0/9 8,000—5-8-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3096

DATED 22nd July 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing S.V. Venkatadasa Aiyer, late Talukdar Gumastah, Satyamangalam taluk, Coimbatore dt. that his request that he may be permitted to resign his appointment or that sanction may be accorded to his taking employment on a Local Fund or Municipal establishment is inadmissible, and that any further petition from him on the subject will remain unnoticed.

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 (189 8) Department.

CURRENT No. 2153

Read B.P. No 111 (Pet^n) dy 13.7.98 (C. No 5036)
.. also petition from Venkatadasa Aiyar
dy 8.B.P. 98 (C. No 4713)
.. also ~~petition~~ ~~from~~ do
dy (C. No 5114)

From The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue,
Madras.

Endorsement Mis. No. 3096 d/22nd July 98.
~~Order~~

Reg No. 711 (Pet^n)

The petitioner will be informed that his requests are inadmissible and that any further petitions from him on the subject will remain unnoticed.

Dated 13th July 1898.
Received 18 —
Registered 19 —
Enclosures 3.
Spare copies

lee
22/7/98

JWC

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Govt petition from S. V. Venkatadasa Aiyar, late Taluk Gumastah, Udiyamanpalam Taluk, Coimbatore Dist., praying that his dismissal may be cancelled and he may be permitted to resign his appointment.

To
The petitioner.
Copy to the Bd of Revenue Ld. A with Encls returned.
24/3/
26.7.98

Ldr
21.7.98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To,

His Excellency the Governor
in Council, Fort St. George
Camp Cotacamund.

The humble petition of
S.V. Venkata Dassayar
Late Taluk Guinavta, Satya-
-mangalam Taluk, Coimba-
-tore District,

Most Respectfully Sheweth:-

In obedience to
His Excellency's Endorsement No 984 R
on his petition dated 21.5.98 (Copy herewith
submitted), he most humbly submits
this petition through the Collector of the
Coimbatore District.

2. The petitioner has already submitted
a petition through the Collector of Coimbatore
requesting his Excellency to admit
resignation of the Petitioners office
in the spirit of the Resolutions contained
in G. O No 2290 Public dated 3rd December
1883 and published in the District Gazette
as Standing Order No 32 of 1889.

3. If the

3. If the Post Government is only pleased to peruse the records (herewith submitted as per list) with reference to this ori-ginal appeal petition & the Review appeal petition, they will then come to know that the Collector's Proceedings is not based upon facts or records but only on imagination which is quite against the Resolutions of the Indian Government contained in the above quoted G. O.

4. The Collector in his letter to the Board (Vide Extt VI, para) has misrepresented to the Board that the Petitioner has merry carelessly scratched an English Endorse-ment, but it is not really the case. The Endorsement has been cancelled (Vide Extt IX) & no initials were obtained. The circumstances under which this has been cancelled have been satisfactorily explained in the original appeal petition (Vide Extt III para 5th).

5. But as the Government once for all declined to reconsider their orders already passed in restoring the petitioners to his office, the poor and much affected petitioner now most humbly prays that the Benevolent Government on perusal of the above records will be mercifully pleased to admit his resignation of his office in the Spirit of the Resolution No 9 contained in the above said G. O.

6. If this request too cannot be complied with the poor petitioner, as the only last request cringes the merciful Government will be graciously pleased to accord him sanction to be entertained in the Municipal or Local Fund Esta-blishment as required under Govern-ment Notification nos 788 & 789 respectively published in the Fort Saint George Gazette dated 27-11-1894 Page 241.

For this act of motherly kindness and Charity he shall, as in duty bound ever pray-

He begs to remain
Most Respected Sirs
Your Excys most Obedt & humble
Servant
Srinivasa Rau

5th July 1898.

Pet No 1133 Rev 98

when submitting this

petition to the Government

3.

4. A copy of the remarks

to / of the Petr's conduct & his

as services which has been record-

-ed in your Honor's office

ap. may also be sent along

to with these records.

