluk, what difficulties attended the preparation of the cultivation accounts in the notation of survey numbers could be easily seen

seen. The collector in his Proceedings referred to above observes "he can never have inspected the fields when he wrote his cultivation accounts" your petitioner begs to submit here that it would not have been possible for your petitioner to commit the foregoing mistakes that he did, if he had not inspected the fields, as he had to write his accounts under a new classification. The mistakes should have been more numerous and serious if he had ^{not} inspected the fields. The collector, your petitioner begs to submit, has erred in concluding so. your petitioner further begs to submit that these corrections reported by the Revenue Inspector do not tally with the actual state of fields. The Revenue Inspector got an enemy of mine, one Rana How to check the entries in the accounts on inspection of the fields without himself inspecting them. It was only when your petitioner protested against this step of the Inspector, he became prejudiced against me and to involve me in trouble, magnified the mistakes.

(5) As to the 4th charge, viz, not bringing to notice the masonry house built on a paramboke land, your petitioner begs to submit, that the house has been in existence even before your petitioner went to the Vattam, viz, Masli 1287; and not, only 5 years, as stated by the Revenue Inspector.

Inspector. There was a plot of land assigned on patta in the cattle stand prior to that, and the house was on patta land as per revenue measured in paimash No. 301. During the resettlement the land was classed as poramboke. Your petitioner had no knowledge until he got the shape books in February 1895 that the site on which the house stands was poramboke as per settlement. So he could not have brought it to the notice of superior officers earlier. As soon as he saw it, your petitioner brought it to the notice of the officers by submitting a B form account therefore, with the recommendation that it ought to be assigned on patta. The Inspector's statement that it was built only 5 years ago is wholly incorrect. So your petitioner begs to submit that no blame could attach to him in respect to this item of charge.

C. As to the item of charge taken as No. 5 in para 2 supra, not bringing to account taxable trees carrying an assessment of Rs 19-8-2, which became fruit bearing 12 years ago, your petitioner begs to submit for your Worships close attention of the following. These plots have not

not been poramboke ones for the last 12 years. Some of the trees of long bearing are on patta land as per revenue accounts and only on poramboke as per settlement accounts. Some trees were on Jari, but since became vacant house sites. However, your petitioner begs to submit that he submitted a list a list of such trees on 26-11-94 for some of the trees. Your petitioner has on hand a despatch book which shows the despatch of the list on 26th November 1894 along with other accounts. The Inspector who has received other accounts denies his receipt of the B form accounts. (list of taxable trees)

The Revenue Inspector, your petitioner begs to submit, has wilfully kept back the accounts which came to his hands to suit his purpose of setting up of frivolous and false charges against your petitioner.

The Revenue Inspector has brought under this item (1) 14 trees which are on Jari land on which there are houses even to day standing and which cannot be brought to account (2) 23 trees in Survey No 150 A while only 13 trees of the recent bearing are to be brought to account. He has failed wilfully to bring

bring to notice a certain item of encroachment
on poramboke for favouring the
pattadar a wealthy man of the
village, and thus caused a loss of Rs 25
to Government even though your petitioner
had brought such case to the notice of the
officers as could be seen from a reference
to the adangal account of the Vattam
which bears the initials of the inspector.
For instance 20 cents of encroachment
in poramboke kanthavanam and
yielding trees thereon carrying a
tax of Rs 15. The Inspector has omitted the
entries in spite of his remarks on the same
in the accounts. It is in respect of
these that the Inspector says that he
found out on his own inspection as
though your petitioner never brought
his notice earlier. I have still records
to show my despatch of such
accounts to the Inspector who
has wilfully ignored them. Further
the Inspector says that no cultivation
note book was shown him at all.
If your petitioner had ^{not} maintained
such a book the Inspector would

would not have been silent about it
without making it an item of charge
against your petitioner. The Inspector
who took it with him at the time of his
inspection has kept it behind wilfully
to magnify the charge against your
petitioner.

7. As to the item of charge that your petitioner
committed serious mistakes in respect of a Barlast
case, taken as No. 6 in para 2 supra, your
petitioner begs to submit that it was in
regard to this that he was prosecuted.
About this the Revenue Inspector
says in his report that 25 cents of
land in survey No. 1308 is cultivated
with plantain, but in the list prepared
by him at his inspection he says it is
30 cents while there is actually 15 cents
of plantain cultivation on the ground.
It is in connection with this very
plot of ground he finds fault with
your petitioner for having entered
as cultivation with black gram

gram as though it was not so cultivated. The
takes it as an item of charge included in 1, 2 & 3.

