

Revenue (189 &) Department.

CURRENT No. 3784

From

Board of Revenue
Land Revenue

Endorsement No 2468 of 10 6 98
Order

Transferred to the Financial
Department.

No. 113

Dated 5. 5. 98

Received 24

Registered 25

Enclosures

Spare copies



The Financial Department.

SUBJECT,

Passing orders on the
Land Revenue Report of
Godavari Dist for March 19

believe
in the
the
in it
that
Msp
mp
of
wa
Ret

3/6/98

13/6/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

submitted, only an
 vacation of his office.
 The lending money, in
 regard on the security
 lands already pledged
 the Govt for advance
 to State loans.

The Rev Inspector
 appears to have broken
 the rule in this matter
 that there is no evidence
 that the money lent was
 unlawfully advanced
 by him. The gravamen of
 this charge is the lie
 the R.I. freely told when
 questioned about these
 loan actions.

To sum up, it seems
 to have been clearly
 proved that the Rev Inspector
 was impertinent, dishonest,
 disobedient & a liar.
 He admitted that there is
 no ground upon which
 he could or should
 expect the decision
 to be confirmed.

And the fact that having so
 much money lent is a strong
 reason for suspending him.

He was also planning
 to be corrupt. whether he broke rules
 or not.

W. H. H.

I submit this paper
 is justified.
 Sir,

51

This means
prescribes
the mode of
recovery

pages 143-4 of the file.

para 40 of the appeal to the court
page 8

Sanjay has a Rev.
Inspection from within
on 20/10/11.

and the interest thereon may be
recovered as if they were
arrear of land revenue due in
respect of the land for the benefit
of which the loan was granted.
In para 7 of his Proceeding
of 26.8.97 the Collector states that
the total amount of money lent by
the Revenue Inspector is more than
his pay for 10 years. The appellant
however accounts for the amount
by showing that out of the total
amount only Rs 487-0-9 is his
and that the remaining amount
is either that of his wife (to which
he has no claim during her lifetime
or that of his wife's sister. Whether
this statement of the petitioner is
true or not is a matter of fact. It is
submitted that the amount involved in
the money transactions of the appellant
and his wife was somewhat large
it does not appear that the Collector
himself has drawn any definite
conclusion and urged it as a
charge against the petitioner.

The only thing in the appeal

a third charge against
the appellant was
"Lending money on mortgage
the security of land already pledged
to the Government for advances for
etc.) loans."

It is not known why the
charge was drawn against the Revenue
Inspector in this formal article
of the Rules regulating the personal
conduct of Government servants does
not apply to the Revenue Inspectors.

It did not appear from the Collector's
statement that the petitioner was
concerned with the witness in the
complaint against the conduct of the
Revenue Inspector in the village
of Chaurai and the other persons
in the village in Chaurai
who were to be handed over to the
police (on account of bad
behaviour). The appellant's
intention is that he could not go to
the village without going to Chaurai
because he had to take his wife and
children with him and had to
stay there because he had to
attend to his business in and
around the village. The
Government records and survey
records were kept and that in
the village was justified by the Tahsildar.

* General remarks

please see Dr. Tahir's report of 20.
pages 133-138 of the file.

transfer. The Tahsildar's endorsement referred to above runs as follows. - Communicated to Denasagayam Pillai, Revenue Inspector, Chennimalai for information and guidance. He has handed over all the papers, records & in his hand. To the Revenue Inspector Perumthurai. What the petitioner states is that as he had no papers or records with him except the books and documents No. 87-0-9 is his register, the remaining account is that of his wife (to which he has no claim during her lifetime or that of his wife's sister. Whether his statement of the petitioner is true or not, no safe inference can be submitted, he derives from the fact that the amount involved in her money transactions of the appeal and her wife was somewhat large it does not appear that the Collector himself has drawn any definite conclusion and urged a charge against the petitioner.

The only house in the plain.

also endorsed as follows:—

communicated to the Tahsildars of
De and Bhaurani for information.
Masafayam Pillai should be directed
to first and relieve Balaji Rao
Keranjipet immediately."