Shencalatha

5/7/98

I have already trans-

-mitted the petn Thumb

Vi

th

c

i

(

1310 Reg

1310

398

N. Dis: No 1133 Rev / 98

Submitted to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras, in continuation of this office Dis: No 1776 Rev of 98, dated 25th June 1898.

Coimbatore Collr's office Despd 12/7/98

for Asst Collector 9.7.98

P.S Clerk 13.7.98
Rf. 14/7/98

COLLECTOR'S C
26 JUL 1898
COIMBATORE

Submitted through the Collector of the Coimbatore Taluk Records to the Tahsildar's letter No 904 dated 18.6.98 (herewith submitted) on his petn dated 21.5.98.

2 The poor petitioner humbly requests that the Collector who is spoken of as a kind & generous Collector on perusal of the records (herewith submitted) with reference to the original appeal petn to the Government (Copy also enclosed) will be mercifully pleased to uphold the petitioner's case & thus protect a poor & miserable family.

3. The present Huzur Division Asst Mr. P.S. Sesadri Rao under whom the petitioner served for 4½ years out of his 5 years service, may also be referred as regards petitioner's conduct & career

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE),

Madras, 18th July 1898.

READ— Petition from S. V. Venkata dasa Aiyar, late Taluk Sumastah, Sathyamangalam Taluk, Coimbatore District, dated 5th July 1898. and Endorsement thereon of J. A. Cumming Esqr: Ag. Collector of Coimbatore dated 9th July 1898 N. Dis No 1133 Rev.

Reference No. 115 Pet dated 18th July 1898.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Reference No 111 (Pet.n) dated 13th July 1898.

2. With that reference the Board submitted a petition from S. V. Venkata dasa Aiyar, late Taluk Sumastah, Sathyamangalam Taluk, Coimbatore District, praying that his dismissal might be cancelled and that he might be allowed to resign his appointment. The same petitioner now prays that, failing the grant of this request, sanction may be accorded to his taking employment on a local fund or municipal establishment.

3.

P.S Clerk 13.7.98

3. The Board observes that the present request has already been once preferred by the petitioner, but without success, in his petition disposed of in G.O. No. 1802 Rev. Mis. dated 25th April 1898. The petitioner has not now adduced any reasons to warrant a reconsideration of that order, and the Board has no recommendation to make on his behalf.

Lionel Davidson.
Sy. Secretary

To the Secretary to Government, R.D.,
with petn. and enclosures, the latter
to be returned.

Letr

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 5114.

From The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue
Madras.

(Ref No. 115 (Pet.)

Order

Dated 18th July 1898.

Received 21 JUL 1898

Registered 22

Enclosures 32.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Govt. further petition from S. V. Venkata dasa Aiyar, late Taluk Shirastah, Sathyamangalam Taluk, Coimbatore District, praying that failing the cancellation of his dismissal, sanction may be accorded to his taking employment on a Local Fund or Municipal Establishment.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
12.	1502	(21)	[illegible]

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Exc III.

To

His Excellency The Governor in Council,

Fort Saint George,

MADRAS

THE HUMBLE MEMORIAL OF VENKATADASA AIYAR LATE A GUMASTA SATTYAMUNGALAM TALUK COIMBATORE DISTRICT.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH :—

1. That the Memorialist has been dismissed the service for fraud in the disposal of a darkast vide Exhibit I. being the Proceedings of the Collector dated 20th April 1895 Reference on No. $\frac{27}{\text{Forest}}$ of 1895.

2. The Honorable Board were appealed to but without success : vide Exhibit II. being the petition of appeal dated 23rd May 1895 and Exhibit III. being Proceedings of the Board dated 2nd July 1895 No. 3281 Mis. L. R.

3. And now as the only quarter where he can hope justice done him, he ventures to look up to and rely upon your Excellency's generous and just Government.

