

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3436

DATED 23rd Aug. 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that the Govt. has no objection to modify the opinion expressed in para 2 of GO. 4893/1-12- as to the expediency of punishing neglect on the part of minor subordinates by the infliction of large fines, and directing the Board of Rev. to take into consideration the case of Tahsildar Panpathi Sastri in Cuddalore who appears to have disregarded the orders of the Colly in a loan case.

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. 4661.

From The Board of Revenue.
Rev. Sett. & Ceds and
Agriculture,
Madras.
Misc. No. 3828 22nd June 98

Order

Dated 22 June 98.
3828 Misc
Received 2 July
Registered 4
Enclosures 8
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Loans.

Passing orders on the
letter from the Collector
of Cuddalore reporting
a loan case as a specimen

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 7th February 1898.

No. 866 Misc.

READ

the following letter from A. C. Late Esquire, Collector of Cuddapah, Ref. bur. no. 7522 Rev. of '96 dated 12th January 1898:-

I have the honour to report the following case for the information of the Board and government as a specimen of loans work in this district and my action regarding it which has been represented to be discouraging to Subordinates

(2) Desaji Tenkata Subbiah Harman of Kalakada, Vayalpad Taluk applied for a loan of Rs 200 under the Special

rules for sinking a well in Survey No. 162. The application was accepted and the 1st instalment of Rs. 100 was paid on the 30th May 1892 with time till 10th July 1892 for execution of work equal to that amount.

(3) The progress of the work was not watched by the Tahsildar and the applicant was left much to himself. He and his undivided brother Ramakrishnaiah (since deceased) presented a petition on 18th August 1892 representing that the work could not be carried out as rocky bed was reached in digging the well and requesting that the first instalment of Rs. 100 together with another advance of Rs. 125, which they had jointly obtained for digging a well in Survey No. 37, might be transferred to the well

This petition was sent to the Revenue Inspector for report on the 25th August 1892. That officer inspected the well in Survey No. 54 and found that its value was Rs. 296. He, therefore, recommended the grant of the petitioners' prayer on condition that the loan should be converted into one under the ordinary rules as the land to be benefited was a shamant Dasabandam inam. On the Revenue Inspector's report, the Tahsildar M. Q. Ry. S. Pampapati Sastri passed the following order dated 2nd December 1892.. "No orders now to grant loans. Endorsement dodge".

4. No endorsement was given to the petitioner according to the 1st portion of the above order, but the papers appear to have been merely lodged among the Taluq records. The matter was then lost sight

of until the 16th August 1895,
on which date a statement
was taken from the 1st petition-
er, the Thunnam (the second
having died) in which he
agreed to repay the loan, if
its transfer to the well in
Survey no. 54 was not
feasible. On the 26th August
1895, the Tahsildar submitted
to the Subcollector a state-
ment recommending the
recovery of the 1st instal-
ment of Rs 100 granted to
Venkata Subbiah with interest
at $6\frac{1}{4}$ percent. The Sub-
Collector recommended
recovery of the loan, with
interest at 3 per cent. Mr
Hawetson ordered thereupon
that the petitioner's application
for transfer of the loan
should be disposed of before
recommending its recovery.
In letter No. Ref. 3365 dated
17th August 1896, the Sub
Collector reported that the
petitioner

petitioner had since withdrawn
his application for transfer
and agreed to repay the
entire amount. He recommend-
ed the recovery of the loan
from the borrower and
interest from the parties at
fault - as shown below.

(1) From the borrower
from the date of advance up
to 18th August 1892 as he
should have obtained previous
permission to dig a well in a
different site.

(2) 2nd December 1892 to
1st July 1893 from Tahsildar
Pampapati Sastri for not
having given any reply to
the petition dated 18th August
1892 and taken no steps
to recover the loan.

(3) 2nd July 1893 to 26th
August 1895 from Tahsildar
Mahomed Abu Syed Khan for
having taken no steps to recover
the loan.

