

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 1318

DATED 5th April 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing Iqbal Hussain Sahib, Late Registrar, Dg. Coll's Office, Madras, that the Govt. sees no reason to reconsider its orders declining to interfere with the Dg's orders compelling him to resign his appointment.

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 (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 1978

DP 5/4/99

Recd petr / duplicate from Inayat
Husain Sahib d. 1-3-99. (Circ. 1591)
99 from

Recd also Board's Refce. E. No. 11, d. R.
d. 17.3.99. (Circ. 1978/99)

Order Mis. No. 1318 d. 5th April 1899.

The Board of Revenue, Land
Revenue, Madras.

No.
REF. E. No. 11

The petitioner will be
informed that the Govt. sees
no reason to reconsider the
orders already passed in his
case.

Dated 17th March 1899

Received 19th

Registered 20th

Enclosures 17

Spare copies

(from orders).

5/4/99

SUBJECT.

2 to the petr., with 1b encl.
2 to the B. of Rev., L. R.

Submitting to Govt. memorial --
from Inayat Husain Sahib, late Regis-
trar, Dy. Collector's office, Madras, --
praying for reinstatement on the --
grant of a pension.

5/4/99

5/4/99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
81	2602	Rev	18.6.98.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Office of the Board of Revenue

/Land Revenue/

Madras, dated 17th March 1899.

Read endorsement of Herbert Bradley Esq., Ag. Collector of Madras, No. 463D of 1899, dated 4th March 1899, submitting for transmission to Government petition from Inayat Hussain Sahib, late Registrar, Madras Deputy Collector's office,

Reference: E.No. 11, dated 17th March 1899.

The Board submits for the orders of Government the memorial of Inayat Hussain Sahib, late Registrar, Deputy Collector's office, Madras, praying for his reinstatement in the public service or the grant of a pension.

2. The memorialist was required by the Board in 1897 to resign his appointment as an alternative to being removed from the service for his breach of Rules 25 & 26 of the Rules for the personal conduct of Government servants and for certain grave misconduct which had come under the notice of the High Court in the course of the decision of a civil appeal.

3. A memorial against the above orders of the Board has already been considered and dismissed by Government in G.O. No. 2602 Mis. R-v., dated 18th June 1898.

4. The present memorial discloses no grounds which would warrant a reopening of the memorialist's case and the Board has no recommendation to make on his behalf.

Lowell Davidson

Ag. Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with memorial and enclosures.

Q.B.

[Signature]

Original.

Submitted in pursuance of Government Order on Petition
Dated 11th May 1899 and 23rd May 1899.

To

His Excellency

SIR ARTHUR ELIBANK HAVELOCK, G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E.,

GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

Fort St. George,

PETITION

6183

MADRAS.

DEPT. OF REVENUE

The humble petition of Inayet Hussain,
late Registrar, Madras Deputy Collec-
tor's Office, Madras.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

Your humble Petitioner submitted an appeal petition (Exhibit A) to your Excellency in Council on the Board's Proceedings, Miscellaneous No. 1627 (Land Revenue), dated 6th May 1897 (Exhibit A1). Upon this your Petitioner received an endorsement, Miscellaneous No. 2602, dated 18th June 1898, "the Government declines to interfere." Your Petitioner, being compelled out of his desperate circumstances to seek again your Excellency's mercy, submitted another petition, dated 1st November 1898, and the endorsement thereon, No. 310-R of 1899, being that such petition should be submitted through the Head of the Department to which the Petitioner once belonged, now ventures most respectfully to submit the following with a strong hope that your Excellency in Council will be pleased to pass favourable orders on a reconsideration of his miserably unfortunate case.

2. That your Petitioner entered in Government service in the year 1881 in the Land Revenue Department of the Board of Revenue, and thence rose to the post of Registrar in the Madras Collectorate on Rs. 60 a month. Exhibit B contains testimonials from Mr. E. Gibson, the late Mr. J. Grose, Mr. H. E. Sullivan and the late Mr. R. W. Barlow, who invariably testified to his conduct, character, and intelligence in the various capacities he served directly under each of them.