4. It is the humble hope of the Memorialist that upon ordinary consideration of the facts of his case, your Excellency's truly benevolent Government will be pleased to see that the finding as to his guilt both of the Board and Collector rests more upon possibilities than upon probabilities, more upon imagination than upon the reality of facts on record. It will be equally manifest to Government that the Memorialist cannot, upon any sensible hypothesis, be connected with the fraud if fraud there is.

5. The facts of the case are as follow:—

In August 1893, one Rame Goudan applied to the Collector for grant, under the darkast rules, of a block of abandoned sandalwood plantation, describing the locality by boundaries and roughly noting its area as 30 acres. vide Exhibit IV. Rame Goudan's application dated 11th August 1893. This, of course, was transferred to the Tahsildar for disposal ; and on its receipt, the Tahsildar referred it to the Revenue Inspector for report *after careful enquiry*. The Revenue Inspector, after enquiring the village officers, vide Exhibit V. being the statement of the Carnam and Monegar to the Revenue Inspector and after personally inspecting the block darkasted, reported no objection to the grant and suggested that the required memorandum might be called for from the Village Officers. Owing to the denial of a copy of this report, the Memorialist cannot submit it herewith as an Exhibit. But the facts are admitted by the Collector himself vide para 2 of his letter to the Board dated 22nd June 1895, Reference on No. $\frac{1065}{\text{Petn.}}$ of 1895. Exhibit VI. Besides, there is a statement made by the Rev. Inspector before the Tahsildar in light of his report, vide Exhibit XXIII. The necessary orders accordingly issued to the Village Officers-and No. 1 Memorandum with its enclosures :—1. Proclamation certificate, 2 Boundary statement, herewith submitted, dated 12th December 1893, was received in office with a list of trees on the land vide Exhibits VII and VIII. respectively.

As usual, vide Exhibit XXI. the Memorialist worked out the value of the trees upon rates prescribed to each kind of trees and the Dy Tahsildar, then in charge of the Taluk, ordered the grant on 18th January 1894. Vide column 16 of Exhibit VII. The trees' value Rs.55-4-0 was collected and credited into the Treasury on 12-2-94. Thus was disposed of one Memorandum. Along with that Memorandum was also received another on behalf one of Veeraiya Goudan with his application dated 26-10-93 enclosed vide Exhibits IX and X. The Memorialist found that this Memorandum was bad for want of some signatures and through hurry of his work he did not notice the tree list that should be with it. He accordingly wrote an endorsement in English in his own hand referring the paper to the Revenue Inspector for the rectification of the defects. But when taking the paper to the Dy. Tahsildar's signature, he found the tree list which he had missed. The discovery necessitated some correction in the endorsement, the only thing rectifiable then being the ommission of signatures. This, the Memorialist thought might be effected through the Village Officers by addressing them direct to save delay. as the chief defct being the non-existence of the Carnam's signature in the Memorandum. The result was that he crossed his pen over, but not scratched as the Collector put it, the English-Endorsement and put up a Vernacular one above it to the Village Officers. The Deputy Tahsildar signed it vide the fly leaf attached to Ex. IX. The Memorandum No 3 thus went back to the Village Officers. It was returned with the defects set right and an application from Rame Goudan the former darkastdar protesting against the grant to Veeraiya Goudan and requesting that the land might be given to himself. This protest is dated 15th March 1894 vide Exhibit XI. When this Memorandum was taken for orders, the Dy. Tahsildar had gone and the Tahsildar had come in. The latter ordered the grant to Rame Goudan in preference to Veeraiya Goudan. The order is dated 19th March 1895 vide column 16 of Exhibit IX. and was made upon three considerations. First because, the area covered by Memorandum No. 3 merged within the first application of Rame Goudan vide Exhibit IV. Secondly because, in the list of boundaries accompanying Memorandum No. 3 Rame Goudan has been described as the owner of lands onthree sides; East, West and South. vide Exhibit XII. And thirdly because, Rame Goudan now protested against the grant to Veeraiya Goudan and represented the superior justice of his being allowed the whole block. It should be submitted in fairness that the valuation of trees in this case also was made by the Memorialist.

