Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 669

DATED 26th March 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Referring Kuppuswami Naidu &c. village Munsiff of Ulundamangalam group Chingleput Dt: to the orders already passed.

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. 7565

From Kuppuswami Nayudu
Ex. Village Mff:
of Veludamangalam
from the
No. Chingleput Dt.

Order

Dated 16.10.96

Received 21.10.96

Registered 23.10.96

Enclosures 4

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Praying for the appt.
of Village Mff: Munsif.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	" No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE

THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

FORT SAINT GEORGE.

The Humble Petition of KUPPUSAMI NAYADU,
Ex. Village Munsif of Uludamangalam group, No. 87 attached to Madurantakam Taluq, Chingleput District.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH :—

1. Petitioner begs most respectfully and confidently to submit his painful history to your Excellency in Council, as the ultimate and certain fountain of pure and strict justice opened to the aggrieved subjects of Her Magesty in the Presidency.

2. Petitioner's great apprehension is that the Honorable Government may perhaps decline to interfere with this petition, as there lay no appeal against the Proceedings of the Collector of Chingleput District, dated 26th June 1896, by which, Petitioner humbly submits, he has been summarily deprived of the post of Village Munsif which he held for a period of over 25 years. Petitioner could have sought redress at the hands of the Board of Revenue against the dire Order of the Collector, if it were possible for him to do so, but under the existing rules, second appeal would not be admitted by the Board. In these circumstances, Petitioner would most respectfully submit that the Government in the exercise of their prerogative power, can admit this memorial, and Petitioner trusts that his petition will be received as a matter of grace.

3. Petitioner's case, it would appear to your Excellency in Council, is one of considerable hardship and deserving of commisseration, and Petitioner has, moreover, perfect confidence that no man however abject or low placed need despair of relief, provided he only takes proper steps to make a full representation of his claims. Petitioner has therefore now made bold to lay his grievances at the feet of mercy and justice.

4. Petitioner's forefathers held the office of Village Munsif hereditarily in Irusama nallur No. 345 now clubbed with Kinar Vattam, from time immemorial. Petitioner & after them, was appointed Munsif not only of the said Village of Irusamanallur, but also of two other Villages, viz. Murukkanjeri No. 344 and Valurpirai No. 346, at the old revision of the Village Establishments Petitioner performed his duties as Monigar and Munsif in the said 3 Villages, until the recent revision, with tried ability, unflagging industry and perfect integrity. All the Revenue Officials under whom Petitioner had the happiness to serve were very favorably impressed with the conduct, character and work of the Petitioner.

5. Petitioner would here parenthetically submit that tho' he was fully occupied in his revenue work, yet he spared and devoted a portion of his time in co-operating with the Vaccination staff. So zealously, and actively did the Petitioner help the Vaccinators by encouraging the Village people of uncultivated minds to tender their children for vaccinating them, that he succeeded in getting more than 200 children Vaccinated. Petitioner's services towards Vaccination were so well appreciated that he considers it noteworthy to mention the expression of opinion placed on record by the President of the District Board, Chingleput, which runs as follows :—

> " The President, District Board, Chingleput, notes with satisfaction the services rendered by the undermentioned Village Munsifs in encouraging and promoting the spread of Vaccination :—
>
> (1) Venketaramanjum Pillai, Village Munsif, Covelong.
> (2) Kuppusami Nayadu, Village Munsif of Uludamangalam.
> (3) Appasami Mudali Do. of Kinar.

This recognition of the said 3 Munsifs, of whom No. 2 is the Petitioner, has been also notified on 23rd April 1896 in Madras and Chingleput District Gazette, dated May 2, 1896.

6. The 3 Villages of which Petitioner was Munsif have been disposed of at the recent revision held on 11th December 1895, by clubbing Irusamanallur with Kinar, and adding Murukkanjeri and Valurperai to Kavathur and Uludamangalam Vattams respectively.

