

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Mis	1138	Rev	18-3-99.				

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 956

From

The Secretary to the Commissioner
of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue,
Madras.

Order

Mis. No. 449.

Dated 4th February 1899.

Received 7/2

Registered 7/2

Enclosures 1 com—

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government report regarding a
deficiency of 100 sheets of Court Fee labels,
of one rupee value each, discovered in an
English packet contained in stamp case No.
9014 received per S.S. "Mombassa" on the
5th January 1899, and requesting it to give
telegraphic intimation of the deficiency
to the Secretary of State for India and to
accord sanction for writing off the ac-
counts the sum of Rs. 3,600 being the
value of the stamps found deficient.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
<i>mis</i>	<i>1664</i>	<i>Rw</i>	<i>26.3.97</i>

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
<i>mis</i>	<i>1138</i>	<i>Rw.</i>	<i>18-3-99.</i>

PRICE 1 pie. $\frac{2,000}{1-9-98}$.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Separate Revenue).

Dated 4th February 1899.

Mis.No. 449.

Read letter from J.N. Atkinson Esquire, I.C.S., Super-

intendent of Stamps, Madras, No.193, dated 27th January 1899.

Resolution:-

The Superintendent of Stamps has brought to the notice of the Board that, while issuing stamps to districts on the 25th ultimo, from the stock of the Assistant Superintendent, one of the packets bearing English seals was found to contain 200 sheets of Court Fee labels of the value of 1 rupee each, instead of 300 as marked on the label pasted thereon. The packet formed part of stamp case No.9014 received per "S.S. Mombassa" on the 5th idem. The packing account of stamp stores, dated 9th December 1898, (Indent¹ dated 25th September 1897) showed that the consignment contained 2800 sheets of 36 Court Fee labels each of the value of one rupee, and the Superintendent of Stamps, who opened it on arrival, found it to contain 5 bundles of 500 sheets each and a sixth bundle marked as containing 300 sheets. The deficiency of one hundred sheets referred to above was discovered in the

last-mentioned bundle by the Head Supervisor in the Stamp Office while counting the stamps for distribution. The Superintendent of Stamps reports that he ~~has~~ satisfied himself that the packet in which the deficiency occurred could not have contained more than 200 sheets and that the entry 300 in the label on the wrapper thereof must be ^a clerical error. Full particulars of the circumstances connected with the deficiency in question are given in the accompanying copy of the report received from the Superintendent on the subject. In view of his assurances regarding the improbability of the packet having contained more than 200 sheets, and of the reported fact that the seals thereon were intact and that it bore no signs of having been tampered with, the Board considers that the case is one of short delivery and accordingly requests that Government will be pleased to give telegraphic intimation of the deficiency to the Secretary of State for India with reference to the Government of India letter communicated with Government Order Mis. No. 1664, dated 26th March 1897, and to accord sanction for writing off the accounts the sum of Rs. 3,600 being the value of the stamps found deficient.

2. The wrapper on the packet in question, together with the label pasted thereon, are herewith forwarded for inspection and transmission to the Secretary of State for India in Council in view to the necessary enquiries being made as to how the deficiency occurred.

(True extract.)

Amma
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with the wrapper and label, and a copy of the letter from
the Superintendent of Stamps.

Copy to the Superintendent of Stamps.

Copy of letter from the Superintendent of Stamps,
Madras, No. 193, dated 27th January 1899.

"I have the honour to bring to the notice of the Board that, while issuing stamps to the districts on the 25th instant from the stock of the Assistant Superintendent, one of the packets bearing English seals was found to contain 200 sheets of Court Fee labels of one rupee value each, instead of 300 as marked on the label pasted thereon. The packet was received in case No. 2014 ex S.S. "Mombassa" on the 5th January 1899. According to the Packing Account of Stamp Stores, dated 9th December 1898 (indent 1, dated 25th September 1897), the case contained 2800 sheets of 36 labels each of Court Fee stamps of the value of one rupee. These cases usually contain 2500 sheets in five bundles of 500 each. Owing to its being shown as containing the unusual number of 2800, the case was opened by me and a sixth ^{bundle,} marked as containing 300 sheets, was found. It was subsequently issued to the Assistant Superintendent in the usual course on ~~the~~ 18th instant. There were actually in the case five packets of 500 sheets each and one of 200 sheets, thus making in all 2700 sheets instead of 2800 as given in the Packing Account.