4. After the orders granting the lands to Rame Goudan had been passed upon these two Memoranda, one Senthalage Goudan goes up to the Collector with a petition dated 11th July 1894, vide Exhibit XIII. impugning the grant to Rame Goudan as informal for want of due publicity and stating that the block should be granted to him as he had some three years ago, applied for it and been then told that it was not available for grant. In the enquiry that arose upon this petition, the circumstances found were (1) that the Memoranda had not been sent to the Forest Department to know if it had any objection to the grant; (2) that the tree valuation was not referred to the Forest Department that the amount might be properly fixed without loss to Government; (3) that the value of the trees is more than 3 times the amount actually levied; (4) that the amount collected has been credited to Land Revenue instead of Forest Revenue.

5. The Divisional Officer, presumably, finding that the grant to Rame Goudan was all right under the rules and was not informal as complained by Senthalage Goudan, appears to have found also that the tree value levied ought to have been much more. But who is responsible for the loss resulting? In as much as the valuation was fixed in the Taluk Office upon the certificate of the Village

Officers and the Revenue Inspector that the trees were unfit for use otherwise than as firewood, the Divisional Officer naturally and reasonably traced the responsibility to the Village Officers and Revenue Inspector and even called for a report from the Tahsildar as to what evidence was available for their criminal prosecution. Vide Exhibit XIV Refce. on No. $\frac{1227}{D.}$ dated 3rd February 1895. The Memorialist presumes that the Tahsildar would have submitted the report called for to the Dy. Collector and this Officer has reported the result of his investigation to the Collector. What the nature of these reports is the Memorialist cannot say owing to the fact that copies of them have been refused to him Vide Exhibits XV and XVI.

d On receipt of the above papers and others, theCollector records proceedings finding fraud in the disposal of the darkasts in question and holding the Memorialist accountable for the fraud vide Exhibit XVII.

e An explanation is then taken from the Memorialist vide Exhibit XVIII. as a form and he is dismissed the service.

f 6. That the Government have been cheated of their dues is more than clear from the evidence on record. The question for the consideration of the Government is whether the Memorialist has had any hand in the fraud. In the first place, it must be admitted that the Memorialist has had no personal knowledge of the nature of the block under darkast. His knowledge is only derived from papers. These papers were furnished him by the Revenue Inspector and the Karnam. These men reported that the sandal wood trees on the land were withered young plants fit only for firewood and the Memorialist valued them on the prescribed firewood rate. The other trees on the land not being shown in the list as fit only for firewood, their value has been fixed at the rates prescribed for them. The fact that the Memorialist calculated the value instead of having it done by the Forest Department, was once made a ground of inference against him. But the ground has been withdrawn by the Collector himself. vide para 4 (2) of the Collector's letter to the Board Exhibit VI. So that it will be clear to the Government that, in the valuation of the trees, it is not the Memorialist who is to blame. There is a sort of undertone in the Collector's arguments to the effect that the Memorialist should not have believed the acting Karnam. But the Collector would seem to overlook the fact that both the permanent Karnam and Monegar say that the sandalwood on the land were small ones and withering vide Exhibit V. and their statement has been checked by the Revenue Inspector by a personal inspection of the block itself. How then, can the Memorialist distrust the reports before him? If the number and nature of the trees reported be incorrect and a loss results to Government, is it not more reasonable and just to hold the reporters responsible rather than the clerk who worked out the total value on prescribed rates? Thus one of the grounds from which the Collector infers fraud on the part of the Memorialist disappears. It is submitted that this ground is the only rational ground upon which the theory of fraud can be built as against the Memorialist.

g It is the hope of the Memorialist that the Government will not find him wrong even in the matter of the non-reference of the darkasts to the Forest Department. The settlement register shows that the block as an assessed waste. The village Officers who ought to have known the history of the block do not say in their statements that the land was an abandoned sandalwood plantation or that it was once before applied for and refused vide Exhibit V. and columns 10, 11 and 13 of Exhibits VII. and IX. Nor does the Revenue Inspector who was directed to make *careful enquiry* say so. How, then, can the Memorialist know that the land was once under the Forest