7. As Irusamanallur, one of the Villages over which the Petitioner exercised his powers as Village Munsif and in which he holds pattah lands, was clubbed with Kinar, it might be asked why Petitioner did not claim to be Munsif of Kinar Vattam. But in answer, Petitioner in fair justice to the present office holder of the said Vattam should and would confess that the said Kinar Vattam is a very big group, paying a comparatively large beriz to Government, and that the person appointed is a hereditary Mirassidar.

Next comes the Petitioner's Village of Murukkanjeri, and this was cloubbed with Kavattur Vattam, in respect of which, Petitioner would honestly admit that he has no better claims than the person appointed therefor.

The third Village is Valurperai, wherein also Petitioner owns lands. This Village has been included in Uludamangalam group, and Petitioner sanguinely hoped to become the Munsif of the said group.

8. There were 3 claimants including the Petitioner to the office of Village Munsif for Uludamangalam Vattam. The Sub-Collector in bestowing upon their applications a cool and dispassionate consideration, has elected the Petitioner for Uludamangalam Vattam, having regard to Petitioner's industrious, unsullied and long service of over 25 years as Village Munsif. The proper person, one Chinnasami Nayadu, the Village Munsif of C. Village of Uludamangalam, has resigned his post, and Petitioner has been selected as the fittest man. Moreover, Valurperai the Village of the Petitioner is as quite near as the C. Village as Mulli, which the Collector has evidently overlooked, and has accordingly appointed the Petitioner as Munsif of Uludamangalam Vattam on 18—12—1895, passing the Order as follows :—

"The choice lies between Sonachala Mudali of Mulli and Kuppusami Naick (the Petitioner) of Valurpurai. The latter's claims were overlooked when this statement relating to enquiries at the Revision) was drawn up. He has 25 years service in Valurpurai which before taken as part of Irusamanallur now included in group No. 79. Sonachala Mudali has only 5 years service. Both men have defaulters. Kuppusami Naick is appointed."

9. Petitioner considers that he should explain and satisfy your Excellency, as regards the alleged defaulters of the Petitioner and his competitor. In the Revenue Department, the highest subordinate—from Tahsildar and down to the Vetti the lowest Village servant are often censured. Remissness on their part is often noticed, and they are frequently either warned or otherwise punished departmentally. But such defaulters are altogether put out of consideration by the superiors, when chances for promotion occur, and in fact the subordinates are notwithstanding lifted up. On this matter, the Collector in his order on the appeal of the Petitioner's competitor Sonachala Mudali, remarks, "So far as previous punishments for departmental errors are concerned, there is nothing to choose between Sonachala Mudali and the respondent".

10. Sonachala Mudali being discomfited by the Sub-Collector's Order dated 18-12-95, preferred an appeal to the Collector on 6-2-96, and thereupon the Collector most summarily disposed it of exparte in favor of the said Sonachella Mudali, without a word of explanation from the Petitioner, despite his protest in writing that due notice should be given him of the date of hearing of the said appeal.

11. The Collector by allowing the appeal, has deprived the Petitioner of his post, and appointed Sonachella Mudali in his stead, as Munsif of Uludamangalam group. The dire effect of this order is undescribable. It scatters away to the wind all his long and faithful service extending over 25 years as Village Munsif. It eats away Petitioner's mind and soul.

12. The Collector assigned no valid reasons for appointing Sonachella Mudali in preference to the Petitioner, who, on the other hand, possesses superior claims. The Uludamangalam Vattam comprises, under the present revision of five Villages, viz, (1) Uludamangalam (2) Valurpurai (3) Kadiricheri (4) Munnutte Kuppam and (5) Mulli. The Collector in his order under objection, observes, entirely relying on the bare statements of the persons who appealed, that the Petitioner holds no lands in any of the Villages constituting the group. The Collector is not, Petitioner submits with all deference to him, justified in

accepting their version in its entirety, without any evidence or public record in support thereof. The appellants, it is natural, generally make reckless statements as against the person they oppose, in their own interest, and hope to throw dust in the eyes of the superiors.

As a matter of fact, Petitioner would emphatically assert, that he does hold lands under patta No. 5 in Valurpurai included in Uludamangalam Vattam, and pays a kist of Rs. 15 thereon to Government. The Collector, however, subsequently admits that Petitioner alleged about his holding lands in Valurpurai, and about his residing in that Village. This Petitioner would most submissively state, gives a lie to the statement of the appellant against, the Petitioner. The Collector further passed remarks in the following words.