3. That your Petitioner has never behaved since in any way in the service as to fall short of the above opinion in the eye of his superiors, whether Collector or the Deputy Collector of the District, under whom he has been serving, as will be borne out in the following circumstances.

4. That your Petitioner belongs to the once ruling families of the Carnatic and the Tippu Sultan of Mysore, and that as a member of the former family, your Petitioner had a small amount of pension which he converted into a bonus after he joined the Government service.

5. That your Petitioner in January 1893 unfortunately, though foolishly, with a view to improve the condition of his family, went in share to a limited extent in buying and selling Government Promissory Notes in the name of one Rajah Eswar Doss (once a servant of the Carnatic Royal house). That, as soon as the Manual of Public servants was placed in his hands on the 30th May of the same year, on the perusal of Rule 22 of the book, he at once discontinued further dealings with the said Eswar Doss (Exhibit C) which, however, created ill-feelings with him, resulting in litigations, which unfortunately continued for a longer period than was anticipated. That your Petitioner at the outset had sufficient funds to meet the expenses in Court, but finding his opponent was a formidable sowcar, prepared to spend any amount in increasing and dragging on in litigation, he was half inclined to accept the favourable terms advanced privately by Eswar Doss to effect a compromise, but as the Collector and his Deputy, Mr. B. H. Chester, strongly advised the Petitioner that, as a public servant, he could not effect a compromise and that he should go on at any cost, he was forced under the circumstances to incur debts, which, however, was not unknown to his superior officers and ultimately the proceedings ended in favour of the Petitioner (Exhibits D and E).

6. The Petitioner being advised by the Collector to engage the services of Messrs. Wilson and King, he had the good fortune to do so, as the late Mr. Wilson of the said firm had so arranged with the Presidency Magistrate that the hearing in the Police Court was fixed out of the usual office hours, thus enabling Petitioner not to disturb or interfere in his Public service, though he had been granted such leave as he was entitled to during the period. **Thus it is obvious that the Petitioner's conduct throughout was not opposed to his official work.** This litigation was finally supposed to be ended in 1895 by the decision of the Hon'ble Justice Shepherd in favour of the Petitioner on the Original Side of the High Court (Exhibit E₁), leaving the defendant in the suit to appeal against the judgment.

7. That in the meantime some charges of corruption were brought against the Sheristadar of the Madras Collectorate, and Mr. W. Austin, the then Collector, utilized the services of the Petitioner in that connection, and though this circumstance may testify to the esteem and confidence the Petitioner was held in by his superior officers, it inevitably created another enemy in the person of the Sheristadar who, together with his old unsuccessful opponent, succeeded in setting up one of his creditors, thus compelling the Petitioner to seek the benefit of the Act of Insolvency. From Exhibit A, page 12, paragraph 3 of letter to the Collector, paragraph 18 of the petition and paragraph 9 of his letter in page 14, or Exhibit L, page 4, paragraph 9, **it is conclusively proved that the Petitioner not only obtained the required permission of the Collector to go through the Insolvency Act, but that every step of the Petitioner's undertaking was with the knowledge and consent of his superior officers, both with regard to the litigations and its consequent attendants.**

8. The Petitioner's case was then under the rules formally brought to the notice of the Board with a recommendation to grant the required leave to the

Petitioner, and the Board thereupon found no objection to grant the said leave (Exhibit G). The result of the Insolvency petition was then duly communicated to the Board as directed in the following terms of recommendation. Exhibit H, page 2, paragraph 3:—

“* * * * * as it appears that he discontinued to have anything to do with it after the Public Service Manual was received by him at the end of May 1893, and he has been discharging his duties as Registrar of the Madras Deputy Collector's Office with efficiency and to the satisfaction of his superior, I strongly recommend that he may be allowed to continue in service.* * * *”

From this it is apparent that on the one hand, so far as the Petitioner's private life was concerned, the presiding Judge of the Insolvency Court discharged him without finding any misuse of the debts incurred by him, and on the other, his public life as a Government servant fully continued to be unimpeached in spite of the most adverse circumstances he was placed in. It was this, the Petitioner believed, the Board was supposed under the public service rules to have expected to be satisfied with, in calling for a report on the result of the Petitioner's insolvency. But unfortunately, contrary to the expectations of the Petitioner, the Board wholly ignoring the circumstances of his case and the strongly-expressed recommendation in his behalf of the Collector, who it was believed to possess the entire power of either appointing or dismissing the Petitioner, knowing, as he did, more about his case, called upon the Petitioner to show cause why he should not be dismissed on account of the merits of:—

First.—The debts included in the Schedule of Insolvency.