Department? If he knew it, certainly he would have made the reference to that Department to ascertain the objection existing for its grant. As it was, he had no reason whatever to make the reference. Nor was there any suggestion in this direction from the Village Officers or the Revenue Inspector so that it might be said that the non-reference to the Forest Department was intentional on the part of the Memorialist. It is for your Excellency's generous Government to say whether there is justice in drawing from this item of non-reference any inference of malafides against the Memorialist. It might be asked as the Collector has done, why was the valuation statement not sent to the Forest Department to be checked by it? The Memorialist has explained that it was because he was then in an uneasy state of mind. He might have said also that it was unnecessary to do so as the Village-Officers and Rev. Inspector had represented the sandalwood trees as withering young plants. No doubt the omission to forward the valuation for approval to the District Forest Office is a defect in the business. But then the question is whether that omission was on purpose? Under the circumstances appearing on the record, no such purpose can be deduced against the Memorialist. First because it is not alleged that the course was suggested or ordered by the Dy. Tahsildar or Tahsildar before grant was made and it was evaded by the Memoridlist. Secondly because, the Memorialist is not the final authority to dispose of the matter on his own responsibility. There was the Tahsildar to enquire *at least* whether the Forest Department has concurred in the valuation. With his limited intelligence and knowledge it is just possible that the Memorialist might have unwittingly gone wrong. But who could tolerate the idea of a more intelligent and better informed Officer such as a Deputy Tahsildar or Tahsildar not caring to see into the papers to know if the form was gone through or even so much as to enquire whether it was done. So that it will be evident to the Government that in the matter of this omission the Memorialist has erred with his superior officer and that if the superior officer is entitled to excuse, much more so is the Memorialist. Was it then that the Memorialist was sacked because of his inferior position? This indeed is unfortunately the sense of the Memorialist and his hope with regard to this finding of the Collector lies in the justice of your Excellency's Government with which the rule has been to deal with a matter on its own merits independent of personl considerations.

h. It is alleged by the Collector in para 9 of his letter to the Board vide Exhibit VI. that the Memorialist's motive is clear from his unwarranted cancellation of an English enorsement and substitution of a vernacular one in its stead. A little reflection will show that the Collector is wrong in his conclusion. The Collector says that the Memorialist modified the order of reference by the Deputy Tahsildar to suit his own purpose, because the Deputy Tahsildar was going out and the pukka Tahsildar was coming in and this offorded him the favorable opportunity to effect his nefarious object. Fortunately for the Memorialist, the Collector credits him with some cunning. Now the very same cunning must have told the Memorialist that to place a Memorandum with a mutilated and substituted endorsement before a new officer was too surely to court suspician. He would, then, think of replacing the Memorandum itself by a fresh one. This was as easier to him as safer. For the Memorandum paper had no initials of the Dy. Tahsildar or Tahsildar to show the date of its receipt into the office and the Karnam was, according to the conspiracy theory of the Collector, ready to furnish a fresh one if so required. That this course was open to the Memorialist is inferentially admitted by the Collector when he says that the tree list for the second of the Memoranda-to wit No. 3-has been subsequently introduced into the record. The fact, then, that the Memorialist did not take the easier and safer step available to him completely refutes the arguments of the Collector in this behalf. On the other hand, the preservation of a suspicious

