Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 635.

DATED 25th March 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

INFORMING Subbarayudu, late Kannan,
of Nagadoor Village, Nandikottkur Taluk, Kurnool
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.

Revenue (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 8623.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
25 NOV 96
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

To lie over
30 Nov. 96.

Order

From Nagaloor Subbarayudu
Late Karnam of Nagaloor
village, Nandikottur Taluk
Kurnool Dt.

No.

Dated 18th
Received 25th } November 1896
Registered 26th
Enclosures 8
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Praying for 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.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

PETITION
0249
REVENUE DEPT

THE EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

FORT SAINT GEORGE,

Madras.

May it please your Excellency :—

The humble Revision petition of Nagatoor Subbarayudu, Late Karnam of Nagatoor village, Nandikotkur Taluk, Kurnool District, Most respectfully shewth :—

1. That he was dismissed from the Karnam of Nagatoor village on dated 30th June 1895 (*a*) on the ground that he, in complicity with the village Magistrate sided in the fabrication of a notice of attachment, while there was in fact, no attachment of the crop at all.

(*b*) That it was found by the Deputy Tahsildar, Deputy Collector and others that the attachment was false.

(*c*) That it is, therefore, unsafe to retain him in the responsible office of village Karnam.

2. Your petitioner begs to state that, it is surprising if the attachment was false and there was no attachment at all, how the Tahsildar would have issued a sale notice No. 3, in respect of the crop on the field in question and how the Revenue Inspector could have conducted the sale of the crop in pursuance of the orders of the Tahsildar. The sale notice No. 3 and the report of sale by the Revenue Inspector do conclusivelly speak of the fact of the attachment of the crop in question.

3. It is said that the report of attachment by the village officer bears a date which was corrected and that it was antidated and could not have been written on the day it purports to have been executed, and there was no reason for its being received in the Taluk office 2 days' late *i. e.* on the 5th February instead of 3rd February, if it was really drawn up on the 3rd February your petitioner begs to state that he was absent from the village and he knows nothing about the report in question. It is true when examined by the Deputy Tahsildar, your petitioner deposed that he was present on the morning of the 30th January, the day on which the crop was actually attached and gave instructions as to how the report should be drafted, but he begs to state he was not at all present at the moment when the crop was attached, nor was he present when the report was drafted, he having gone to Mosalimadugu to the Revenue Inspector. There was nothing to construe him to be present all day long and this is in no way inconsistent with what he deposed before the Deputy Collector.

4. It is said that the correction of the date in the report of attachment gives an air of suspicion in respect of geniousness of document in question. If

your petitioner as alleged by the Deputy Tahsildar and others was really an interested party and had really had a hand in it, it was not unpracticable nor impossible for him to draft a fair report without any corrections.

5. It is said that the complainant Achamma made no mention of the attachment of the crop, and this has been considered as substantial cases to presume the absence of attachment. Your petitioner begs to state, that by no authority she was questioned as to whether the crop in question was attached by the village officers. She was the proper person to depose as to the fact of the attachment of the crop and such a person was not examined. It is therefore necessary that she may be ordered to be examined on this point.

6. When the attachment has been found to be a fact then the sole ground of the charge against the petitioner falls to the ground and he therefore begs to be restored to his appointment of the Karnikam office of Nagatoor.

7. Your petitioner begs to bring forward your honor, that he has served as Karnam for a period of 15 years without committing any sort of mistakes or anything. The petitioner humbly begs to lay it before your Excellency that no justice, the poor petitioner has obtained in the lower Courts. Therefore your petitioner most humbly prays Your honor will kindly take the poor petitioner's circumstances into your honor's kind consideration and restore him to his Karanikam of Nagatoor village.

With profound repect
Your petitioner begs to remain,

Karanum. Subbarayudu

Your Excellency's Humõle Petitioner.

Dated,
18-11-[illegible]

3

Government of Madras.

Read C.No. 8623 of 96.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement No. 635 R d/25-3-97

Note

Bpad[illegible]

The petition is dt 18-11-96.

O.A. 24 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.

(By Order.)

(O.C)

Thst 25/3/97.

~~Under~~ *Secretary to Government.*

FORT ST. GEORGE,

189 .

To the petr with Enclosures

dis. 29-3-97

5

e/AV 24/3/97.

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.