Second.—The result of the Appeal preferred against the judgment of Justice Shepherd in Petitioner's favour. (Exhibit I). *L₁₁*

9. From Exhibit A, page 10, paragraph 1, clauses 1 to 4, it is evident that the Petitioner cannot offer a more satisfactory explanation either with regard to the circumstances that compelled the Petitioner to borrow, or that the Petitioner's official position did not entitle him to the application of Rules 23 and 26 of the Pamphlet for Public Servants, he being only a ministerial servant, doing duties under the direct orders of the Deputy Collector who only does the duties of Registrar. Regarding (2nd) the remarks in the appellate judgment. The Petitioner, beyond what he submitted in Exhibit A, pages 11 and 12, clauses 1 to 4, begs to submit that the two original Courts having *strongly decided on those points in favour of the Petitioner*, it will be no argument against the Petitioner if the Appellate Court had differed on those points for the reasons that such decision was arrived at in the absence of the personal knowledge of the conduct and demeanour of the witnesses. That the judgment passed by the Appellate Court was to a certain extent *ex parte*, as the Petitioner for want of funds was unable to engage strong legal representatives to argue the appeal, but obtained only a formal representation of the Official Assignee. Besides, the late Mr. Wilson having strongly expressed his opinion **that the judgment of Justice Shepherd was not to be disturbed by the Appellate Court**, the Petitioner was not so anxious about maintaining a strong representation at the time of the hearing. **It may further be submitted that, if the Peti-**

tioner's pecuniary circumstances permitted, he should not have allowed the decision of the Appellate Court to be regarded as final, there being yet a higher tribunal to revise such judgment in the Privy Council, and that his Solicitors, Messrs. Wilson and King and Mr. Eardley Norton and others, promised all help in their power, if the Petitioner only met them half way, and even this it was not possible under his circumstances to adopt. If the Appellate Court did not decide in favour of the Petitioner, it was only a proportionate loss to the creditors and nothing disturbing the Petitioner so far as his pecuniary interest was concerned, but as for the truth or otherwise of the case, the Petitioner holds three different judgments relating to the same case in his favour diametrically opposed to the judgment of the Appellate Court. Now the Petitioner believes that your Excellency will view the merits of the case in the light it deserves.

10. From Exhibit K, which is the Board's Resolution thereon, the Petitioner was directed to submit his resignation under certain conditions. As this was not the sort of the resignation the Petitioner thought he should under the circumstances be bound to tender, he submitted another representation requesting for a reconsideration of his case—vide pages 14, 15 and 16 of Exhibit A.

11. The Petitioner begs to submit Exhibit M or page 16 of Exhibit A, paragraph 21. The Board of Revenue permitted Petitioner to appear before a Medical Officer to secure a certificate of unfitness for further service, and on its receipt to submit the question of pension to Government in the ordinary course.

12. Exhibit N is the copy of the medical certificate secured which, however, was a recommendation of the Medical Officer for granting him further 12 months' sick leave.

13. The Board thereupon by its Proceedings, Miscellaneous No. 1627, dated 6th May 1897 (Exhibit A, page 20, paragraph 28), among other things said that as the Petitioner could not arrange to retire on medical certificate, he must be removed from the service unless he then resigned his appointment within seven days after the receipt of the said order.

14. The Petitioner, in obedience to the commands of the Board in his letter, dated 18th May 1897 (Exhibit A, pages 21 and 22, paragraph 30), submitted his resignation holding at the same time the right of appeal to your Excellency in Council.