paper only argues that the Memorialist was consciously innocent and therefore not reflexions about it and negatives with equal force the theory of the Collector as to the subsequent introduction of the tree list relating to it. The Government will be pleased to note in column 9 of this Memorandum Exhibit IX. a statement to the effect that the tree list has been attached to it. While reasonable considerations point to the genuineness and innocense of the alteration of the endorsement, is it just to suspect the Memorialist simply because the Deputy Tahsildar denies knowledge of it? Such a denial being liable to proceed from various causes. It may be that the Deputy Tahsildar could not remember the circumstances as indeed it is not reasonable to expect him to do so among so many things he has attended to and after a lapse of time long enough to affect the memory. It may be that he finds himself in a delicate position as one who had something to do with the matter and prefers to enter a denial. Thus either through bad memory or through timidity, the Deputy Tahsildar has said that he knew not of the alteration of the endorsement. This is just as probable as possible. It is for the generous Government of Your Excellency to declare upon the matter. There is a set of circumstances infering innocense on the part of the Memorialist. On the contrary there is the denial of the Deputy Tahsildar of any knoweledge of the alteration, which raises suspician against the Memorialist. In these circumstances, is it not the character of the Memorialist to be adjudged upon by a reference to the several Tahsildars under whom he has worked as to the impressions they have formed of him? There is, however a confidential register maintained in the office in which the conduct of the Memorialist and his humble service for over a period of 4 years, out of his 5 year's service, has been recorded. This, the Memorialist has represented in his explanation before the Collector vide concluding portion Exhibit XVIII. An extract from the register, the Memorialist is unable to produce before the Government as a copy of the same has been refused. vide Exhibit XV. It is the misfortune of the Memorialist that the Collector did not choose to do so.

j The Collector further utilises an argument for him, the fact that the value has been credited to Land Revenue instead of Forest, saying that the wrong credit was meant to keep the Forest Department ignorant of the grant. It will suffice to state that the head of credit is determinable in the Treasury branch of the office to which the Memorialist does not belong. Nor is it alleged that this Treasury called upon him to assign the head of credit and he assigned a wrong one even orally. The Chellans for the credit are herewith submitted for the observation of the Government. vide Exhibits XIX and XX.

k The Collector in all his proceedings, would seem to imply that these irregularities were committed by the Memorialist to help Rame Goundan. The Government will be pleased to note, from what has already been submitted that Rame Goundan has succeeded solely upon the merits of his case as represented by the Village Officers and Rev. Inspector.

l There is another thing stated by the Collector which needs explanation. He observes that the Memoranda have not been initialled by the superior officer and seem to have been received by the Memorialist direct from the Village Officers. This is an error. It is a fact that these Memos have no initials. An examination of the office will furnish thousands of such instances. So that no inference can legitimately be drawn that they never came through the superior officer-Tahsildar. Be it remembered such papers belong to periods anterior to Memorialist's connection with the office and even after his unfortunate disconnection with it. The reason for their existence is that Tahsildars usually initial the paper uppermost when a batch is received by them.

7. It is the humble hope and prayer of the Memorialist that upon the foregoing considerations, the Benevolence of Your Excellency's Government, will be pleased to take his case into favourable consideration, hold out to him a succouring hand and restore him to office; thereby vindicating the cause of justice.

For which act of chairity and justice, he shall ever pray, as in duty bound.

He begs to remain
Most Respected and Honored Sir,
Your Excellency's most obedient and
humble servant.

Copy
Vincent Talbot

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council
Fort Saint George.
Madras.

Camp Coimbatore.

Thro the Collector of Coimbatore
Coimbatore

The humble petition of
S. V. Venkata Dasayyar
late Taluk Gumastah
Satyamangalam Taluk
Coimbatore District,

Most Respectfully sheweth:-

The humble petitioner is in receipt of your Excellency's Endorsement dated 25/4/98 No 1802 this (Copy enclosed) declining to reconsider his appeal regarding restoration to his office.

2. The poor petitioner is to blame his fate only for his unsuccess even after his explaining to the Government to the fullest extent the miscarriage of justice done to him in the Lower Court

Court in regard his case. and humbly submits the following prays for your Excellency's merciful consideration and favorable orders.

