

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 1965

DATED 23rd April

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording, with remark, Board's Proceedings
submitting to Government, with remark, the review
petition of T. Alvariah, Late Sub-Inspector, Cum-
brum Circle, appealing against the Board's order
confirming the order of dismissal passed on him
by the Deputy Commissioner, Central Division

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 (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 2345

87-23/4/58

Cnos 2345 + 2401/98

From

The Secretary to the
Commission of Salt, Akbari and
Separate Revenue.

Order Misc. No. 17658/23.4.98.

Recorded with
reference to Ex. No^s 2690
D 9.7.97 & 561 D 18.3.9

Mis No. 1066
 Dated 18th March 1898.

Received, 23

Registered 247

Enclosures /

Spare copies

To the petr with ¹⁰⁸ mels. } depos.
11104-112401 } 27.4.28.

SUBJECT.

Note. The pet'r now sends Submitting to Government with
up another copy of his re- remarks the review petition of I
view petition disposed of in Alwariah late Sub. Inspector
the G.O's above quoted, & addendum Circle, appealing again
that if he cannot be restored the Board's Order confirming him
to his former post, his re- order of dismissal passed on his
employment in some suit- by the Deputy Commissioner
able place may be ordered. Local Division

44
8/6/98

Me

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	2690	Rev	9.7.96.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE
SIR ARTHUR ELIBANK HAVELOCK, G.C.M.G., Kt., G.C.I.E.,
Governor & President-in-Council
of Fort St. George,
MADRAS.

(Through the Honorable the Board of Revenue, Separate Revenue).

*The humble review petition of T. ALWARIAH,
residing at Madras, late Sub-Inspector of
Salt and Abkari Revenue, Cumbum Circle,
Kurnool District.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That the memorialist was in January 1894 a Sub-Inspector of Salt and Abkari Revenue, Cumbum Circle, Kurnool District, in the Presidency of Madras, on a salary of Rs. 60, and had been in the said Department of service for a period of over 16 years.

2. That during the said period he conscientiously believes he had given more than usual satisfaction to his official superiors (*vide* Enclosures B. and C.) and he obtained promotion so lately as 1892.

3. That in January 1894 he was dismissed the service under order of the Deputy Commissioner, Central Division, dated 22nd Idem.

4. That the fault which the memorialist has been found guilty of is that in his diary (Enc. D) submitted for the week ending 9th December 1893, a mis-statement appears that he visited 2 villages which he had not visited.

5. That the memorialist made no sort of attempt to deny the inaccuracy of the entry, but honestly at the very outset admitted it was a mistake, and his explanation was that the entry was by oversight copied from a programme he had sketched out for his guidance before he started on his visits for the day.

6. That his case is stated at length in his petitions to the Honorable the Board of Revenue and Government (*vide* Enclosures J. and L.) but without success (*vide* Enclosures K. and M. respectively).

7. That the memorialist begs to state that Sub-Inspectors of Salt and Abkari Revenue are not entitled to batta or travelling allowance though they may inspect any number of villages and that the memorialist cannot therefore be said to have had any fraudulent motive in making the entry, but that he most solemnly declares that it is only an innocent mistake.

8. That the memorialist likewise humbly ventures to point out that the Honorable the Board of Revenue also falls, to his misfortune, into the error of supposing in effect that his explanation aforesaid regarding the said mistake of entry is an after-thought on the ground that when suddenly called upon personally without any previous intimation to explain the inaccurate entry, he stated to the Assistant Commissioner who questioned him that he *could not account for it*, for the memorialist humbly *submits* that that could be the honest and conscientious answer that one in his then position could give, without hazarding a guess, until he could *find out* by looking into his papers or thinking over the matter or otherwise *how* he had been *led into the mistake*. It need hardly be stated that in all cases of this kind, and as it invariably obtains in the Department, some previous intimation should be given of the charge laid before obtaining explanation, and if such regular procedure had been adopted, what the Honorable Board erroneously conceives to be an inconsistency but is *not really* one, would never have appeared in the explanation.

9. That the memorialist prays that he may not be understood as denying culpability altogether on his part, but, unequivocally admitting the same, as he has all along done, he ventures to submit that it is so venial, as may appear from its nature and from *much* graver cases of misconduct discovered and comparatively excused in the same Department of service that the punishment awarded to him is out of all proportion to his transgression. Here, your memorialist begs to bring to Your Excellency's notice the punishment which the memorialist understands has been inflicted in the undermentioned cases which are of far more serious nature.

(a). One S. Govindu Chetty formerly a Sub-Inspector in the Salt and Abkari Department was charged with overstorage of Salt (which means considerable loss of money to Government) in 1877 or 1878 when he was Assistant Superintendent in Factory Establishment. He was first dismissed and subsequently on a re-consideration re-instated by the Board of Revenue.

(b). Again, in 1888 or 1889 when he was Sub-Inspector in Bellary Circle a report was made against him by the Inspector Mr. Miransirali Sahib, containing charges of *misappropriation of reward money and sending in false diaries*, and the memorialist understands that the Sub-Inspector was thereupon so leniently dealt with that only an order of suspension for two or three months was passed in his case by the higher authorities, whereas the humble memorialist, though found fault with for the first time and for a clerical mistake, has been so severely dealt with.