15. The Petitioner, without further discussing all the points in his favour, and the manner in which he was most miserably treated, in spite of the strong recommendations of his superior officers, begs leave to submit that, as the first petition to your Excellency (Exhibit A) was drafted by a Vakil when he was in a poor state of health and mind, he was overruled by the Vakil to allow an argument (page 24, paragraph 32 of Exhibit A) in spite of his will, to appear in the said petition, and he therefore begs to take this opportunity to withdraw the same, and in addition to expressing his deep-felt regret for its appearance, humbly requests the Board as well as your Excellency to pardon him for this mishap.

16. Under these circumstances your humble Petitioner having supported his whole case on facts regarding his conduct, character and integrity, fully borne out by the strong recommendations of the Collectors throughout his career as a Public servant for a continued term of 16 years, prays your Excellency on a reconsideration of his unfortunate case—

- (a) to restore him to his appointment with arrears of pay as his case fully entitles him to make this humble request, or
- (b) to recommend him for any other appointment carrying equal emoluments to the same Collector or to any other head of the Department in your Excellency's Government, or
- (c) if the circumstances of his case should unfortunately appear such as to deserve no better mercy and treatment at the hands of your Excellency then to grant him such pension as he deserves to which, however, the Board raised no objection but promised to recommend him to your Excellency.

17. The Petitioner in conclusion would not withhold submitting for your Excellency's kind and merciful consideration that he has a large family with a wife, four sons and one daughter to educate and support, and that their destinies depend on the consideration your Excellency may bestow on a poor but faithful servant of the State who spent 16 years of his prime of life in uninterruptedly securing the good-will of all his superiors in spite of adverse circumstances, and is still prepared to devote the remaining days of his energy in the due discharge of duties that may be entrusted to him.

For which act of kindness your petitioner shall, as in duty bound,

EVER PRAY.

AKBER SAHEB STREET,
TRIPPLICANE, MADRAS,
1st March 1899.

List of Enclosures

$\frac{0}{18} 4,000-18-10-98.$

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 159

From

Inayet Hussain —
late Registrar,
Madras Dy. Collector's
Office

No. —

Dated 1st }
Received 4th } *March 1879.*
Registered 6th }
Enclosures 1
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Requesting that the enclosed
petition, praying for restoration, &c.,
may be laid before H. E. the
Governor in Council.

~~2/2~~

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION.

0150

Secretary
Government of
Madras



In obedience to Government
order of 1899 dated
23rd February 1899 I most humbly
beg to submit that I have this day
forwarded the Petition in original
with enclosures to the Collector of
Madras. I also beg to submit herewith
the same in "Duplicate" and
request that you will be kindly pleased
to place the same before His Excellency
the Governor in Council for favourable
consideration.

I beg to remain,

Sir
Your most obedient servant

at Madras
1899

W. M. M. M.

Duplicate

*Submitted in obedience to Government Order on Petition
Endorsement - 12310 R of 1898 dated 23rd February 1899.*

To

His Excellency

SIR ARTHUR ELIBANK HAVELOCK, G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E.,
GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
Fort St. George,
MADRAS.

*The humble petition of Inayet Hussain,
late Registrar, Madras Deputy Collec-
tor's Office, Madras.*

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

Your humble Petitioner submitted an appeal petition (Exhibit A) to your Excellency in Council on the Board's Proceedings, Miscellaneous No. 1627 (Land Revenue), dated 6th May 1897 (Exhibit A1). Upon this your Petitioner received an endorsement, Miscellaneous No. 2602, dated 18th June 1898, "the Government declines to interfere." Your Petitioner, being compelled out of his desperate circumstances to seek again your Excellency's mercy, submitted another petition, dated 1st November 1898, and the endorsement thereon, No. 310-R of 1899, being that such petition should be submitted through the Head of the Department to which the Petitioner once belonged, now ventures most respectfully to submit the following with a strong hope that your Excellency in Council will be pleased to pass favourable orders on a reconsideration of his miserably unfortunate case.

2. That your Petitioner entered in Government service in the year 1881 in the Land Revenue Department of the Board of Revenue, and thence rose to the post of Registrar in the Madras Collectorate on Rs. 60 a month. Exhibit B contains testimonials from Mr. E. Gibson, the late Mr. J. Grose, Mr. H. E. Sullivan and the late Mr. R. W. Barlow, who invariably testified to his conduct, character, and intelligence in the various capacities he served directly under each of them.