I ordered thereupon that
the

the aggregate amount involved in the two cases (Rs 225) should be recovered from the borrower with interest at 3 per cent from the date of advance up to 18th August 1892, that interest from 19th August 1892 to 1st July 1893 should be collected from the Tahsildar Pampapati Sastri unless he could show cause to the contrary and that from 2nd July 1893 to 26th August 1895 from Tahsildar Mahomed Abu Syed Khan, whose explanation had been received and considered to be unsatisfactory. I also said that the above order should be treated as urgent and that the fact of recovery should be reported at a very early date.

(5) M. R. Ry S. Pampapati Sastri has neither paid the amount nor has shown cause to the contrary though over

over a year has elapsed since the order was passed.

(6) In this case, the time allowed for doing work equal to the amount of 1st instalment expired on 10th July 1892 and no steps were taken to cause the work to be inspected and to recommend extension of recovery. The order passed by the Tahsildar dated 2nd December 1892 on the Revenue Inspector's recommendation for transfer of the loan is meaningless and incorrect. The first portion of the order directing the granting of an endorsement to the petitioner is inconsistent with the latter portion directing that the papers should be lodged. Moreover, the application was not for payment of loan as the Tahsildar seems to have thought, but was only for the transfer of a loan already

already made. The restrictions then imposed applied to only to payment of fresh loans. When passing the order, the Tahsildar should have known that the time allowed for the execution of the work had already expired and since he knew from the petition itself that work could not be successfully carried out, it was his duty to have recommended the immediate recovery of the loan. It was difficult to imagine how the Tahsildar thought it fit to lodge a paper on which action had to be taken. As a result of his action, the matter of recovery of the loan was entirely lost sight of. He was in that taluk till 1st July 1893 and he did nothing in the matter. His successor also failed to do anything. Government having

having thus lost interest for a considerable period, I approved of the Sub Collector's recommendation in its entirety with the exception that the Tahsildar Pampapali Sastri was ordered to make good the loss of interest from 19th August 1892 (i.e. from the next day after receipt of petition, instead of from 2nd December 1892, the date of passing orders on it, as he should have understood from the petition itself that the work could not succeed and that recovery was necessary. The Board will thus observe that the recovery of the interest in this case from the Government officers at fault was recommended by the Sub Collector and approved by me, considering the neglect shown by the Tahsildar with regard to Government interests.

I

I felt myself constrained to order the recovery of interest which Government was unnecessarily losing through his gross carelessness and if such action on my part is condemned as discouraging to subordinates, I request to know how Government interests are to be protected in such cases. Personally I do not even now see that my order was unduly harsh considering the importance of the matter.

(7) Lakhs of Rupees were advanced in the year 91-93 and the interests of the Government must suffer very largely if the subordinate officers neglect their work in this fashion and such neglect be allowed to pass unnoticed without responsibility being visited upon. I beg to invite the attention of the Board to the

the previous papers connected with the loan work in the subdivision of this District. In his letter No. 4157 ^{ver} dated 18th September 1893 Mr. Mounsey wrote as follows: "Failure to inspect after the time allowed is a rule and not an exception in the subdivision and the present case one out of the hundreds where there were such failures". In Proceedings No. 6059 M.O. dated 6th September 94 and 4889 M.O. dated 16th August 1893 the Board considered the explanation of the officers at fault as unsatisfactory. When I joined this District at the end of September 1895, numerous cases of the kind came up before me and I could not understand how the officers concerned could escape all liability to

to account for their neglect. Before, however, fixing pecuniary responsibility on these officers, I thought I should obtain the general orders of the Board in such cases, leaving particular cases to be decided by me at discretion according to their merits.

I accordingly addressed the Board in my letter No.

Ref: 3952^{over} of 9⁵ dated 16th

November 1895. In its Proceedings No. 6813 Misc dated 12th December 1895, the Board observed that it had had itself occasion to call for explanations in numerous cases of delays on the part of Revenue Inspectors and Tahsildars in making inspections and that where loss of interest to Government is distinctly traceable to very gross neglect, the officers responsible should

Certainly

Certainly be called upon to make good the whole or portion of the loss. It further approved of my suggestion that I should be left to deal with each case as it arises. In accordance with this order, I have been using discretion in holding Government officers pecuniarily responsible in cases in which they have displayed gross neglect of duty. I would also solicit attention to the case disposed of in Government order No. 1843 Misc, dated 13th May 1896, communicated with Board's Proceedings No. 2488 Misc dated 19th May 1896. In this case Government was pleased to hold a taluk Accountant responsible for a part of the loan (not interest alone).