The charge is that the Revenue Inspector Contrary to the above order the Sub Collector went first to Ghummalai instead of Keringipet before the order of transfer, the Sub Collector detained the appellant at Erode and did not permit him to go to Ghummalai with a view chiefly to prevent him from interfering with the witnesses in a case of complaint against the conduct of a Revenue Inspector written against Ghummalai and three other persons. The persons in Ghummalai were to be handed over to him of good behaviour. The appellant's intention is that he could not go to Keringipet without going to Ghummalai because he had to take his wife and two children with him and had to make any house he was living in and unless Government records and survey the same were kept and that in the same justified by the Tahsildar's

He knew before that the
the Pink color had prohibited
him from going to Chemmanur
No

para. 7 to 14 of the appeal to the Court
and para. 27-34 of the appeal to the B.

Mr. & Mrs. Moore said
 was that he had received
 information that the
 petition which had been
 sent to the Collector
 was sent by a person
 who kept the Rev.
 Inspector's wife. This
 was alleged that Mr.
 Moore had not received
 such information

But he did not have said
 it.

* please see B.P. (R) 4608 this
 1.12.97
 page 185 of the file

I don't think so.

please see page 108 of the file

The sub Collector admitted
 that in the interview with the
 Revenue Inspector he got very
 angry and spoke louder than
 usual, that he made a statement
 damaging the Revenue Inspector's
 wife and that the only thing he
 said in the nature of threat was
 that he would have the Revenue
 Inspector prosecuted for perjury if
 what he said before the Sub Magistrate
 turned out to be false.

When the Revenue Inspector
 appealed to the Board against the
 Collector's order, the Board thought
 that within a month after the admission
 (detailed above) made by Mr. Moore
 the first charge against the appella-
 nt might well have been dropped.

The first charge might therefore
 be left out.

5. Second Charge.

Going to Chennimalai
 in direct disobedience to the Sub Collector's
 orders.

In communicating the order
 of the Collector transferring the
 appellant from the Chennimalai
 to the Keringipet Patta, the

by the appellant had seen
 evidence given by him before
 the Sub Collector that the huttler go-
 ing to his house on ^{a certain} the evening
 during the Sub Collector's stay
 Chennimalai. For this, according
 to the statement of the appellant, he
 is ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~for~~ ^{for} ~~from~~ ^{from} questioned by the
 Sub Collector on the 6th August, 1897
 August the Revenue Inspector
 at a ~~petition~~ ^{petition} Complaint to the Collector

that the Sub Collector threatened
 to insult him. Thereupon the
 Collector (Mr. Bradley) held an enquiry
 into the matter with the result that he
 dismissed the appellant on the following
 charges

i. making a false petition against
 the Sub Collector.

ii. going to Chennimalai in direct
 disobedience to the Sub Collector's
 orders.

iii. lending money on mortgage on
 security of land already pledged to
 the Government as security for State
 a/c.

During the enquiry made
 the Collector regarding the
 conduct of the Revenue Inspector,

not to name ^{107th} ~~who~~ ^{he} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~mentioned~~ ^{mentioned} the man's wife in
 he did, but his long among his own
 friends does not make false right
 his all. The dep. of false before
 the Court, in which he said that Mrs.
 Moore had threatened to break his
 nose &c, shows that he is addicted
 to unimportant exaggeration. I
 am of opinion that, though the
 thought that charge should be dropped,
 it is found

@ page 1 of the file.
 Charge III. Peter knew that Mrs.
 Moore, for strange reasons, had
 prohibited him from going to Chen-
 nimalai. His going there was a
 distinct disobedience to orders,
 & his fortune that he considered
 please see proceedings of the Collector
 26.8.97, pages 149-165 of the
 the Court under supervision of Mr.
 Moore is non-sensical.

Charge IV. This charge as
 worded (unless the word read as
 "money" is "indebted", & I do not
 think it is) discloses no offence
 but it is sufficiently indicated
 from the signing that Peter was
 charged with lending money in
 such a way as to show that
 he was liable to the full for his
 position. I think that is proved, &
 that Peter was guilty of false and wilful
 I am of opinion therefore
 that Peter should not interfere,

5/6/98

file. The Sub Collector admitted
that in Paid Board's (L.R.) No 38 of 1897

(Cus 219382532 of

Note.