3. That your Petitioner has never behaved *since* in any way in the service as to fall short of the above opinion in the eye of his superiors, whether Collector or the Deputy Collector of the District, under whom he has been serving, as will be borne out in the following circumstances.

4. That your Petitioner belongs to the once ruling families of the Carnatic and the Tippu Sultan of Mysore, and that as a member of the former family, your Petitioner had a small amount of pension which he converted into a bonus after he joined the Government service.

5. That your Petitioner in January 1893 unfortunately, though foolishly, with a view to improve the condition of his family, went in share to a limited extent in buying and selling Government Promissory Notes in the name of one Rajah Eswar Doss (once a servant of the Carnatic Royal house). That, as soon as the Manual of Public servants was placed in his hands on the 30th May of the same year, on the perusal of Rule 22 of the book, he at once discontinued further dealings with the said Eswar Doss (Exhibit C) which, however, created ill-feelings with him, resulting in litigations, which unfortunately continued for a longer period than was anticipated. That your Petitioner at the outset had sufficient funds to meet the expenses in Court, but finding his opponent was a formidable sowcar, prepared to spend any amount in increasing and dragging on in litigation, he was half inclined to accept the favourable terms advanced privately by Eswar Doss to effect a compromise, but, as the Collector and his Deputy, Mr. B. H. Chester, strongly advised the Petitioner that, as a public servant, he could not effect a compromise and that he should go on at any cost, he was forced under the circumstances to incur debts, which, however, was not unknown to his superior officers and ultimately the proceedings ended in favour of the Petitioner (Exhibits D and E).

6. The Petitioner being advised by the Collector to engage the services of Messrs. Wilson and King, he had the good fortune to do so, as the late Mr. Wilson of the said firm had so arranged with the Presidency Magistrate that the hearing in the Police Court was fixed out of the usual office hours, thus enabling Petitioner not to disturb or interfere in his Public service, though he had been granted such leave as he was entitled to during the period. **Thus it is obvious that the Petitioner's conduct throughout was not opposed to his official work.** This litigation was finally supposed to be ended in 1895 by the decision of the Hon'ble Justice Shepherd in favour of the Petitioner on the Original Side of the High Court (Exhibit E), leaving the defendant in the suit to appeal against the judgment. *E(1)*

7. That in the meantime some charges of corruption were brought against the Sheristadar of the Madras Collectorate, and Mr. W. Austin, the then Collector, utilized the services of the Petitioner in that connection, and though this circumstance may testify to the esteem and confidence the Petitioner was held in by his superior officers, it inevitably created another enemy in the person of the Sheristadar who, together with his old unsuccessful opponent, succeeded in setting up one of his creditors, thus compelling the Petitioner to seek the benefit of the Act of Insolvency. From Exhibit A, page 12, paragraph 3 of letter to the Collector, paragraph 18 of the petition and paragraph 9 of his letter in page 14, or Exhibit L, page 4, paragraph 9, **it is conclusively proved that the Petitioner not only obtained the required permission of the Collector to go through the Insolvency Act, but that every step of the Petitioner's undertaking was with the knowledge and consent of his superior officers, both with regard to the litigations and its consequent attendants.**

8. The Petitioner's case was then under the rules formally brought to the notice of the Board with a recommendation to grant the required leave to the

Petitioner, and the Board thereupon found no objection to grant the said leave (Exhibit G). The result of the Insolvency petition was then duly communicated to the Board as directed in the following terms of recommendation. Exhibit H, page 2, paragraph 3:—

“* * * * * as it appears that he discontinued to have anything to do with it after the Public Service Manual was received by him at the end of May 1893, and he has been discharging his duties as Registrar of the Madras Deputy Collector's Office with efficiency and to the satisfaction of his superior, I strongly recommend that he may be allowed to continue in service.* * * * *

From this it is apparent that on the one hand, so far as the Petitioner's private life was concerned, the presiding Judge of the Insolvency Court discharged him without finding any misuse of the debts incurred by him, and on the other, his public life as a Government servant fully continued to be unimpeached in spite of the most adverse circumstances he was placed in. It was this, the Petitioner believed, the Board was supposed under the public service rules to have expected to be satisfied with, in calling for a report on the result of the Petitioner's insolvency. But unfortunately, contrary to the expectations of the Petitioner, the Board wholly ignoring the circumstances of his case and the strongly-expressed recommendation in his behalf of the Collector, who it was believed to possess the entire power of either appointing or dismissing the Petitioner, knowing, as he did, more about his case, called upon the Petitioner to show cause why he should not be dismissed on account of the merits of:—

First.—The debts included in the Schedule of Insolvency.