(8.) While the course followed by me was thus in accord with the directions of the Board

Board and Government, I regret that the Income Commissioner frequently remarked that my action has been discouraging to Subordinates. Vide Board's Proceedings No: 379 Settlement dated 18th May 1897 and Board's Proceedings No: 525 Settlement dated 23rd July 1897. In the particular Case under reference, the facts reported will clearly show that the circumstances justified the course adopted by me. I shall be glad if the Board will report this Case for the information of Government and request a reconsideration of the order already approved by it in Government Order No: 4895 Misc dated 1st December 1896. As I have applied for leave, I request that this matter may be sent to Government as soon as possible.

Resolution

Resolution

In connection with the loans Case reported in the Collector's letter read above, he is requested to send the following papers for reference.

- (1) The petition presented by the borrower on 18th August 1892 applying for a transfer of the loans
- (2) The Revenue Inspector's report thereon
- (3) The Statement taken from the borrower on the 16th August 1895 and
- (4) The Tahsildar's report to the Sub Collector dated 26th August 1895.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Sd) R. V. Srinivasar
Secretary

To the Collector of Cuddapah
(True Copy)

R. V. Srinivasar
Secretary.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 22nd June 1898
No. 3828 Misc.

READ

+ copy attached

Agam Board's Proceedings,
No: 866 dated 7th February 1898.

Read also letter from E. L.
Tanghan Esquire, Ag Collector
of Buddapah Ref: no: 7522^{Rev}
of 96 dated 7th May 1898:-

I have the honour to forward
herewith the papers called for
in Board's Proceedings no:
866 Misc dated 7th February
1898.

Resolution.

In para 2 of its
Proceedings no: 5741 Misc.,
dated 17th November 1896,
the Board, while dealing with
Certain

to 4875-
1-12-96

Certain Cases of irrecoverable loans in Cuddapah, expressed doubts as to the expediency of inflicting heavy fines on Village officers and Revenue Inspectors who may be found to have overvalued lands offered and accepted as security for loans. Government in its order No: 4895 Misc dated 1st December 1896 concurred with the Board. Again in para 6 of its Proceedings No: 525 dated 23rd July 1897 the Board observed that Subordinate officers in the Cuddapah District were not, as a rule, inclined to encourage loan applications and that whatever zeal there might have been in this direction was stamped out by the action of the Collector, who held some officials granting a loan liable for the amount, in the event of a default in

to 687
10-8-97

payment.

With reference to the above remarks, the Collector (Mr A. C. Tate) reports a loan Case as a specimen of loan work in his district and of the action taken by him in such Cases. He says that the interests of Government must suffer very largely if subordinate officers neglect their work in the way they did in the Case reported by him and that, in holding Government officers pecuniarily responsible for losses caused by their neglect, he was only acting in accordance with the orders issued from time to time. He accordingly requests that the Case reported by him may be submitted for the information of Government and that the remarks approved in Government Order No: 4895 Misc dated

1st December 1896, may be reconsidered.

2. In the Case reported by the Collector, two sums of Rs 125 and Rs 100 were advanced as first instalments of loans under the Special Well rules to two undivided brothers for sinking wells in two separate Survey numbers. The trial borings in these survey numbers proving unsuccessful, the brothers utilised the two advances in sinking a well in a different Survey number, and as the well was intended for the benefit of lands which were partly Government and partly inam, they submitted a petition praying that the two preliminary advances might together be treated as a loan granted for the new well under the ordinary rules.

There were no
drill borings at all
but they had
reached the bottom
11' 16" & nothing is
shown as to S. 11' 37"

This was the recommenda-
tion of the Revenue Inspector

rules. The request was supported by the Revenue Inspector, but the Tahsildar gave no endorsement to the petitioners. He merely lodged the petition without either taking steps for the grant of the petitioners' prayer, or ordering summary recovery of the preliminary advances for failure to sink wells as originally agreed to by the petitioners. The matter was lost sight of for about three years, and at the end of that period, the then Tahsildar in one of his inspection reports brought one of the pending advances to notice and recommended its summary recovery with interest at $6\frac{1}{4}$ per Cent. The borrowers being willing to refund the entire advance of Rs 225, it was finally decided by the Collector that the offer should be accepted.

and that interest on the preliminary advances at 3 per cent should be collected as follows:-

(1) For the period from the date of advance to that (18th August 1898) of the petition praying for transfer of loans; from the borrowers and (2) for the period subsequent to the date of the petition, from the Tahsildars concerned.

