Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 995

DATED 22nd May

[Despatch Abstract.]

Seeing no reason to interfere on behalf of Maddalam Chetty, late Village Munsiff of Gogai, Salem Dh, in the matter of his dismissal from the Vice

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. 4120

Dp. 22-5-97

From Maddalam Chetty, late Village Munsiff of Gogai.

No. Salem

Order ~~No.~~ R. no. 995 d/22nd May '97.

The Government sees no reason to interfere on behalf of the petitioner.

[signature]

Dated 12.5.97

Received 15.5.97

Registered 17.5.97

Enclosures 4.

Spare copies

List

To the petitioner with Encls } Dd. 28-5-97

Note

The Village offices in Salem are not hereditary. Hence the above draft vide G.O. No. 561 d/18th Feby 1896

[initials] 20 May 97

SUBJECT.

Appealing against his dismissal from the office of Village munsiff.

BACK PAPERS.

9

G.O.	No	Department.	Date.
	561		5-2-97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Salem
12th May 1897

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 14 MAY 97

CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 15 MAY 1897

COURT FEE TWO RUPEES

12-5-97

PETITION To
0414
REVENUE DEPT

His Excellency the Governor in Council
Madras

The memorial of one Maddalam Chetty
Ex-village Munsiff of Gogai, Salem.

May it please your Excellency.

That the Petitioner was the village munsiff of Gogay, for several years, but was dismissed from service by the false representations of some of his dissatisfied men of his village, at whose instance he was at first suspended by the Head Quarters Deputy Collector of Salem.

2. That the Petitioner was charged of having received illegal gratification from the several Suitors who had filed petty Civil Suits in his Court, to influence him in his Capacity as a village Munsiff.

3. That the Memorialist is quite unaware of the several payments made. though he had satisfactorily Explained his case, witness Ramaswamy Chetty, who bears a grudge all along against Petitioner, because he did not get the Village Munsiff's post when he tried for it. Concocted a case against him.

him forming himself into a clique with some of his enemies.

4. The head Quarters Deputy magistrate, who held an enquiry into the case, without entering into his defence was of opinion that he (Petitioner) would have levied black mail under the pretext of Court Expences, and Copying fees - rather giving Credit to the pleas of his enemies argument.

5. That the memorialist is a man holding extensive lands paying 80Rs yearly khists to Government, and living upon the rich income of his lands. That he is a Mirasdar. Pays also house tax of Rs 7—6—a

6. That the charge were simply Contrived up by this Memorialist from holding the place.

7. That his enemy, Appana chetti not being Content with the punishment he had, from the Head Quarters Deputy Magistrate again petitioned to the District Collector. on 16.5.96, to criminally prosecute him. From this, Your Excellency will judge, how eager, his enemies were, to ruin him.

8. That the memorialist at the hard shock he had, at the hands of Head Quarters, Dy. Magistrate, fell ill & could not prefer an appeal against the order of Suspension—

(2) sheet.

his Enemies had tried these means also to get the Memorialist into difficulties.

9. The District Collector, had totally dismissed Memorialist from service, giving weight to the Counter-parties petitions & basing his grounds that the Memorialist had preferred no appeal, against the order of Suspension.

10. Memorialist had appealed to the Honorable Board of Revenue, against this unusual method of dealing justice with a double hand. — the two authorities inflicting two kinds of punishment to suit each one's discretion.

11. That when once justice is rendered by a Court — and the Appellate Court, would not interfere Even though it considers the punishment is not severe, Considering its heinousness, but would Simply Confirm it —

12. In the Memorialist's case, the adverse party had sought for permission & have him Criminally prosecuted. The Collector could have given them permission, &

could have
& the memorialist had a better chance
to defend himself & thus disprove the
charges

13 The present nominee is one
of those interested in his prosecution.
He was once holding the same
appointment, but was dismissed
in the year 1892 by Mr G. Stokes,
for bad Conduct - Memorialist
was once Compelled to accept this
Honorary post by the then Head Quarters
Deputy Collector Mr Kodanda Ramier
and besides the post is "honorary"

14. That the ~~small~~ sums, Memorialist
was supposed to have received from the
suitors is so small, that no man of
ordinary understanding could ever
think, Petitioner would have brooked
& accept them, under Circumstances
referred to -

15. Most of the Opulent men of
his village, who were once free of
Income tax - are now dissatisfied
with the Memorialist because they
were taxed - under the Income tax
act, by the sole interference & report
of the Memorialist -

4th sheet.

The Memorialists in bringing his unfortunate case into ~~you~~ His Excellency's benign Consideration, submitting also the papers connected with his case - begs leave that ~~you~~ His Excellency will consider first, his position, and the daring spirit of the Counter parties & the non-interference of the Board, at whose hands Memorialists expected a fair justice -

That his Excellency will protect his interests by rendering justice -

For such act of Charity, Petitioner & Memorialists shall ever pray -

Your Excellency's Obedt. subject.

(5th sheet.)

[illegible]

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