2. Out of the five full packets of 500 sheets each, one was sent to the Treasury Deputy Collector of Malabar on the 19th instant. A telegram was despatched to him yesterday instructing him to examine the contents of the packets and to report

the result, and he has replied that it contains 500 sheets. The other four packets, which are in this office, have been examined by me and found to contain 500 sheets each. I have satisfied myself that the packet, in which the deficiency occurred, could not have contained 100 more sheets, as I actually placed an additional hundred sheets into it and found that the folding was altered thereby and the broken portions of the English seal would not meet. I have certified this on the brown paper covering, which I am sending herewith for the inspection of the Board.

3. The seals on the packet were intact and it bore no signs of having been tampered with. There appears to be no reason to doubt that only 200 sheets were placed in the packet and that the figure "300" is a clerical error. The wrapper with the label in question, bearing the signatures of the counter and of the checker, as noted in the margin, are herewith forwarded for inspection and ^{essential} ~~external~~ transmission to the Secretary of State for India, in view to the necessary enquiries being made as to how the deficiency occurred.

The labels on the ^{five} full ~~five~~ bundles are dated the 11th November, and the odd packet of 200 the 14th idem.

4. I would explain that the system of issue by the Assistant Superintendent for compliance with District Indents is to enter all the demands in the various books, and then to issue the totals to the Supervisor, who makes the distribution according to districts. It thus often happens that packets bearing English seals are issued intact to the Supervisor who counts the contents for distribution.

The packet in question was issued by the Assistant Superintendent

to Head Supervisor Narainasamy for distribution. It was opened in the Supervisor's presence by Counter Kuppuram, who counted the sheets. Counters Venkatasamy, Abdul Aziz, Ramasamy, Vanugopaul, Rungiah and Chockalingam were also present. The deficiency was at once reported in writing by the Supervisor to the Assistant Superintendent, who brought the matter to my notice without delay. After the distribution is completed, the stamps are counted and examined again, district by district, by the Assistant Superintendent before they are packed.

5. It is for the Board to decide whether this is a case of "short delivery". If so, the Government should be moved to give telegraphic intimation of the occurrence to the Secretary of State for India, in accordance with the ruling in Board's Proceedings Mis. No. 1309, dated 1st April 1897 (Separate Revenue).

6. I have the honour to request that the requisite sanction for writing off the accounts the value of the stamps found deficient, viz, Rs. 3,600, may be communicated to me."

(True copy)

Rammanickam

Assistant
Acting Secretary.

communicating
G.O. 1664 of 26.3.97.

Note attached with
c.no. 956499

SpSant
return papers
7/2/99
Recd after
5 days - 8.2.99
sent to
supd. 8.2.99

No indication of
tampering

Telegram

To

The Rt. Hon. the Secy. of State
for India.

A packet of one-rupee
court fee labels received
Mombassa 5th ultimo in
case No. 9014 contained 200
sheets instead of 300 marked
on ^{package} label. Seals on packet
intact. Dispatch follows.

KO
7-2-99

8/7/99

To under Secy

The telegram codified
is submitted in the ^{attached} ~~accom-~~
~~panying~~ copy for approval

8.2.99

W
8/2/99

a desp.

Note: The words within brackets
to be omitted
(Draftly
For the under Secy's approval)

one
packet
(of)

~~one~~ (a)
rupee

Court fee stamps = Nequeret
labels

received per S.S. = nasution
Mombassa

5th January last = Leniat

in case = Innervio

(no)

9014

contained

200

= Xenium

sheets

instead of = adve hito

300

= Turimam

marked

(on)

package

Seals

(on)

(packet)

intact

(and)

no

indications

(of)
tampering

a despatch on the subject will follow = Paucoros
1/8/81

A

Code
Class.

INDIAN



TELEGRAPHS.

Monthly
Number.

To

(Office)

Telephonist

From

(Office)

Message

Words.

Day.

Hour.

Minute.

Official
Instructions.

To

(Person)

1st Assistant
Revenue Dep't

From

(Person)

Assistant Secy
Board Sup. Rev

The Sup't of Stamps reports that there was no apparent deficiency until the stamp packet in question was opened and that no further deficiency has come to light.

64 Word Form.

F. C 2.

Recd. from

LN.

Sent to

LN.

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

Telegraph Master.

Telephone Message

To the Asst Secy,
Board of Rev
Sep Rev

Please see O.D. No 449 dated 4-2-99
and your message of the 16th instant. May it be
presumed that the number of stamps ~~is the~~
according to the invoice agreed with the total of
the numbers on the packets? Have all the packets
received in the Consignment been opened? If
any remains unopened, may it be opened to
see whether the missing sheets have been put
into any other packet. An early reply will oblige

V. K. Ramaniachari
For and

23-2-99

Revenue Department

14.57
23.2.99

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS. *Monthly Number.*Code
Class.To
(Office)

Telephonic

From
(Office)

Message

Words.