(c). The memorialist also understands that it is only recently that one Mr. Mitchell, Assistant Inspector in the Salt and Abkari Department, submitted a false diary, an offence similar to that of Your Excellency's memorialist but he was only reduced to the next grade. Your Excellency's memorialist humbly begs to mention here that Assistant Inspectors when they go out on tour of inspection are entitled to travelling allowance. But, Sub-Inspectors to which class Your Excellency's memorialist belonged are not entitled to batta or travelling allowance under the rules. Consequently Your Excellency's memorialist could not have made false entries with the intention of defrauding Government of the travelling allowance.

(d). The memorialist also understands that a Sub-Registrar, or Registrar, a graduate, put in a false Travelling Allowance Bill for which he was fined Rs. 10.

(e.) That further, he has not been brought up to any other work but pen and paper, and with this unmerited stigma in his character he is unable to go and seek for employment elsewhere; he deeply regrets therefore that the effects of the undeservedly severe order of dismissal will in short expose the humble petitioner and his family to extreme misery and poverty.

10. That before he was taken into the Salt and Abkari Department by the Honorable Mr. Bliss, Your Excellency's memorialist was employed as a Ledger-keeper in the well known firm of Messrs. Arbuthnot and Co., Madras, and the reputation which he established there may be understood from the testimonial granted by them (*vide* Enclosure A). Had he remained there by this time he would have been drawing a salary of more than 100 Rs. a month, whereas, the punishment now inflicted on him, is by one stroke, ignores a long period of arduous and honest service, and consigns him to practical ruin by subjecting him to forfeiture of pension and thereby depriving him and his family of means of livelihood at a time of his life when he cannot seek another calling, leaving alone the fact that with the stigma cast upon his character by the authority to whose service he devoted the best part of his life, he can hardly apply for employment any where.

11. That the memorialist, earnestly and with all the solicitude that a poor ruined man can put forth, appeals to Your Excellency-in-Council for a generous re-consideration of his case and for a meed of that characteristic justice which every subject of her Majesty's rule hopefully and confidently expects to have eventually (though for a time it may fail him) seeing that for a very small dereliction he has been visited with a crushing penalty, and that the loss of pay which he has sustained from February 1894 (amounting to over Rs. ³⁰⁰⁰~~1700~~) is more than adequate to his small offence, and that his restoration to service will only save a faithful servant of unblemished record for 16 years and his family ^{consisting of his wife and 3 children} from an unhappy wreck.

12. For which act of charity and justice Your Excellency's humble memorialist shall, as in duty bound,

EVER PRAY.

24th March 1898.
MADRAS, ~~June 15~~, 1898.

J. Alwariah
Sahib Sub-Inspector of Salt & Abkari

12. In conclusion, the petitioner prays that at least his re-employment in Government Service in some suitable appointment, may be ordered: if not, his restoration to his former post.

Address.

J. Alwariah
204, Ramanuja Iyer Street, Washermunpettah, Madras.

SALT

PET REGR NO 375.85


Ref. It is grass since he was

dismissed

cg

7-3-95

493



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Separate Revenue),

Dated 18th March, 1898.

Mis No. 1066.

Read review petition from T. Alwariah.
Madras. dated 4th March 1898.

Resolution

Submitted to Government

2. The petitioner has not forwarded the enclosures referred to in his petition, but as the latter is simply another copy of the one rejected by Government in Government order Mis No. 2690. dated 9th July. 1896, the Board believes it is unnecessary to detain it in order to send for them.


(True extract)

R. M. Thacker

Ag Assistant Secretary.

To The Secretary to Government. Rev. Department.
With the petition.

22/3/98



15
Sub. received
7/3/95

Appealing against the order
of the Deputy Commr. since
Central Dir. in dismissing
him from the office
in January 1896.

V. J. S.
1073

1898
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
2345

473 2 74

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 2401.

Order

From

T. Alwariah
Lat. Sub-Inspector of
Salt & Abkari Revenue
No. *Madras.*

Dated *24 Mar*

Received *24*

Registered *25*

Enclosures *10.*

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Praying that the enclosures
submitted herewith may be
put up with his petition sub-
mitted to Govt through the B?
of Rev. for favourable considera-
tion & orders.

K. S.
25.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

0218

Madras, March 24, 1898.

To REVENUE DEPT

The Secretary to Government

Revenue Department.

Fort St George.

Respected Sir,

I beg respectfully to state that on the 4th Instant I submitted through the Board of Revenue. Separate Revenue my review petition to His Excellency the Governor in Council, but through an oversight the enclosures were not submitted at the time.

As my petition would have reached Government by this time I beg now to submit the enclosures with the request that the review petition and the enclosures may be placed together before His Excellency the Governor in Council for favorable consideration and orders.

I beg to remain
Respected Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

T. Alvariah
Late Sub-Inspector of Salt & Bkharis
No 4 Ramanya Iyer Street
Washermenpetta, Madras.