Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 649

DATED 26th March 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

INFORMING Kothandaraama Iyengar, late Village Munsif of Uttaramallur Village, Madurantakam Taluk, Chingleput District, that, under section 23 of Madras Act III of 1895, as amended by Act IV 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 (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1043

Intercourse
Cor. 3566/96

C.P.
9/Feb/97

Order

From C. Kothundrama Aiyangar
Village Munsiff
Uttaramallur
Madurantakam Taluq
Chingleput Dt.

No.

Dated 28-1-97

Received 30-1-97

Registered 4-2-97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Praying that he has received no orders to his previous petitions of 7th October 1896.

Regd to clerk
5-2-97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No	Department.	Date.
	Cos-7566/96		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

The Secretary to Government

Revenue Department

Fort St. George

SECY. GOVT. MADRAS
30 JAN 97
REV. DEPT.

PETITION respectfully showeth.

9008

REVENUE DEPT

That your humble petitioner sent in an appeal petition regarding the post of Village Munsiff of Kakamalur, Madurantacam Tq: Chengleput Dist. as long ago as 7th oct 96 and that he has not received any order thereon as yet.

Cos. 7566/96 lying over

As he is anxious to see that justice is done to him at an early date (the) he respectfully requests that final orders may be passed in his case after a kind perusal of all the records sent with his original petition

I beg to remain

Most honored Sir

28th Jany '97

Your most obedient and humble Servant

Address

C. Kothandarama Aiyangar

Village Munsiff

Uttaramallur

Madurantacam Tq: Chengleput D.

Revenue (1896) Department.

~~D. O. No.~~

Current Number 7566

SECRETARIAT 19 OCT 1896 REVENUE

From

H. A. Stuart Esqre I.C.S.
Private secretary to
His Excellency the Governor.

D. O.

No.

Dated 15 October 1896.

Received 19-10-96

Registered 23-10-96.

Enclosures 10

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Transfers a petition dated 1st October 1896 from Kottanda-
-rama aiyangar late Munsif
Madhurantakam Taluk, Chin-
-gleput Dt. praying that he
may be restored to his former
post.

By order

H. A. Stuart

Private Secretary.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

0518

REVENUE DEPT

To

His Excellency

SIR ARTHUR ELIBANK HAVELOCK G. C. M. G., G. C. S. I.

GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

The humble Petition of KOTHANDA RAMA IYENGAR
Munsiff Monigar of Kakanallur village,
Madurantacam Taluq, Chenglepet
District.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH.

1. That this is an Appeal re Munsiff's post of the above village against the order of the Board of Revenue dated 25th August 1896 No. 2323 rejecting the appeal against the Collector's order dated 17th July 1896 No. 2013 under Section 23 of Madras Act III of 1895 stating that no second appeal lies to the Board against appointments made at a revision of village Establishments. But in the order of the Government of Madras, No. 276, dated 22nd June 1896 His Excellency in Council have decided that all appeals rejected by the Board under Section 23 of Act III of 1895 should be reopened by that authority *suo motu* and decided upon merits.

2. That the village had three monigars before revision; but when, at revision, the number was reduced to two your petitioner was thrown out and two others were retained. Your petitioner has on his side all the grounds contemplated in Act III of 1895 for the preference of a monigar at the time of revision and the Respondent has none whatever as will be seen below. Yet all these grounds have been unjustly overlooked by the Tahsildar Mr. Loganatha Iyer whose recommendation has been adopted by the Sub-Collector.

3. The grounds in brief are:—

a. The village has not been affected by Revision since its limits have not been changed and there has been only a reduction in the number of its officers from 3 to 2.

b. Your petitioner is a Mirasidar whereas the Respondent is not.

c. Your petitioner's service, family or personal, is immensely greater than that of the other.

d. Your petitioner is a Munsiff Monigar while the other is only a Revenue Monigar.

e. Your petitioner's Kist to Government is greater than that of the other.

f. Your petitioner's personal service of 20 years without any single fine is itself an evidence of his competency.

g. Your petitioner has not been found guilty of any short comings and has further had many testimonials from Messrs. Price and Farmer, the Deputy Tahsildars, the police Inspector and the union Chairman of the Taluq to testify to his good conduct and character, *Vide* Exhibits 3 to 6.

h. That the Collector's remark in his Pros under Appeal that the acting and permanent Thasildars and the Sub-Collector consider your petitioner as unsuited to hold the post is a remark unsupported by evidence. The Tasildars referred to are M. R. Ry. Arumugam Pillai and Loganatha Iyer who have not supported their statements by proving, in what respect, and when and how your petitioner was a fomenter of quarrels. As regards the Collecter's allusion to the Sub-Collector's observation your petitioner begs to point out, that petitioner is aware of no such remark. Further, it is not equitable that a public servant of Mirasi right should be removed from his long held Mirasi post on account of some opinion formed by any officer unsupported by evidence.

4. While such has been the state of things, the Tahsildar Mr. Loganatha Iyer who was under suspension and who is the present stationary Magistrate of Chingleput, has entered in the revision statement (1) that your petitioner is fomenter of quarrels, in Uttaramallur between the police, the chairman and the Sub-magistrate (2) that he is therefore incompetent (3) that he was lately reported on more than once and (4) that he should therefore not be preferred to the Respondent.

5. Your petitioner here humbly begs to point out that the above remarks on your petitioner are unwarranted and one sided and also erroneous. The certificates enclosed herein and the absence of the Tasildar's reference to any order of his or his higher authorities are alone sufficient to disprove the remarks. And Your petitioner has never been punished for his alleged quarrelsome spirit in any Revenue or Criminal Courts but on the contrary he has had good testimonials from the officers concerned. These constitute a sufficient answer to the Collector's remark that petitioner has not established a character for straight forward discharge of duty. The Deputy Tahsildar reports have ended in petitioner being found by the Sub-Collector to be blameless.

6. So from these it is clear that the Tasildar has erroneously and from prejudice recommended the other man in preference to your petitioner. This was approved by the Sub Collector who seems not to have entered into the case deeply nor has the Collector to whom an appeal was preferred done Justice to your petitioner.

7. In these circumstances your petitioner humbly prays that His Excellency in Council will kindly admit this appeal and call for the records from the Collector and render him Justice by restoring him to his post considering his 20 years approved service in the same post which was in his family for more than 200 Years and considering the Board's repeated orders and decisions that a Munsiff Monigar is always to be preferred to a Revenue Monigar who is in this case *a gire* Mirasidar who has also been fined once or twice and who is in every way inferior to the petitioner as shown in para 3 above.

For this act of Justice your petitioner shall as in duty bound ever pray.

1st October 1896.

Government of Madras.

Read cos. 7566 of 96 and 643 of 97.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement No. 649 dt 26th March 97

Xpd 25/3/97

Note
The first petition to Govt is dt 15-10-96.

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.

C.P. 24 March 97

(By Order.)
(O.C.)

Under-Secretary to Government.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
189 .

To the petr with Encls

Rd. 30-3-97

Xpd 23/3/97.

n given for copying ____
n copied ____
n examined ____
n signed ____
} 189.

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

URRENT 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.