Day.

Hour.

Minute.

Official
Instructions.To
(Person)18th AssistantFrom
(Person)

Post Secy

Revenue Dept

Board Secy

Your telephone of 3rd Dec. deficiency in a stamp packet. The Sup. of Stamp reports that the actual number of stamps received agrees with number on packet, meaning a certain no. labels on packets and that all other packets of that description were opened & examined & found correct. He is of opinion that the deficiency was not due to envelopment but to clerical error.

64 Word Form.

for an explanation please see telephonic message marked G.

x actual

Recd. from

I.N.

Sent to

I.N.

At

Hrs.

Mts by

At

Hrs.

Mts by

Telegraph Master.

D

Telephone

From

The First asst. R.D.

To

The asst. Secy. Board
S.R.

your telephone
of today. My query
whether it maybe
presumed that the
number of stamps given
in the invoice agreed
with the total of the
numbers on the packets
has not been answered.
An early reply to this
will oblige.

V. K. Ramanujachari

28-2-99

17/5
28/7/99

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS. Monthly Number.Code
Class.To
(Office)From
(Office)

Words

Day

Hour

Minute

Official
InstructionsTo
(Person)The 1st Asstt
Res. Dept.From
(Person)The Asstt Secy
Separate Revenue

Your telephone message of
28th February. The Superintendent of
Stamps report that the numbers
according to the invoice agree
with the total of the numbers on
the packets

64 Word Form.

F.C.2.

Recd. from

LN.

Sent to

LN.

Telegraph Master

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

F

marked C

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
TELEPHONIC MESSAGE.

To	From
The Asst. Secretary, Board of Rev. (S.R.)	First Assistant, Rev. Secretariat, Fort St. George.

In your telephonic message of the 28th ultimo re: deficiency in a stamp packet you say "that all other packets of that description were opened" and examined and found correct. Will you please let me know ^{what} you mean by "of that description"? Do you mean ~~all~~ the packets received in case No. 9014? have been opened & examined?

VK Ramaniyachari
Date 3.3.99
PPK
16.2
3-3-99
For asw.

Handwritten notes in the top left corner of the left page.

Handwritten notes in the middle left section of the left page.

Handwritten notes in the bottom left section of the left page.

Revenue Department

TH G

To And Secretary, Bd. of Rev. (S.R.)
From First Assistant, Rev. Secretariat, Fort St. George.

Please expedite the reply ^{state when I may expect the}

to my telephonic message of the 3rd instant re: the deficiency in the number of court-fee label sheets received from the India Office.

Code Class

INDIAN

To Office

Telephonic

Words	Day	Hour	Minute
0	7	13	26

To (Person)

1st Asst. R.D.

V.K. Ramaniyachari
Asst. Assistant

Reply
Have asked. Supt. of Stamps. Am awaiting his reply which will probably come today.

64 Word Form.

F.C.2.

Recd. from	LN	Sent to	LN		
At	Hrs.	Mts. by	At	Hrs.	Mts. by

Telegraph Master.

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS. Monthly Number.Code
Class.To
(Office)

Telephonie

From
(Office)

Message

Words

Day.

Hour.

Minute.

Official
Instructions.To
(Person)

(Person)

1st Asst R.D.

From
(Person)

(Person)

Asst Secy

D.D. Secy. Res.

The other packets in case^{no} 9014 have been examined & found correct. The remaining 4 cases received in the Consignment are in the Supt's store. It is not usual to open them before issue. Supt says that they will be examined if ordered. Does the Govt wish them to be opened & examined.

64 Word Form.

F.C.2.

Recd. from

LN.

Sent to

LN.

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

Telegraph Master.

C. No. 956.

From The Board of Revenue (Sep. Rev.)
Mis. No. 449 Dated 4.2.99.

189

FOR ORDERS.

To Secy.

Please see below a
draft telegram to the Secretary
of State with reference to the
letter from the Govt of India,
Encl. & Com. Dept. No. 1307 S.R.

under G.O. 1664
26.3.97.

20
26.3.97

2. After issue, a draft
despatch and G.O. will be
submitted for approval.

KD
7-2-99

Mul
8/7/99

To Secy.

Please see draft G.O.
and despatch to the Secy. of State
below.

KD
11-2-99

But was there a deficiency
in the total consigt. of stamps

8/2.13/99

To Secy.

The information asked for not being available in the papers before Govt, then Board ~~was~~ asked. reference was made to the Board. which replies that "There was no apparent deficiency until the stamp packet in question was opened, and that no further deficiency has come to light."

