25-677

CONFIDENTIAL.

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 433

Confidential No 12

Dated 30th January 1899

[Despatch Abstract.]

Dismissal from Service M.R.R. V. Srinivasaraghava chari, Tahsildar of Nandigama.

4

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O	No.	Department.	Date.
Cl Ord 235/99							

Confidential

~~REVENUE~~

Public (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8294
Confl No 98

From
The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue,
Madras.

Ref **No.** 1373/Confdl.No.40

Dated 2nd December 1898.
Received 4/12/98
Registered
Enclosures
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government letters from the Collector of Kistna reporting on certain charges against M.R.Ry.V.Srinivasa-Raghavachari, Tahsildar of Nandigama, and recommending his dismissal from service.

Read B.P. Ref No. 1373 d 2 Dec 98

1 **Order** Misc 433
Confl No 12
Recd 30.1.99

H.E. the G. in C. has considered the charge against M.R.Ry. V. Srinivasaraghavachari, his explanation & the evidence recorded. ~~and~~ It is clearly proved that the ~~[illegible]~~ Tahsildar was in the habit ~~[illegible]~~ of borrowing considerable ~~[illegible]~~ sums of money on unduly ~~[illegible]~~ favourable terms from ~~[illegible]~~ traders living within his jurisdiction & the sphere of his official influence. No extenuating circumstances appear in the case. H.E. the G. in C. accordingly directs that M.R.Ry. V. Srinivasaraghavachari be dismissed the public service with effect from the date of the communication of this order to him.

To the Bd of Rev.
To the Collr of Kistna

Issd. 31.1.99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Confidential

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE),

Madras, 2nd December 1898.

A

READ-- letter from R.Morris Esq, Ag.Collector of Kistna, Ref on Cur NO.7 Confidential of 1898, dated 26th Sepetember 1898.

,, ,, Telegram thereon to the aforesaid officer dated 1st October 1898.

,, ,, also letter from the same officer Ref.on C.NO.7 Confdl.of 1898, dated 3rd November 1898.

pp 70-80 of file

Reference No 1373 ~~(Petition)~~ dated 2nd December 1898.
Confdl.NO.40

The Collector's report will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The papers relate to misconduct on the part of M.R.Ry Srinivasa Raghavachari, Tahsildar of Nandigama Taluk, Kistna District. The matter was first brought to the Board's notice by the receipt in the end of September last from the Collector of a copy of a confidential report* drawn up by his Head Assistant, dealing with a number of charges brought against the Tahsildar. Only one of these has been selected by the Collector himself for detailed investigation, and as his inquiry has conclusively proved that the Tahsildar was in the habit of borrowing considerable sums of money on unduly favourable terms from traders living within his jurisdiction and the sphere of his official influence, the Board agrees with the Collector in considering that the Tahsildar has rendered himself clearly liable to dismissal, and that for this reason it is unnecessary to investigate any of the other numerous charges against him.

×D pp 1-37 of file

B pp 70-80 of file

3. Into the facts of the case it is unnecessary for the Board itself to enter. They are clearly set out in the Collector's report* and are practically undisputed. The inquiry was conducted in strict accordance with the rules and, as the Collector points out,

*B pp 70-80 of file

* in paras 5 & 6 of his letter d. 3.11.98 B

it is difficult to conceive that the Tahsildar was ignorant of those provisions, for early in the current year a Deputy Tahsildar in the same district was reduced on a similar --- [G.O.54 Misc., dated 6th January 1898 — charge. The papers show that the Tahsildar remitted over Rs 5000 into the hands of some four or five merchants in satisfaction of his debts to them during a period of under fourteen months. He offers an explanation to account for the extent of his transactions which has not been verified, but even if it be true and can be taken as satisfactorily rebutting the inference that he was habitually corrupt, the Board considers that no punishment short of dismissal would meet his flagrant disobedience of the rule which prohibits an officer of Government from borrowing money from persons within the sphere of his official influence.

pp 95-103 infra

Lionel Davidson

(True Extract)

L

Ag. Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with two letters and enclosures in original to be returned.

Rev Dept 1

C. No. 8294 of 1898.

Hag 7

Note.

In his letter to the Collector dated the 25th Septr. 1898, the Head Assistant Collector, Kistna, brought the following charges against M. R. Ry. V. Srinivasa Raghavachari, Tahsildar of the Nandigama taluk: —

(i) That the Tahsildar owned lands in certain villages of the taluk, most of which came into the possession of one Ramanadha Rayudu — in whose name they were registered — under suspicious circumstances (Pages 1 to 8 of the file).

(ii) That he granted extents of village sites contrary to the rules to two village officers and to a relative of each of them. (pages 9 to 11).

(iii) That he granted to a relative of one of his agents a piece of village site, in the face of an order of the Head Assistant Collector that it should be left vacant for the use of the public (pages 11 to 14).

(iv) That in respect of a penal charge of 15 times the highest dry rate of assessment sanctioned by the Head Assistant Collector in the case of an unauthorised occupation of village site, the Tahsildar altered in an official document the entry "15 times" the highest dry rate into "5 times" that rate (pp. 14-15).

(v) That he levied no charge in ~~a~~ the case of an unauthorised occupation of certain assessed waste land by two persons, one of whom was the individual who benefited by the alteration which forms the subject of the last charge (pages 15-17).