3. The much affected petitioner, finding no other go for redress, humbly begs to bring to the notice of the benign Government, the Resolutions of the Indian Government contained in G.C. No 2290 Public dated 3rd December 1883 and published in the Coimbatore District Gazette dated 18th June 1889 page 22, as Standing Orde No 32 of 89 in which the Indian Government is pleased to pass a resolution in para 9 of the said G.O. that a Subordinate should not be dismissed with disgrace but allowed to resign or simply relieved of his office so that he may seek his livelihood elsewhere. and cringes therefore that, in his present case, the just and benevolent Government will be kindly and mercifully pleased to admit his resignation of his office thus allowing him to be entertained in some other departmt.

4. The petitioner is a very poor man with no ancestral property whatever solely depending on his own earning which for the past 3 years ie since his dismissal, were cut down and he is really in a very miserable begging state.

5. He begs to submit that his conduct is recorded in the Confidential Register maintained in the Taluk and if the Government is pleased to call for a copy of the same and perused, they will be satisfied of the petitioner's services and his conduct.

The petitioner therefore most humbly prays the merciful government will be graciously pleased to pass favorable orders on this petition and thus protect a poor & miserable family.

For which act of kindness and Charity, the poor petitioner, as in duty bound, ever prays.

He begs to be
Most Respectfully
your Excy's most obdt & humble
Servant.

23.1.98 Sheikh Fathima

Petn No 1051/Rev of 98.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
22 JUN 1898
COIMBATORE.

Submitted through the Collector of Coimbatore with a very humble request that the Copy of the remarks of the petitioner's services & his conduct, which is in your Honor's office may be forwarded to the Government along with his petition

Shencottah
23. 6. 98

1352.

1898
RECEIVED
Despatch No.
Date of Despatch

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE);
Madras, 13th July 1898.

READ— ~~Endorsement of~~ Letter from J. A. Cummins Esq, Ag. Collector of Coimbatore, dis No. 1776/Rev 898, dated 25th June 1898.

Reference No. III (Petn) dated 13th July 1898.

Submitted to Govt.

2. The Petitioner, who was lately a Taluk Sumastah of Satyamangalam Taluk, Coimbatore Distt was dismissed in April 1895 by the Collector for fraudulent conduct in a darkhast case. His case has already been twice dealt with by Govt, namely, in G.O. No. 2626/Rev. mis, dt 4th July 96 and in G.O. No. 1802 Rev. Mis. dt 25th April 98. In the former order Govt rejected the petitioner's memorial appealing against his dismissal, and in the latter, it refused to reconsider its previous order.

3. The Petitioner now addresses the Govt for the third time, with the prayer that his dismissal may be cancelled and that he may be permitted

permitted to resign his appointment so as to enable him to obtain employment in some other department. The Collector remarks that this is a concession to which the Petitioner is not entitled, as he has been found guilty of fraudulent conduct. The Board concurs in this view and has no recommendation to make on the Petitioner's behalf.

Yours &c.
Ag. Secretary.

To The Secy to Govt, R.D.

with Coll's letter, petition and Encls, (after letter and Encls to be returned)

O/18 4,000—19-7-97.

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 2703

For orders as to whether the current may be over pending receipt of the petition through the proper channel.

17/8. But the petition must in this paper have already been considered & refused vide G.O. No. 1802 R. 25 April 98

From S. V. Venkata Doraiyar
Late Taluk Clerk
Valayamangalam Taluk
Coimbatore Dist.

No.

Order of

Para III, C Rules.

17/7

Dated 8 July
Received 12 "
Registered 13 "
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Praying that his resignation may be considered in the spirit of G.O No. 2290 Pub: dt. 3-12-83

The Collector.

17/8. Please see Dept. or. C. No. 5030 of 98

9/7/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date
10	984	Rev	15-6-98
"	1802	"	25-11-98
"	525	"	[illegible]
"	959	"	[illegible]
"	920	"	[illegible]

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

0425

REVENUE DEPT

To,

His Excellency the Governor in Council

Camp. Cotacamund.

May it please your Excellency.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
11 JUL 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

ASSISTANT

In obedience to your Excellency's endorsement No 984 dated 15th June 1898 the humble petitioner V. Venkata Dasayar late Taluk Clerk Satyamangalam Taluk, Coimbatore Dt. most respectfully begs to state that he has submitted a petition through the Collector of the Coimbatore District on the 5th July 1898.