Second.—The result of the Appeal preferred against the judgment of Justice Shepherd in Petitioner's favour. (Exhibit I). *E(1)*

9. From Exhibit A, page 10, paragraph 1, clauses 1 to 4, it is evident that the Petitioner cannot offer a more satisfactory explanation either with regard to the circumstances that compelled the Petitioner to borrow, or that the Petitioner's official position did not entitle him to the application of Rules 23 and 26 of the Pamphlet for Public Servants, he being only a ministerial servant, doing duties under the direct orders of the Deputy Collector who only does the duties of Registrar. Regarding (2nd) the remarks in the appellate judgment. The Petitioner, beyond what he submitted in Exhibit A, pages 11 and 12, clauses 1 to 4, begs to submit that the two original Courts having *strongly decided on those points in favour of the Petitioner*, it will be no argument against the Petitioner if the Appellate Court had differed on those points for the reasons that such decision was arrived at in the absence of the personal knowledge of the conduct and demeanour of the witnesses. That the judgment passed by the Appellate Court was to a certain extent *ex parte*, as the Petitioner for want of funds was unable to engage strong legal representatives to argue the appeal, but obtained only a formal representation of the Official Assignee. Besides, the late Mr. Wilson having strongly expressed his opinion **that the judgment of Justice Shepherd was not to be disturbed by the Appellate Court**, the Petitioner was not so anxious about maintaining a strong representation at the time of the hearing. **It may further be submitted that, if the Peti-**

tioner's pecuniary circumstances permitted, he should not have allowed the decision of the Appellate Court to be regarded as final, there being yet a higher tribunal to revise such judgment in the Privy Council, and that his Solicitors, Messrs. Wilson and King and Mr. Eardley Norton and others, promised all help in their power, if the Petitioner only met them half way, and even this it was not possible under his circumstances to adopt. If the Appellate Court did not decide in favour of the Petitioner, it was only a proportionate loss to the creditors and nothing disturbing the Petitioner so far as his pecuniary interest was concerned, but as for the truth or otherwise of the case, the Petitioner holds three different judgments relating to the same case in his favour diametrically opposed to the judgment of the Appellate Court. Now the Petitioner believes that your Excellency will view the merits of the case in the light it deserves.

10. From Exhibit K, which is the Board's Resolution thereon, the Petitioner was directed to submit his resignation under certain conditions. As this was not the sort of the resignation the Petitioner thought he should under the circumstances be bound to tender, he submitted another representation requesting for a reconsideration of his case—vide pages 14, 15 and 16 of Exhibit A.

11. The Petitioner begs to submit Exhibit M or page 16 of Exhibit A, paragraph 21. The Board of Revenue permitted Petitioner to appear before a Medical Officer to secure a certificate of unfitness for further service, and on its receipt to submit the question of pension to Government in the ordinary course.

12. Exhibit N is the copy of the medical certificate secured which, however, was a recommendation of the Medical Officer for granting him further 12 months' sick leave.

13. The Board thereupon by its Proceedings, Miscellaneous No. 1627, dated 6th May 1897 (Exhibit A, page 20, paragraph 28), among other things said that as the Petitioner could not arrange to retire on medical certificate, he must be removed from the service unless he then resigned his appointment within seven days after the receipt of the said order.

14. The Petitioner, in obedience to the commands of the Board in his letter, dated 18th May 1897 (Exhibit A, pages 21 and 22, paragraph 30), submitted his resignation holding at the same time the right of appeal to your Excellency in Council.