(vi)

(vi) That he failed to submit to the Head Assistant Collector the inquest report, which was duly received by him, in connection with a suspicious death which occurred in a certain village, and that he was guilty of other irregularities in the procedure he followed in the investigation of the case (pages 17 to 21).

(vii) That he borrowed considerable sums of money from and was indebted to several merchants living within ~~the~~ ~~[illegible]~~ his jurisdiction. (pages 21 to 25).

(viii) That he omitted to assess to income-tax or else assessed inadequately certain persons who were either his intimate friends or his agents (pages 25 to 26).

(i

piece of village site, in the face of an order of the Head Assistant Collector that it should be left vacant for the use of the public (pages 1 to 14).

(iv) That in respect of a penal charge of 15 times the highest dry rate of assessment sanctioned by the Head Assistant Collector in the case of an unauthorised occupation of village site, the Tahsildar altered in an official document the entry "15 times" the highest dry rate into "5 times" that rate (pp. 14-15).

(v) That he levied no charge in ~~a~~ the case of an unauthorised occupation of certain assessed waste land by two persons, one of whom was the individual who benefited by the alteration which forms the subject of the last charge (pages 15-17).

(vi)

(vi) That he failed to submit to the Head Assistant Collector the inquest report, which was duly received by him, in connection with a suspicious death which occurred in a certain village, and that he was guilty of other irregularities in the procedure he followed in the investigation of the case (pages 17 to 21).

(vii) That he borrowed considerable sums of money from and was indebted to several merchants living within ~~his~~ ~~[illegible]~~ his jurisdiction (pages 21 to 25).

(viii) That he omitted to assess to income-tax or else assessed inadequately certain persons who were either his intimate friends or his agents (pp. 25 to 26).

(i

) That he granted to an "agricultural" or "horticultural" society of which he was a member, a piece of land on darkhast; that he was instrumental in effecting the sales of certain godown sites belonging to the society; that he managed the society's accounts; that he obtained a grant from the Taluk Board for the construction of a well which was required for the improvement of the Society's property but was not necessary for the public benefit; and that he erected two temples in the vicinity of the Society's and by means of contributions from ryots and baniyas throughout the taluk (pages 6 to 30).

That he levied a contribution of pulses from various villages for ceremonies in connection with the [illegible] of one of the two temples referred to in the last charge (pages – 31)

(xi)

(xi) That he levied an unauthorised contribution from the village officers in his taluk for the "maintenance of a horse "for the use of the public". (pages 31 to 34).

(xii) That he had dealings in cattle (pages 34 – 35).

(xiii). That he appointed a minor "a mere stripling" – to act as Karnam of a certain village during the absence of the minor's gumastah (pages 35 – 37).

P.C.
16/12/98. Secy

From the H.A.C.s report there wd appear to be more or less evidence on all these charges. But the Collector selected one only for detailed investigation viz that of borrowing sums of money & being indebted to several merchants & moneylenders living within his jurisdiction. The result of Mr Morris' enquiry is set out in his report to the

S2 dated 3 Nov 98 (Slip B)

The Tahsildar explanation will be found at pp 95-103 of the file.

The Tahsildar monetary transactions besides being against the Rules appear to have affected the integrity of his work as regards the administration of the Income tax Act. He violated the Rules with a full knowledge of what the fate which befell Dy Tahsildar Nagabushanam in the same District for a similar offence viz reduction to a clerkship.

The Collector recommends that the Tahr be dismissed & the Bd supports the recommendation.

Wll
3/1/99

H/ The case is fully set out in the pp. submitted by the Board

S.R. 4/1/9

6

× pp 70-80 of file

×.

He was originally under me in the Settlement Dept. When I was President M.C. Madras I made him head of one of the Departments. He did well & when I was Collr of Kistna, trying to get in some good men from outside I made him - first a Dy Tahr I think, & then Tahr - From the H A Collrs report the man seems to have become thoroughly corrupt. AEA

Vide Collrs letter B pp 70-80 of file

I made this Tahsildar's acquaintance when on tour in Nandigama in 1897 - He was brought to Kistna by Mr. Arundel he told me - was I think once employed in Madras Municipality -

Are these cases against Tahsildars decided by one Member?

It is proved, and the Tahr - Srinivasa Raghava Chari admits, that he has on divers occasions & from divers merchants & Sowcars within the limits of the taluk of wh. he was Tahsildar, borrowed sums of money to the extent of several thousands of rupees -

As pointed out by the Board the Tahr in a little over one year repaid debts ~~to the extent~~ of amounting to over Rs 5000 contracted from persons within the sphere of his official influence - I think he must be dismissed as recommended H.S. 6-1-99 -

(xi)

I see no extenuating circumstances whatever. The Tahsildar ought to be dismissed.

AEA 25.1.99.

To H.E. the Governor

S.R. 7-1-9

I think myself the Tahsildar should be dismissed. But, the Hon. Mr. Arundel knows him and may be able to suggest extenuating circumstances. If Mr. Arundel does suggest such circumstances, I should not be unwilling to consider them.

A.E.H. 20.1.99

The Hon Mr Arundel

S.R. 21/1/9

Secy

Please see draft on docket below

Wll
27/1/99

JMcl S.R. 30/1/9

(xi)

When given for copying ________
When copied ________ 189
When examined ________
When signed ________

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED 189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.							
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.							
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.,—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.