2. The petitioner is afraid that each and every petition submitted through the Collector, is not supported at all because it is not very uncommon that an acting Collector will never deviate from the views of the permanent Collector especially in matters of the dismissed public servants in consideration that he may have to incur the displeasure of the permanent Collector who is to come again to the District in case he deviate from his views.

3. So the humble petitioner most respectfully

respectfully prays that the just Government will be kindly & mercifully pleased to comply with the petitioners following request on perusal of the records submitted by the petitioner with reference to his petitions. and also on perusal of the petitioners Conduct recorded in the Confidential Registe maintained in the Taluk Copy of which has been sent by the Tahsildar & the Collector when the petitioner has requested to forward it to the Government.

(1) The petitioners resignation of his office in the Spirit of the Resolution No 9 contained in G.O. No 2290 Public dated 3rd December 1883.

(2) In case the first request cannot be complied with the just Government will accord him Sanction to be entertained in the Municipal or Local Fund Establishment as required under Government Notification No 788 & 789 respectively published in the Fort Saint George Gazette dated 27-11-1894 Page 2401.

(3) In case the 1st two requests cannot also be complied with the poor petitioner humbly requests that the merciful Government will be kindly pleased to provide him at least with a Copyist post under the new Scheme.

4- The petitioner has already represented to the Government that he is a very poor man on whom depending a good number of members for protection & that he has no landed property or anything & solely depending on his own earnings and if any one of the above said requests cannot be complied with certainly he will be endorser.

Eagerly anticipating a favorable reply.

He begs to remain

May it please your Excy.

Your Excys most obedt & humble servant.

Veerakallia

8th July 1898.

Petition from Venkatadesa aiyar late Taluk Gumastah, Satyamangelam taluk, Coimbatore dt dy. 8. 7. 98

(C. No 4913)

1 ——

To the Under Secy:.

The petitioner was dismissed by the Collector of Coimbatore on the ground of his having acted fraudulently in a certain Darkast case. His appeal to Govt was disposed of in G.O. No 2626 dy 4. 7. 96 in which the Govt declined to interfere on the petitioners behalf. He put in a review petition in April last in which he requested as an alternative measure that sanction may be accorded to his being entertained in the Municipal or Local Fund dept or for his being provided at least with a copyist's place. The petitioner was told in G.O. No. 1802 dy 25. 4. 98 that "the Govt sees no reason to reconsider the orders already passed". The petitioner thereupon points out

that

that no orders were passed on his alternative requests but as this petitioner was entitled direct to grant he was given para X of the C Rules.

In his present petition the petitioner states that he has submitted a petition through the Collector of the Coimbatore dt making three alternative requests:-
(i) He may be considered to have resigned his appointment; or
(ii) Sanction may be given for his entertainment in Municipal or Local Fund establishments; or
(iii) He may be be provided with a vacancy post under the new scheme.

Submitted that the petitioner may be given Para VI of the C. rules. Please see draft order put up on the back of the current.

2/8/18

Office

The petition referred to ADM Came last evg. Dabit up

1/8/18

G.O. No 984 dy 15.6.9

"x"

"Every petition must be sen
"through the Head of the
"or Department to whi
"petitioner belongs or he

/A

"x"

"As the Governor in Council must
"interfere with the distribution
"of subordinate appointments
"applications for situations in the
"gift of Heads of Departments
"will also remain unnoticed".

To the Undersecy:.

Please see C. No. 5038 put up below as directed. In the petition submitted through the Collector forwarded with the above current the petitioner makes only one request, viz, that his dismissal may be cancelled and that he may be permitted to resign his appointment so as to enable him to obtain employment in some other department.

2. Submitted that the petitioner may be told that his request is inadmissible and that any further petitions from him on the subject will remain unnoticed.

2/8/18

21/7/18

21/7/18