

Revenue (189⁸) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4641

DATED 25th Nov 98.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Communicating to the B? of Rev S.O.
No 2741 of 29.6.98 passing orders
on Jaynagar Chow application for
certain needs and stating that copy
of the collector's report disposed of in
B.P. 1788 of 15.5.98 may be sent to
Jaynagar Chow.

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
Financial (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 138

From

The Board of Revenue, Land
Revenue Madras.

No. 134 (Petn)

Order *hise*

G.O. No 2740 of 29.6.98;
passed on an application from
Jaya Raja Rao for record connected
with his case, will now be
communicated to the Board of Revenue
for information and guidance.

Dated 31st August 1898

Received 2

Registered 3

Enclosures /

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting for orders ^{an} appli-
cation from R. Jaya Raja Rao, late --
Muzur Sheristadar, Nilgiris, for co-
pies of certain Board's Proceedings
passed in his case.


The B. of Revenue L.R.
with and returned and with
G.O. No 2740 of 29.6.98 (A)

Copy to the collector of the Nilgiris
with G.O. No 2740 of 29.6.98 (A)

Min
Let *an* *copy*
of the order *W. P. L.*
to the B. of Revenue *11.8.98*
has been
no *sin* *it has not been* *usual*
to do so. *The* *mission* *is*
repeated *and* *in* *future* *the* *re-*
instructions *will* *be* *followed*
in *such* *cases.*

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



The Secretary to the Commissioners

J. Laut Kassar
Madras.

One fauna C. 28

STAMPS ISSUED 1556
LAND REVENUE
Stamps

Si.

As I have to prefer an appeal against the order
of Government dismissing me from service I request -
fully beg that I may be furnished with copies of the
first Board's proceedings passed on the collection report to the
Board & my explanation and of the remarks of the Board
contained in its No: d. 2. No 6869 d: 18 December 1897
and of any other records that might have originated
from the Board in this connection. The requisite
stamp papers will be submitted on information received.

My dear Sir, your
most obedient servant.

R. Luycklaers
Go Postmaster
fiedum baram.

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE),

Madras, ~~31st August~~ 1898.

READ— petition from R. Jaya Raja Rao, care of Postmaster,
Chidambaram, South Arcot District, dated 13th August 1898.

Reference No. 134 (Patn) dated ~~31st August~~ 1898.

The petitioner's copy application will be submitted
for the orders of Government.

2. The petitioner, who is the Huzur Sheristadar of the
Nilgiris dismissed in G.O. No. 234 Revenue, dated 27th April 1898, has
been informed that the Board's Reference dated 30th April 1897, is
not relevant to his case, and a copy of it will not be granted.

3. Copies of Board's Proceedings No. 1788 Mis. dated 15"
May 1897, and No. 4819 Mis. dated 18th December 1897, cannot be granted
without the orders of Government.

Lonel Davidson

Ag. Secretary.

To the Secretary to Govt., R.D., with petition in original.
-- the Petitioner.

Exd. *Aln*

Revenue Department

B.P. No 134 Petn d. 31. 8. 98.
(C. No. 6138)

In the Under Secretary's

The Board of Revenue submits for the orders of Govt an application from Jayaraja Row, late Muzar Sanichan, to Laramund, for copies of the following papers:-

- (i) Board's Refree d. 30. 4. 97.
- (ii) B.P. No. 1788 Muz d. 15. 5. 97.
- (iii) 4819 Muz d. 18. 12. 97.

2. The Board has informed the petitioner that the first paper is not relevant to his case and that a copy of it will not be granted. As regards the other two papers the Board has informed him that copies thereof cannot be granted without the orders of Govt.

3. Attention is solicited to the concluding sentence of G.O. No 2740 d. 29. 6. 98 in which the

Where are there?
mark them
234
disposed of in G.O. No. 2740 d. 27. 4. 98.
H.

[This G.O. was in the office of the Secy and was returned only the day before yesterday. It was taken in connection with an application for copies of papers sent by the petitioner to that Secy.]
13.10.98

the petitioner was informed that copies of items 2 and 3 cannot be paid to. This G.O. was not communicated to the Board of Revenue as it has not been usual to do so in such cases. The omission is regretted.

4. Submitted that the G.O. may now be communicated to the Board of Revenue and to the Collector of the Nilgiris for information and guidance. Please see a draft order put up on the back of the current.