KD
17-2-99

I mean did they receive the full invoiced quantity? JH 17/10/21

To Secy.

The Supt. of Stamps apparently compared the invoice with the number of stamps shown on the labels ^{on the packets} and found no discrepancy. This may be presumed from the Board's statement ^{that} "there was no apparent deficiency until the stamp packet was opened." Does the Secretary wish to know whether the missing 100 ^{sheets} papers have been found in some other

vide telephoned message below.

Telephonic message below marked A.

packet? If some packets have not yet been opened, does he wish that they should now be examined?

Or does the Secretary mean the quantity invoiced for?

KD
18-2-99
Is not every consignment accompanied by an invoice showing the total quantity in all the packets forming the consignment of that particular vessel? If so, was the total received whether or no a particular packet was wrongly marked as total
JH
10/4

To Secy.

yes. Every consignment is accompanied by an invoice. As the packets do not appear to be opened until necessary, the invoice can be compared only with the numbers of the stamps marked on the packets. This comparison appears to have been made,

and no discrepancy was noticed. May the Supt of Stamps be asked to open all the unopened packets, if any, and to state whether the full invoiced quantity has been received?

K.O.

21-2-99

To Secy.

Further enquiries have been made of the Board of Revenue as directed. The results are:—

(i) That the numbers of stamps as per invoice agrees with the total of the numbers entered on the labels of the various packets.

(ii) That all the packets in case No. 9014 have been opened and examined. Except the packet, in which a deficiency of 100 sheets of one rupee Court fee labels was reported, the contents of the other packets are correct.

(iii) That four other cases were received along with the case No. 9014, which are in the Superintendent's store unopened.

Please speak

HA

Telephonic message marked E

Shid. marked H.

Shid.

Enquiry is made whether they should be opened and examined. Orders are requested. If not, will the Secretary kindly pass the drafts?

K.O.

9-2-99

Telegram from the Secy. of State of 7.3.99 (C. no. 1760)

To Secy.

The telegram read above may, it is submitted, be forwarded to the Board of Revenue for enquiry and report. It is not clear what enquiry is intended. Perhaps it has to be ascertained whether the 100 sheets ^{found to be missing} ~~received~~ short in this Presidency have been received in Bombay. Please see draft below. May the Secy. of State be addressed on the receipt of report?

K.O.

16-3-99

Issue reused despatch

8/5/5

Read B.P. (S.R.) No. 449 of 4.2.99 (c. no. 956)

G.O. no. 1137 of 18th March '99.

Ordered that the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for India be addressed.

2. On receipt of reply, sanction to write off the value of the deficient stamps will be accorded. deferred pending receipt of reply.

[Signature]
13/4/99

To

The Board of Revenue (S.R.)

DU. 21-3-99

Sehamed
23/8/99

Despatch No. 3 of 23rd March '99

To

The Rt. Hon. the Secy. of State for India.

My Lord,

In continuation of telegram of 8th instant, reporting a deficiency of ^{one hundred} ~~100~~ sheets in a packet of one-rupee court-fee labels enclosed in case No. 9014 received on the 5th ultimo per S. S. Nombassa, we have

the honour to transmit the wrapper on the packet, and the label pasted thereon, together with a copy of a report of the circumstances in which the deficiency was discovered. The Superintendent of Stamps states that the seals on the packet were intact, that it bore no sign of having been tampered with, and that ~~it could not~~ ^{the packing did} ~~contain~~ ^{impossibility} ~~more than 200 sheets,~~ ^{admit of its} ~~the number actually found~~ ^{in it.} He therefore concludes that the entry of 300 in the label on the wrapper ^{was a clerical error.} ~~We have therefore~~ ^{agents} ~~suggested~~ that your Lordship will be pleased to ~~direct~~ ^{direct} enquiries to be made as to the cause of the deficiency.

[Signature]

11-2-99

Sealed packet to accompany despatch

B.P. Mss. No. 449 of 4-2-99 (C2956)
(with enclosure)

*under G.O. 1138
18-3-99*

With reference to your L^ds letter of the 7th inst., we have directed that the inquiry therein suggested shall be made, & on the result being ascertained we shall address Y^r L^d. again

[Signature]
18/3/99

When given for copying _____
When copied _____ } 189
When examined _____
When signed _____

AD AGAIN G.O., No. _____, DATED
189 _____

PRESENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

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.

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 1137

DATED 18th March 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Addressing the Rt. Hon. the Secretary
of State for India on the deficiency of one-hundred
sheets in a packet of one-rupee court-fee labels
in case No. 9014 received on the per S.S. Mombasa.