"It is however evident that his (Petitioner's) interests in the group are much smaller than those of the Mirassi office holders of the other minor Villages of the group".

Here Petitioner would most humbly submit, with highest respect to the Collector, that the above remarks are untenable, in as much as the Collector is merely drawing upon his imagination. It has not been shewn by appellant Sonachala Mudali that Petitioner possesses claims inferior to him or to the other holders of the minor Villages. On the other hand Sonachela Mudali held the office of Munsif in Mulli clubbed with Uludamangalam only for a very short period of 5 years, as observed also by the Sub-Collector, and his father prior to him for twice that period. Sonachala Mudali holds no patta for his lands in Mulli Village exclusively in his name, but he pays his quota of kist, say about 12 Rupees, on the common pattah standing in the names of the several coparceners of his family.

13. Sonachala Mudali who has succeeded in his appeal to the Collector has wilfully and falsely furnished information that the service rendered by him or his family extends to about 60 years, when the statement relating to the claims of the several office holders was drawn up.

14. Petitioner would respectfully urge on the kind attention of your Excellency in Council that he has unquestionably better claims than those of the said Sonachala Mudali, which will be found to be true, when the facts, that Petitioner holds pattah No. 5, Pattah No. 1 and Pattah No. 97 in the villages of Valurpurai, Irusamanallur and Kinar respectively, of which, Valurpurai is clubbed with the group in question, are taken into consideration. Petitioner pays assessment to the extent of Rs. 110 for the lands in the said 3 villages.

15. The Collector after making one or two sweeping remarks in the absence of Petitioner, has jumped into the conclusion that Sonachala Mudali who had appealed to him is the person that has the best claims. It may be that Mulli Village of the Petitioner has the largest beriz- a beriz more than twice than that of Valurpurai, but this fact cannot, Petitioner respectfully submits, create a better title in Sonachala Mudali. The question to be considered is what assessment the said Sonachala Mudali pays to Government, and whether it is larger than that paid by the Petitioner. As already submitted, Sonachala Mudali pays only Rs. 12 or 13 for his quota under the general pattah of the family, while the assessment levied from the Petitioner is somewhere about Rs. 110. As regards the beriz, Petitioner would prominently bring to the kind consideration of your Excellency in Council, that the aggregate beriz for the 3 Villages of which Petitioner was Munsif till the present revision, is about Rs. 700 which is approximately the same as that of Mulli, the Petitioner's Village. Then, as regards the amount of service put in by the Petitioner and the said Sonachala Mudali, Petitioner would humbly and prominently mention that he Petitioner has put in over 25 years service as against 5 years service of the Collector's nominee, the said Sonachala Mudali.

16. Petitioner therefore most humbly prays that the Honorable Government will be graciously pleased to take into a fair and cool consideration all the facts and circumstances herein set out, having in view in particular the long, faithful and industrious service of the Petitioner extending over 25 years, and direct the restoration of the Petitioner to the post of Village Munsif of Uludamangalam group to which he had been appointed by the Sub Collector after mature consideration, or, to refer this memorial to the Honorable Board of Revenue for a full enquiry into Petitioner's grievances and for disposal after satisfying themselves with the several averments of the Petitioner in respect of his claims.

For which act of benevolence and merciful dispensation of justice, Petitioner shall, as in duty bound,

EVER PRAY.

16-10-98

PETITION
9314
REVENUE DEPT

CHIEF SECRETARY
19 OCT 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

To

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE

THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

FORT SAINT GEORGE.

The Humble Petition of KUPPUSAMI NAYADU,
Ex. Village Munsif of Uludamangalam group
No. 87, attached to Maduranticum Taluq,
Chingleput District.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH :—

1. Petitioner begs to approach your Excellency in Council with considerable reluctance and apprehension. He is painfully conscious of urging his case by again submitting the appeal. Petitioner would abide by the natural course of events, if it were possible for him to do so. But as it is not, Petitioner feels constrained to crave the kind indulgence of your Excellency in Council for resubmitting his appeal, under the following circumstances, and humbly beseeches your Excellency's kind attention and favorable consideration of it.