W.R.
9-9-98
13-10-98

Levy
21-10-98

Submitted by
28/10/98

Has it been usual
to give pp. such as
to want to be
refused to be

28/10/98

✓

Please see items 3 & 4 in
his application under G.O.
no 2740 of 29.6.98. R

Please see Jayaraja Row's
application in G.O. no.
2740 of 29.6.98.
and the above G.O.
H.

Is under levy

With reference to the
Levy's remarks above it is
submitted that the following
papers were refused; viz.

(i) The Collector's report to the
Board and the Board's orders
thereon; and

(ii) The Collector's report
forwarding the case to Govt.
and the Board's remarks, if
any thereon.

2. The petitioner was asked
to apply to the Collector for the
charges framed against him,
his answers, the evidence on
both sides, his explanation
and notes of evidence and he
was furnished with a copy
of G.O. (order only) 234 of 27-4-98.

3. The rule on the subject
is contained in paras 10 & 13
of the rules in G.O. no 105-2
of 5.12.93. The gist of the
rules seems to be that
reports should not be printed
if they are of a confidential
nature.

W.R.
8/11/98

Levy
The rules quoted are
for the guidance of
Boswell subordinate

4

to the Government.
 The principle,
 which no doubt, should
 apply equally in cases
 where the Govt. disallows
 a man, is that (1)
 dismissed. public servants
 should have all the
 papers necessary to enable
 to make his appeal
 & to higher authority is
 he should know the
 reasons for his dismissal.
 But then, secondly, to
 no good reason why
 he should be furnished
 with any papers showing
 that ~~different~~ ~~different~~
 & different opinions
 were held as to his case
 by authorities subordinate to
 the Govt. or their authority
 dismissing him.
 In the present case
 G.O. 234 & 27 Apr 92 they
 show that the Bd held a
 different view to that taken by the
 Govt. The reasons for the Bd's
 view have been ruled to be irrelevant
 against the Govt. I am not concerned relevant to
 the petitioner's case. Perhaps however he might get a copy of the

Yes - give him a copy of
 the Orders except that
 not of the Boards
 G.O. 19.10.8

a copy of which (order)
 has been furnished to
 the petitioner

5

As regards precedents
 please see the case
 of Tahulda Jinn Rao
 G.O. 2370 & 17 June 1896
 dismissing him in the
 face of the Bd's recommendation
 to reduce him was committed
 to him in full.
 There was however
 nothing confidential
 about the pp.
 Please also see
 the case of Saubham
 Meena. Uncond. Ant.
 Sett Party. G.O. 1196
 & 3-12-92 appears to
 have been committed to
 him in full although the
 papers contained
 evidence of personalities
 between Mr Castle Stuart
 Stuart & Mr Dungey
 But in this case the
 despatch entry appears
 to have been entered
 by the Muz whether with
 or without the Secy's authority
 it does not appear.

Ule
 18th/92

7
To Under Secy:.

It is respectfully submitted that there are two letters from the Collector in this case.

(i) First report of the Collector submitting the case for the orders of the Board. The number and date of this letter are not available here. But the report was discussed by the B. in B. P. No. 1788 of 15.5.97 (Please see the B. P. read at 12 of 9.0. No. 234 of 27.4.98).

(ii) The second letter of the Collector was a report to Govt. requesting orders in the matter of the prosecution of Jaymanga Das. This letter was referred to the B. in 9.0. No 1684 Judicial of 30.11.97; and was resubmitted to Govt. with B. P. No 4819 of 18.12.97. On this final order was passed in 9.0. No 234 of 27.4.98.

It is presumed that the petitioner should be granted only a copy of the collector's first report.

6
of 4.6.97 No 10/97
read at the head of 9.0.
No 234 of 27.4.98. J

For the other has
nothing to do with
the merits of the case
and is refused

report -

These were reported over
submitted below for approval

W.R. Secy 23/11/98

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text in the left column, possibly containing details of the report and administrative notes.]

Sp
25/11/98

Revenue Department

B.O. No 134 Dtd 31.8.98
(C. No 6138)

G.O. Memo No. 444/dps-11-98

G.O. No 27487 29.6.98
passed on an application from
Jagajaya Row for records
connected with his case will
now be communicated to the
Board of Revenue for
information and guidance.

2. The Govt. considers
that a copy of the collector's
report ^{disposed of in R.P.} ~~originally submitted~~
^{1788 & 15 May 1898} ~~the case for the Board of the~~
~~Board~~ may be sent to
the petitioner.

Mls
28/11/98

W.R.
23.11.98
2-12-98
The B.O. of Revue (d. 2) Dtd 29.11.98

[Faint handwritten notes on the left margin, mostly illegible.]

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

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.