At the same time the inspector says
that the trees on the plot were not brought
to account. Your petitioner begs to
submit that if it was your petitioner's
wish to help the pata dar by not bringing
to account taxable trees, he would not
have brought to account black gram
cultivation on this very piece of land.
If your petitioner had really wished
to help the pata dar, your petitioner
would have kept quiet without even
bringing to notice the black gram
cultivation. Black gram is cultivated
in October and harvested late in
January and at the beginning of February.
At the time of the Inspector's visit traces of
black gram were not visible. The trees on
the plots came to bear only in the fasli
and so your petitioner could not have
brought to account earlier. Further
these very plots were inspected
by Mr. H. P. J. S. Aya Hanoo Nilay, the
then Revenue Inspector during
the previous fasli; if the trees had been
fruit bearing then, the then Inspector

Inspector would not allow the trees not
being accounted in the fasli. The Inspector's
statement that that they had become fruit
bearing 12 years ago is unfounded and got
up only for the occasion. The land
was classed as cultivable dry waste as per
settlement. There are trees on the plot
enjoyed by several pata dars. One
pata dar had grown black gram
in the intervals of trees. Your petitioner
had to bring it to notice. So your petitioner
in sending up a WarKast application
therefor, stated all the particulars regarding
the application, but he felt a doubt
about the propriety of entering the trees
in Col. II there of as the trees were in
the occupation of several pata dars.
Your petitioner sought the instructions
of the Inspector who directed him
not to mention it in Col. II. So your
petitioner sent up the memorandum
stating the grounds why it could not be
assigned it being within 6, 1/2 to 10 of

of channel and pathway. So your petitioner begs to submit that he has not wilfully made any mistakes.

8. your petitioner begs to submit that the charges woven against him by the Inspector were due to the serious misunderstanding that arose between them. The Revenue Inspector deputed a friend of his by name one Rama Row to inspect the fields and check the entries in the Adangal and cultivation note. I at once told the Inspector that it was not proper and requested him to do it himself. The Inspector without heeding my request got the fields inspected by the said Rama Row who made pencil entries in the Adangal account. The entries were opposed to the actual state of fields. your petitioner protested against this. But the inspector adopted it as his own. When your petitioner told the Inspector that he would lay the matter before the authorities, he wanted to get hold of the Adangal account in order to

to have the pencil entries in the hand of Rama Row to be rubbed out. your petitioner was careful not to allow them rubbed away. The Revenue Inspector's illegal action in regard to the destruction of another Vattams cultivation accounts came to your petitioner's knowledge.

The Revenue Inspector desired your petitioner to conform to his wrong ways to which he (petitioner) did not yield. The Inspector, in view to swear himself got up these charges against your petitioner. It would also be seen from another circumstance. The Inspector who had been 1 month in the range remarked that your petitioner's conduct was not good. your petitioner begs to submit that his previous conduct has been exemplary and nothing could be said against it. The Inspector has, simply to magnify the charges against your petitioner, made such a statement.

9. your petitioner begs to submit that as soon as he came to know

known of the recommendation by the
 Thsilvar for dismissal, he brought
 to the notice of the sub collector the
 mistakes made by the Inspector and
 foisted upon your petitioner, in a
 petition dated 25th April 1895, and
 also to the collector of Tanjore on 20.5.1895.
 For that purpose your petitioner produced
 the Adangal accounts of his vattam to
 the sub collector on 8.5.1895. The then
 sub collector was pleased to order
 them to be kept under seal. Your
 petitioner begs to submit that no
 proper enquiry of it has been made
 and no inspection of the plots made
 till now. If an enquiry was made
 and the fields had been inspected then
 and there, your petitioner's case would
 have been stronger and the result of
 his appeals would have been different.

10. Your petitioner is now only 51 years of age strong enough to work as hard as he has been doing for at least 20 years more. After an approved service of 35 years during which period his conduct has been exemplary, he has been

been suddenly thrown on the world
with no means of livelihood. Your
petitioner begs to submit that
within this long period of 35 years
he has never been found fault with
at any time. No sort of punishment
by way of fine or suspension had
be fallen your petitioner.

11 Your petitioner therefore prays
that his worship The Governor of
Madras will be pleased to reverse
the order of the Board and restore
your petitioner to his appointment,
for which act of justice and charity,
your petitioner will ^{as} ever in duty
bound pray for your Worship's long
life and prosperity.

I most Humbly beg to remain
your Worship's most obedient & humble servant.

Scaphiobolus

When signed,

189

189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

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

N.B.—

A ~~new~~ Copy in full.

B = Not to be copied.

P == Copy abstract only.

Q == Copy heading only.