With the Current first re-
alence the Board of Revenue
Submits to the Government a
petition from one C. D. Devasa-
gayan Pillai late 2nd Class Revenue
Inspector, Keriinjipet division,
Bhadani taluk, Coimbatore district
appealing against the order of
dismissal passed by the Collector
and confirmed by the Board.

2 In July 1897, the Mooneyar
of Chennimalai sent a petition
to the Collector complaining that
the Sub Collector Mr. Moore had
had extorted from him Rs 9-7. The
Case was tried by the Grade Sub-
Magistrate but was dismissed by
him. Thereupon the Sub Collector
enquired into the matter depart-
mentally and the result was that in
his Proceedings dated the 12th Aug
1897 he dismissed the Mooneyar
for having brought a false
Complaint against the Sub Collector.

3 In the Course of the a

Sup^{to} 17/1/98.

Charge I. The Rev. Insp. (posts)
asked the Govt for a telegram,
to release him from Mr. Moore's
detention in a sort of con-
finement at Erode, & said in sup-
port of his request, that Mr.
Moore & his Butler, after
getting him into the Sub Court's house,
had come close to him, pushed
him under the table &
him abused him, and that all
this was only because of a com-
plaint made by a Mooneyar
against the Butler. It is proved
that his detention at Erode was
not because of the complaint
against the Butler, but because
Moore and the attorney as
he alleged in Mr. Moore's house,
that persons whom he did not
mention were present at the
Scene in the house - If he
had mentioned them he knew the
Govt. and not send a telegram.

page 92-98 of the file.


When the Rev. Insp. Moore has con-
fessed wrong to justify this
complaint, he says what is false.

2/1/98
Mr. Moore let his Butler, & one per

Pet No 33
Rev. April 7 98

Enclosure

To
His Excellency the Right Honorable
THE GOVERNOR
AND
PRESIDENT IN COUNCIL,
Fort Saint George,
MADRAS.



Through
THE COLLECTOR OF COIMBATORE.

Dated 28th
Received } February 1898.

ENCLOSURES. 1

SUBJECT.

Appealing against the order of the Re-
venue Board declining to interfere on be-
half of the memorialist's appeal and hum-
bly begging, under the circumstances here-
in submitted, to be kindly reinstated in his
appointment as Revenue Inspector, with
retrospective effect.

RECEIVED
2

partment of which about 9 were spent in the grade of a Revenue Inspector without any stain in his conduct, that there had been no complaint whatever against him either on this occasion or at any time before, that he had all along the approbation of his superiors, that Mr. Bradley, on some misrepresentations made to him, had mercilessly awarded him the punishment of dismissal and deprived him of his long and pensionable service, and of his, and his children's bread, and left him in a deplorable state of life.

22. The humble memorialist further submits, that his appeal to the Revenue Board was against the order of the late Collector. It was therefore very unfortunate for him to have referred it to the late Sub Collector, (Mr. Moore) who had already been prejudiced against him, and had him dismissed on account of his having sinned in speaking a simple truth against his butler (paras 7 and 8 Revenue Board appeal)—a truth that awaits its reward.

23. He therefore most humbly and earnestly implores, that Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to take all these facts into benign consideration, exonerate him from the charges and reinstate him in his appointment with retrospective effect.

For which act of charity and benevolence, the humble memorialist shall, as in duty bound,

Ever Pray.

Ch. Dravacoppy
28-2-98

orders, and the stay there was admittedly intended by him (the Sub Collector) to be pending receipt, from the Collector, of the order applied for the transfer of the poor memorialist from Chennimalai (para 32 Revenue Board appeal).

8. This order (an endorsement, on the Collector's order of transfer) was received from the Sub Collector on the 14th night of August, and on the 15th morning, (Sunday) another order was received direct from the Collector to the same effect. As soon as these orders were received, the poor memorialist started off at once to Chennimalai, where there were all the records, current and old and survey instruments etc. *on his hand*, with a view to hand them over at Head Quarters, with a complete list, as per District orders, and see them all removed from his custody, before going to Nerinjipet, as he could not have gone thither before doing so.