3. Under Rule 16 of the Special Well rules, interest at 6½ per cent is to be charged on advances recovered for failure of borrowers to utilise them for the purposes for which they were granted. The Collector's action in fixing the rate at 3 per cent was irregular. In view, however of the fact that the failure to sink wells on the original sites was due to causes beyond the control of the borrowers,

From 19-8-92 to
1st July 93

from h. R. Rly
Campatpati
Savtri

- 2-7-93 to 26-8-95

Mahomed
Abu Syed
Khan Sahib.

the Board confirms the 3 per cent rate, under the Sub Clause to Rule 16 of the Special Well Rules, on the assumption that both the loans were applied for before 1st June 1892.

The Tahsildars concerned were no doubt both of them to blame for having lost sight of the advances for several years. But the officer more to blame was the Tahsildar who lodged the transfer application which was received by him immediately after the date prescribed for the completion of the well in one of the loan cases; and it may be doubted whether the Collector's apportionment between these officers, of the interest due to Government is fair.

4. In regard to the remarks approved in Government Order No: 4895,

Mis. dated 1st December 1896,
the Board does not consider
that they require to be re-
considered. The present Case
and the Cases dealt with
in the Government Order
quoted above, are not -
parallel. In the former the
officers considered are Tahsildars
and in the latter they were -
village officers and Revenue
Inspectors. The charge in the
present Case is one of Careless-
ness, while in the other Case, it
was one of overvaluation which
might have been made in good
faith. The Board's view accepted
by Government regarding
village officers and Revenue
Inspectors was that where
punishment beyond a small
fine was deserved, suspension
would be preferable. In the
remarks column of the
Collector's Statement submitted
to Government with Board's
Proceedings 5741 Mis dated
17th

to 4895
1-12-96

17th November 1896. and dis-
posed of in Government Order
No: 4895 Mis dated 1st
December 1896, the Collector
had remarked that a Revenue
Inspector responsible for over-
valuation of lands in one of
the Cases dealt with in that
Statement had already been
ordered to pay nearly Rs 120
in other Cases. Repeated flogging
such as was resorted to in
the Case of this Revenue
Inspector practically means
that the officer concerned
is to do duty for 4 or 5
months without pay. The
obvious inexpediency of this
Course was pointed out by
the Board and acknowledged
by Government.

5. In para 2 of its order
No: 687 Revenue dated 10th
August 1897, Government
called upon the Collector to
submit a full explanation
with reference to the re-

in para 6 of Board's Proceedings
 No: 525 dated 23rd July 1897
 Though Mr Tate does not
 allude to this Government
 Order, the first of his letters
 now under consideration —
 partially complies with the
 order of Government. He
 has not submitted an explana-
 tion with reference to the paucity
 of applications for loans to
 buy fodder and the slow
 progress of advances up to
 the end of the week ending
 26th June 1897 noticed by the
 Board in the same para.
 (True copy and Extract.)

P. V. Sundaram
 Secretary.

To: The Secretary to Government,
 Revenue Department, with copy of B.O. 866 and original
 Collector of Cuddapah. 7-2-98

30/6

4 0 4 9 5 7
 1 1 2 9 6 7

B.O. Profs No. 3828 his
22-6-98
 (Cw 4661)

To Under Secretary

In connection with
 the disposal of certain cases
 of irrecoverable arrears of
 loans granted in the Cuddapah
 district, the Collector (Mr Tate)
 ordered the recovery of a
 portion of the amounts
 from the village officers and
 the Revenue Inspectors con-
 cerned who were found to
 have overvalued the lands
 accepted as security in
 those cases. The Board of
 Rev, however, doubted the
 expediency of inflicting such
 heavy fines for overvalua-
 tions due possibly to mistake
 made in good faith, and
 was of opinion that when
 any punishment beyond
 a small fine was de-
 sirable, suspension would
 be preferable. In this
 view of the Board, the Govt
 expressed

Copy 24
 21/7/98

expressed its concurrence. Again in its remarks on the collector's fortnightly narrative for the second half of April 1897, the Board noticed the slow progress made in the district in the granting of loans, and as it had reason to believe that "Revenue Subordinates" of the district were under "apprehension as to the personal consequences which might ensue to them, if loans granted were not recovered," it requested the collector to "make it clear to his Subordinates that, except in case of clear dishonesty or gross carelessness they (had) nothing to fear."