2. Petitioner respectfully begs to state that he presented the enclosed petition to your Excellency in Council on 4-9-96 for reinstatement to his post of Village Munsif conferred on him by the Sub Collector of Chingleput at the recent revision of the Village Establishments.

3. The Government communicated to the Petitioner, to his sore disappointment and grief, by Endorsement No. 3682 Mis, Revenue Department dated 14th September 1896, that under Act III of 1895, no appeal lies to them.

4. Petitioner would now prominently bring to the notice of your Excellency in Council that in para 2 of his enclosed petition he himself expressed his apprehension as to the admissibility of his appeal to Government. He, however, entertained a sanguine hope that the August Government might, in the exercise of their prerogative power, admit the appeal and render him retributive justice. Petitioner also stated that he was unable to seek redress at the hands of the Revenue Board, as no second appeal lies to it.

5. Under the above circumstances, Petitioner threw himself upon the clemency of your Excellency in Council, and again now, despite the order of Government rejecting the petition under Act III of 1895, the Petitioner ignoring considerations of being tiresome or vexatious, begs to resubmit his appeal, relying on a very recent G. O., and with perfect confidence that whatever may be the momentary annoyance, nothing that is incompatible with justice, mercy and good conscience, can emanate from her majesty's noble Government.

6. The prayer of this hapless petitioner was, as will appear in the last para of his memorial hereto annexed, alternative.

Petitioner solicited that the Government will either dispose it of, by directing the restoration of the Petitioner to the post of Village of Uludamangalam group in consideration of his long, industrious and unsullied service extending over 25 years, or, to refer his memorial

to the Honorable Board of Revenue for a full enquiry into Petitioner's grievances and for disposal after satisfying themselves, with the several averments of the Petitioner in respect of his claims.

7. Petitioner deeply regrets that his alternative prayer also was not granted, altho' the Government so recently as in June 1896, did refer an exactly similar petition to the Board of Revenue.

8. In the case of one Ramasami Nayadu, Ex. Village Munsif of Vilagam Streeperumatur Division, Chingleput District, the Government transferred his petition against the Proceedings of the Collector of Chingleput District, superseding him by another claimant, by their Order No. 1258, R dated 23rd June 1896, for Revision, with reference to G. O. No. 276 dated 22nd June 1896.

9. Unfortunately, the Petitioner is not in possession of the said G. O. No. 276, dated 22nd June 1896, under which the Petition of the aforesaid Ramasami Nayadu was transferred to the Revenue Board, and therefore he is unable to dwell at length on it. However, Petitioner most humbly submits that there is the Government Order, plain as anything is, and Petitioner is at a loss to conceive why his case cannot be governed by it.

10. Petitioner therefore most humbly beseeches your Excellency in Council to at least transfer his petition also to the Board of Revenue for revision, with reference to G. O. No. 276, dated 22nd June 1896, as they were pleased to do in the case of Ramasami Nayadu, the Ex. Village Munsif of Vilagam in Sreeperumatur Division, by their Order No. 1258 dated 23rd June 1896, or, to direct or permit the Petitioner in the alternative, to submit his petition of appeal to the Board of Revenue.

11. Petitioner in conclusion begs very humbly the pardon of your Excellency in Council for his ostensible boldness in resubmitting his memorial to Government, notwithstanding their endorsement No. 3632, Mis. R. D. dated 14th September 1896, as he does merely relying on G. O. No. 276 dated 22nd June 1896.

Petitioner shall, as in duty bound, for the merciful dispensation of justice that he sanguinely expects.

16-10-96

EVER PRAY.

INDIAN PRESS, CHINGLEPUT.

Read cr. 7565 of 96
C.O.R. No. 669 d. 26th March 97

The petr is referred to the orders already passed and informed that the Govt cannot interfere.

25/3/97.

Ap 26/3/97

Lt

Note

The first petition to Govt was dt 4-9-96.

C.P.
25/3/97

To the petr with Encls
27.3.97

eHW
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.