Revenue (189/) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 595

DATED 22nd March 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

INFORMING C.N. Ramasimah, late Kannan, of Indianpalayam Village, Sathiamangalam Taluk, Coimbatore District, that, under section 23 of Madras Act III of 1895, as amended by Act II of 1897, no appeal lies to Government.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
C No 3329/97.							

Revenue (189) Department.

Have the enclosures since come?

To account 18. 12 March

NB

13/3/97

Order 20/3/97 Norwithstanding 20/3/97

13 March

CURRENT No.

2143

From Cr. Ramasiriah
Late Karnam of Sudiampa-
liam Village
Sattiamangalam Taluk
Coimbatore Dt.

Dated 6th Feb. 1897
Received 8th March 1897
Registered 9th

Enclosures not received 12/3/97 written later

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Appealing against the order of the Board of Revenue, dismissing him from the post of Karnam

Regd to clerk 9-3-97

I

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

I

PETITION

0215

REVENUE DEPT

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
18 MAR 97

I.

CHIEF SECRETARY
6 MAR. 1897
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

To The Hon'ble
The Chief Secretary to Government of
Madras.

Most Honored & Respected Sir,

Submitting a Revenue Petition on the order of the Board of Revenue, Conferring, on the dismissal of the under-signed, from the post of Karnam-Ship of Indiampalliam, Village, Sadiamangalam Taly., Coimbatore Dist.

The facts Are,

I. He was appointed, as Karnam of the Village, in the months of April 1891. (Vide. Ext. M). Ever-Since, he was appointed, he was discharging

discharging his duties, to the entire
Satisfaction of his Superiors.
While Such being the case, he was
unjustly dismissed from the Service,
in the month of October of the Same
year. (vide Ext. L.).

While matters Stand thus,

II The Petitioner, Submitted the
Power-of-Pleader, for the disposal
of the Tahsildar, during the time
of Jamabandy, as Soon as he
took Charge of the Village. The
Same was passed by the Tahsildar.
(vide Ext. C.). But, when the
petitioner, came to understand,
that there is Some dispute in the
transfer of Pattah, he referred
the matter to the disposal of the
Tahsildar, long-before. (vide Ext. C.).
Owing, to the unusual delay
of the, Clerk, of the Taluka,

No. enquiry, was made by the Tahsildar, even-though the same was ordered by him. Seeing the perfect silence of further procedure, one Muthialu-Naikan, who was greately believing that the report of the Karnam, while he enquired into, ~~Lodged~~ loged a Criminal-Complaint, (vide Ext. N.), thing, that his Claim, will once-looked, by transferring the Pattah, to the name of some-one, at the East-approching, Jamabandy.

III. On this Complaint the petitioner was Suspended, (Vide Ext. B.), and the case was taken up, for enquiry by the same Tahsildar. On the perusal of the Records, the Tahsildar, finding, that the Karnam, is quite innocent, & unconcerned, in the matter, (Vide Ext. D.), ~~restored~~ Restored him to his office. (Vide Ext. H.).

Even-though, all these Records, go to show, that the Warnam is quite, innocent, yet, no Reference, has been made, by, Dipission Officer, which, should Safely be attributed to his misfortune.

IV. The opinion of the Tahsildar in his judgement has purposely been marked out, in Read-Ink, so that the Same may be perused.

In, this Connection, the under-Signed begs to point-out, what, made the Division-Officer to, remove him, (who is quite new to the Village, & also a quite innocent in the matter), entirely from his Office, without, any enquiry, with all the Records, & Recommendations of Tahsildar, who is aware of his Conduct, from a long time, & who is his immediate Superior.

N-B. From

The publication of the Collectors in the District Gazette of 1889, that, an inferior Servant, should not be removed, from the office, without, hearing the defence of the aggrieved, produced, no good effect, in the case of the poor petitioner (vide Collector's, circular no. 32 of 1889), or, an extract, taken from the judicial proceedings of, Bombay, & Madras, Government, &, Board of Revenue. The judgement, of the, D, ggier, X gainst the Lords, above referred, to, as he gave no, chance, of defence enquiry, to the injured, appellant. — From his judge- up to -ment, itself only, it can be inferred that he never, heared the defence. In case if he has, taken any defence, he might have, as well as, pointed X -out, the same, with the various other records of the case, ——

— in the very heading of the judge-
-ment. While such being the case
the, Division-Officer, plainly, speaks,
in his judgement, as if he had
taken any Deposition from the
petitioner, &, his explanation,
Satisfactory. The petitioner, is
rest assured, that he has never
submitted, any explanation. If
the Statement, of the Division officer,
be true, the petitioner humbly
craves the mercy of the Leeniency in
Government, to call up the original
records, of the case, to peruse
his explanation, which, the
Dy, Collector, Say's, to have been
Submitted.

V

N-B.

The very Deputy Collector, who
has removed, that, he has not
the least doubt, that the petitioner
has acted, dishonestly, least.
he has removed the petitioner,

N-B. | from his office, (in the very Sentence of his judgement), stating, that, as a warning to others. The petitioner, begs to request, that he should not be so severely deal- with, to warn others.

VI. Under the above circumstances, the poor petitioner, humbly begs, & prays, for the revenging of the case, considering, the illegal proceedings of the Deputy Collector, which is quite, against the order of the Bombay & Madras Governments, & Board of revenue, as shown in Para - IV - of this petition, &, to ~~restore him~~ render him justice.

And the Petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

18th February 1893

Your's most obediently,
Ramaswamiah.

Submitted, this day, as Book-Post-

I have here-with, attached all the Exhibits (all the Public Records) in which, including, 2. Private Copies, as I am unable to get the true copies,

Noted.

VIII.

IX.

X.

Government of Madras.

Read ctd. 2113 of 1897.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement No. 595 R. dt 22 March 97

Dp 22/3/97

Note.

The petition is dated 14th Febry 1897.

C.R.
20 mar 97

THE petitioner is informed that no appeal lies to Government under Section 23 (1) of Madras Act III of 1895 as amended by act II of 1897. He is also informed that the records said to have been forwarded have not been received.

(By Order.)

(O.C.)

~~Under~~ Secretary to Government.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
189 .

To the petr Secs. 25-3-97

CM 26/3/97

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

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

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.