9. Respectfully keeping aside the Collector's order, favourable as it was, and confining only to the Sub Collector's, as it was *the one* referred to, in the charge, the poor memorialist humbly submits, that this order had in fact superseded all the previous orders and in which no mention was made, that the records &c. should be sent for from Chennimalai and handed over at Erode.

10. Besides, the Revenue Inspector of Perundurai, to whom the charge had to be made over, also came up to Chennimalai, as he had no orders to relieve the poor memorialist at Erode.

11. The poor memorialist also very humbly submits, that neither the Sub Collector nor the Tahsildar found fault with him, when they knew on the 17th, that he had gone to Chennimalai for the purpose of handing over charge, for, in the order sent to him thither, on that date, by the Sub Collector through the Tahsildar's peon, nothing more was said than that he should come at once to Erode and stay there till further orders, as the Collector wished to take a statement from him (memorialist).

Exhibit. IV.

Exhibit. V.

III. lending money on mortgage on the security of lands already pledged to Government for state loans.

3. The humble memorialist had explained his innocence in his appeal to the Revenue Board, a copy of which is very respectfully enclosed for your Excellency's kind perusal, as it contains the details of the case, and the Revenue Board, the poor memorialist laments, had only declined to interfere on his behalf, *assigning no reasons whatever*, as per para 2 of their Proceedings appealed against. Para-1 had been given with asterisk marks, and a copy of their entire Proceedings had even been refused though applied for. (vide exhibit 3.)

Exhibit. II.

Exhibit. III.

4. *As the matter has now come before your Excellency, the poor memorialist prays for justice, as he had suffered injustice, from the very commencement of his unfortunate case.*

5. With regard to the 1st and the main charge, the poor memorialist had advanced his reasons in his appeal to the Revenue Board (paras 5 to 26) and now, only lays before your Excellency *the bare admissions of Mr. Moore* (Sub para 14 Revenue Board appeal) for kind consideration, whether the petition was false, even when it was admitted *him, that he did slander the poor memorialist's wife by a language that was indecent to her sex and insulting to her husband and to her community.*

6. On the face of this and the other admissions made by him, the poor memorialist humbly submits, that the first and the main charge was shown to have fallen, with no remnant to *at the other charges framed by an agent.*

7. With regard to the second charge, he had shown his reasons (paras 27 to 34 Revenue Board appeal) and now again, humbly submits, that he went to Erode from Chennimalai, (his head quarters, before his transfer to Nerinjipet) on the 6th August 1897, and stayed there till the 15th noon, in direct obedience to the Sub Collector's

Vol. 33
Rev. 1898

TO

His Excellency the Right Honorable
SIR ARTHUR ELIBANK HAVELOCK, G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E.,
The Governor and President in Council,

MADRAS.

(THROUGH THE COLLECTOR OF COIMBATORE).

*The humble memorial of C. DAVID DEVA-
SAGAYAM PILLAI, late 2nd class Revenue Ins-
pector, Nerinjipet Division, Bhavani Taluk,
Coimbatore District,*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH THAT:—

Exhibit. 1.

Your Excellency's humble memorialist
begs to appeal against the extract of the
Revenue Board Proceedings, Mis. No. 4605,
dated 1st December 1897, *barely declining*
to interfere on behalf of his appeal, dated
11th October 1897, against the order of
the Collector of Coimbatore, dismissing
him from the Government Service.

2. Before going into the charges, the
poor memorialist humbly begs to state, as a
preamble, that on the 9th August 1897,
he represented by a petition to the late
Collector (Mr. Bradley) the unkind treat-
ment he had received in the late Sub
Collector's (Mr. Moore's) Bangalow, on the
6th of that month; that though the facts
in the petition were proved, it is much to
be regretted, Mr. Bradley, owing to some
misrepresentations made to him, framed the
following charges against the humble me-
morialist and dismissed him from *his long*
service of 18 years under Government.

The first and the chief charge was, ma-
king a false petition against the Sub Collec-
tor.

II. Going to Chennimalai in direct dis-
obedience to the Sub Collector's orders and,

G.O., No.

DATED

189

89

No.

to G. No.

GOVERNMENT

GOVERNMENT

WITH DITTO

FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
ORIGINAL.

A. Copy in full.
B. Not to be copied.
C. Copy abstract only.
D. Copy heading only.