(Para 10 of the B.P. in G.O. $\frac{454}{12-6-97}$)
Again in its review of the Cuddapah fortnightly narrative for the second half of June, the Board, while remarking on the backwardness

Para 2 of G.O. $\frac{4895}{1-12-96}$

7.

Para 10 of B.P. in G.O. $\frac{454}{12-6-97}$ E

Para 6 of the B.P.
in G.O. $\frac{687}{10-8-97}$
H.

backwardness, ^{of the people} in applying for State loans in the district, attributed it to the slowness on the part of Subordinate officials to encourage loan applications which again was attributed to the action of the collector who, the Board said "held some officials granting a loan liable for the amount in the event of a default in payment." He further called upon the collector to submit a full explanation with reference to the above remarks.

2. Without appearing to answer this call, ^{the collector} the collector submits in justification of his action a specimen case which occurred in his district and requests that, in the circumstances therein stated, his action in ordering the recovery of certain amounts from the

the officials at fault may
be approved and the order
of the Govt of the 1-12-96
concurring in the Board's
opinion above referred
to, reconsidered.

Go. 4895
1-12-96

7

pages 1 to 3 of Coll's letter
of 12-1-98 in the current

3. In this specimen
case two sums of
Rs. ¹⁰⁰~~125~~ and ¹²⁵~~100~~ were
advanced, as the first instal-
ments under the Special
well rules to ~~the same~~ ^{a Karmam.}
and the second sum to him & his undivided
brothers for sinking wells
in two separate survey
numbers. ~~For the well~~
in the first case did not prove
~~successful~~ ^{successful},
and the two brothers utilized
the ~~two~~ advances in sinking
a well in a ~~different~~ ^{third}
survey number, and applied
for a transfer of the
loan to that survey number.
As the well was partly for
benefit in ~~the~~ lands, the
Revenue Inspector who re-
ported on this application
recommended the transfer
of the loans from the Special

Go 338
15-5-88

M.
Rampathi Sastri
of ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~same~~ ^{same}

pages 4 to 6 of Coll's letter

page 7 ibid

to the general rules; the
papers were, however, lodged
by the Tahsil Dar and the
matter was then lost sight of
for three years. When the
matter came to notice subse-
quently the borrowers agreed
to refund the entire advance
of Rs. 225, and the offer was
accepted. The interest on
the amount was, on the
recommendation of the
Sub. Collector, ordered to be
paid partly by the borrow-
ers and partly by the
Tahsil Dar through whose
carelessness the amount
remained uncollected for
3 years.

4. The collector (Mr. Tate)
says that such instances
of carelessness are very
common in the district,
that when he joined the
district in 1895 numerous
cases of the kind ~~came~~
~~came~~ came up before
him, that before filing

a pecuniary responsibility
 on ~~these~~ officers concerned
 he addressed the Board on the
 subject, and that he was
 informed in reply that the
 Board itself had ^{had} occasion
 to call for explanations in
 numerous cases of delays
 on the part of Revenue
 Inspectors and Tahsildars
 in making inspections
 and that when loss of interest
 to Govt. was distinctly tra-
 ciable to very gross neglect
 the officers responsible
 should certainly be called
 upon to make good the
 whole or portion of the
 loss. Mr. Talo also in-
 vited attention to the case
 disposed of in G.O. 1843
18-5-96 ^C
 in which a Taluk ~~an~~ ^{Revenue} ~~Revenue~~ ^{Inspector} ~~Revenue~~
~~Committee~~ was held res-
 ponsible for a portion
 of the loan (principal),
 and says that the course
 followed by him ^{in other cases} was in
 accordance with the directions
 of