15. The Petitioner, without further discussing all the points in his favour, and the manner in which he was most miserably treated, in spite of the strong recommendations of his superior officers, begs leave to submit that, as the first petition to your Excellency (Exhibit A) was drafted by a Vakil when he was in a poor state of health and mind, he was overruled by the Vakil to allow an argument (page 24, paragraph 32 of Exhibit A) in spite of his will, to appear in the said petition, and he therefore begs to take this opportunity to withdraw the same, and in addition to expressing his deep-felt regret for its appearance, humbly requests the Board as well as your Excellency to pardon him for this mishap.

16. Under these circumstances your humble Petitioner having supported his whole case on facts regarding his conduct, character and integrity, fully borne out by the strong recommendations of the Collectors throughout his career as a Public servant for a continued term of 16 years, prays your Excellency on a reconsideration of his unfortunate case—

- (a) to restore him to his appointment with arrears of pay as his case fully entitles him to make this humble request, or
- (b) to recommend him for any other appointment carrying equal emoluments to the same Collector or to any other head of the Department in your Excellency's Government, or
- (c) if the circumstances of his case should unfortunately appear such as to deserve no better mercy and treatment at the hands of your Excellency then to grant him such pension as he deserves to which, however, the Board raised no objection but promised to recommend him to your Excellency.

17. The Petitioner in conclusion would not withhold submitting for your Excellency's kind and merciful consideration that he has a large family with a wife, four sons and one daughter to educate and support, and that their destinies depend on the consideration your Excellency may bestow on a poor but faithful servant of the State who spent 16 years of his prime of life in uninterruptedly securing the good-will of all his superiors in spite of adverse circumstances, and is still prepared to devote the remaining days of his energy in the due discharge of duties that may be entrusted to him.

For which act of kindness your petitioner shall, as in duty bound,
EVER PRAY.

AKBER SAHEB STREET,
TRIPPLICANE, MADRAS,
1st March 1899. }

To Under Secy.

With the second of the papers noted above, the Board of Revenue submits to Govt a review petition from Ima yet Hussain Sahib, late Registrar, Deputy Collector's Office, Marass, praying for his re-installment in the public service or for the grant of a pension. The petitioner's case is set out at length in the office note under Govt No. 2602 Mus. d. 18-6-98, to which attention is solicited. The case was very briefly this - The petitioner was required by the Board of Revenue in 1897 to resign his ~~app~~ appointment as an ~~alt~~ native

native to being removed
from the service for a
breach of rules 23 and
26 of the Rules for the
Personal Conduct of
Govt. Servants which
forbid certain officers
taking debts from persons
coming within the sphere
of their official influence,
and for certain misconduct
which came under the notice
of the High Court in the
course of the decision of
a civil appeal ⁱⁿ which
the petitioner was a party.
Against his compulsory
resignation the petitioner
appealed to Govt., but the
Govt. held that his case
did not call for interference
and declined to interfere in
his behalf. please see go.
No: 2602 His d. 18-6-98 P
and the notes thereunder. In
the present review petition
the petitioner does not
adduce any grounds for
interference

I think this must be
regarded as a hard
case, but I cannot
say that no new matter has
been adduced to warrant
its being re-opened -
Order as at A

KS-
1-4-99-

interference in his behalf
which he had not already
placed before Govt. in
his first petition. It is
accordingly submitted
that the review petition
is liable to summary
rejection under rule V(3)
of the Rules for the submis-
sion of petitions to this Govt.,
and that the petitioner
may be informed that
the Govt. sees no reason
to reconsider the orders
already passed in his
case.

Ph.
21.3.99. Levy
The only new matter
is an apologetic
Explanation for an
imperlinence in the
original appeal peti-
tion para 15 of the
present peti. & para
32 of the former
peti (Encls A to the
present peti)
The Me
22/3/88
Peti may be informed as at A

To Elmdon Secy.
 Please see the draft
 order submitted on the
 lock et sheet of Cuo 1978/99.

5-4-99
 574/88

I think this must be
 reported as a lost
 case, but I cannot
 see how it can be
 handled. I have
 no objection to your
 doing as you think
 best.

28/3/99
 12/4/99

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

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

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. 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.