para 8 ibid

7

of the Board and Govt.
 5. The Board points
 out that the Specimen case
 cited by the Collector and the
 one disposed of in G.O. 4895
1-12-96
 (the reconsideration of which
 is now brought ~~for~~ by the Collr)
 are not parallel. In the
 former case, it states,
~~that~~ the officers concerned
 were Tahsildars, while in
 the latter they were village
 officers and Revenue In-
 spectors, and that the charge
 in the former case was
 one of carelessness, while
 in the latter it was one
 of overvaluation which
 in the opinion of the Board
 might have been made
 in good faith, and reiterating
 the opinion expressed in
 November 1896 as to the
 inexpediency of inflicting
 heavy fines on low paid
 officers.

nd
9-8-98 ^{Secy} It is sub-
 mitted that each case must be

with its merits.
It is obvious that
"over valuation" may
be due to carelessness
incompetence or
fraud. For such a
case please see
that lately disposed
of by the Govt in G.O. 2240 & 23 May 98^P
where a karnam &
Revinspetu valued
at Rs 200 land which
when sold fetched Rs 82.

The Govt may
however it is submitted
again affirm the
general rule that it
is inexpedient to
inflict large fines
on minor subordinates
since there will probably
be satisfied by money
obtained illicitly.

In the case
passed by Mr Tate, it
is submitted that
the order directing
recovery of the interest (which cannot be any very large sum)
on the Tahildar at fault

Yes - as before laid down
suspension is the proper punishment.
Crim. pros. can of course be
resorted to where fraud is imputed.
M.A.

Yes: if there is fraud
or criminal neglect it
should be ~~prosecuted~~ dealt
with in the mag. courts
S.P.

G.P. must say nothing
about this.
M.A.

The Bt. should take the case
of this Tahildar into consideration
decide whether he should be punished for
disregard of the Collector's
orders regarding the information
of the M.A. 12.8.98

The collector's order appoints
the interest between the
two Tahildars according
to the periods during
which they held charge.
The Bt. seems to hold
that the first Tahildar
who originally lodged
the paper was more to
blame. But it seems
hardly worth while
disturbing the collector's
order on this score as
the 2nd Tahildar has
apparently paid of. The
first Tahildar Rampathi
Sastri has not however
paid (vide page of collector's
letter flagged V). I submit
he should be ordered to
pay at once & to explain
his contumacy.

M.A.
10.8.98

H.M.
S.P. 11/87

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read ²² 3828 dy 22-6-98 (C.N. 4661)

passing orders on letter from the
Collector of Cuddalore reporting a
loan case as a specimen of loose
work in ~~the~~ ^{the} district, and
of the action taken by him
in such cases.

G. O. no. 3436 dy 23rd Aug 98

The Government has
carefully perused Mr. Taler's
report received with the
B. P. read above, but sees
no reason to modify the
opinion expressed in
para 2 of G. O. ⁴⁸⁹⁵ 1-12-96
~~that it is~~ ^{as to the} inexpediency
of ~~to~~ ^{the} furnishing neglect on the
part of minor subordi-
nates by the infliction
of large fines. Suspension
is the proper punish-
ment in such cases, ~~and~~ ^{can be clearly pro-}
Where fraud ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~imposed~~
Criminal prosecution
can, of course, be

9/1
23/8/98

F

Uco

n re

in the table.

resorted to. Each case ^{however} must be dealt with on its own merits. ~~and~~ in the case cited by the Collector, his order directing the recovery of interest from the Tahsildars at fault appears ^{to be} ~~was perfectly~~ justifiable.

2. From para 5 of Mr. Taki's letter it is observed that M. R. Ry S. Pampapathi Sastri the Tahsildar who ~~declined to pass orders on~~ ^{originally lodged} decided that no orders should be passed on the Rev. Inspector's report has neither paid the amount ordered to be paid by him by the Collector nor shown cause to the contrary. The Board of Rev should take the case of this Tahsildar into consideration and decide whether he should not be ~~dealt with~~ ^{punished} for his disregard of the Collector's orders

RS
1-8-98

Me
23/7/98

23/8/98
26-8-98

Who for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 189 DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A. A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

STATEMENT 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.