

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES:

G.O., No. 1525

DATED 24th April 1899

[Despatch Abstract.]

with remarks
Sanctioning the ^{while} writing off the account the sum of Rs 237-10
embodied by a forester in charge of the Kottampudi & Narasaraopet
Sub-ranges, Kistna Dt.

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 (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1190

From The Board of Rev. L.R.



Order

For Ref: No. 52

Dated 13:2:1899.

Received 16/2

Registered 16/2

Enclosures 2

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Requesting the sanction of Govt. for writing off the accounts an irrecoverable sum of Rs. 237-10 being Govt. money embezzled by one B. Sabha Rao, late forester, Kistna Dt

25
16/2/10

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	833	mis	26.2.99
	833	mis	16.2.98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE),

Madras, 13: February 1899.

READ— again Board's Proceedings Forest No. 810 Routine of 7.12.96 recording, pending further report, endorsement of the Conservator of Forests, Northern Circle, forwarding copy of letter from the Collr. of Kistna reporting on the misappropriation and breach of trust committed by Temporary Forester B. Subba Rao, Vinukonda Range, Kistna Dt.

— also letter from E. D. M. Hooper Esquire, Acting Conservator of Forests, Northern Circle, R.C. No. 1313 dated 7: January 1899.

Reference No. 52 dated 13: February 1899.

The Board requests the sanction of Government for writing off as irrecoverable a sum of Rs. 237-10-00 embezzled under the circumstances set out in the enclosed memorandum drawn up by the Conservator of Forests, Northern Circle, who reports that all the processes authorized by law for the recovery of the amount have been instituted without result, and adds that he is censuring the Range Officer at fault.

Lyonel Davidson

Acting Secretary.

To.
The Secy to Govt. R.D. with letter and
Memorandum to be ret'd

18: January

again observe that in 1881 the route of
the Government of Forests, Northern Circle, forwarding copy of the
from the Office of British reporting on the manuscript of the
and a copy of the Committee by temporary Forest
B. Gibbs Esq, Winchester Range, British
- also letter from E. A. M. Hooper Esq, Acting
Governor of Forests, Northern Circle, R.C. No. 1813
dated 1: January 1881.

18: January

25

The Board requests the sanction of Government
for setting off as irretrievable a sum of Rs. 250-0-0
under the circumstances set out in
the enclosed memorandum drawn up by the
Governor of Forests, Northern Circle, who reports
that all the forests authorized by law for the
recovery of the Government have been initiated
without result, and adds that he is continuing
the Range Officer at fault.

Shaping Secretary

13.3.88

13.3.88

What is the
Lushington's record
in the way of land
work or otherwise
8/11/31

To the Under Secretary

Mr A. W. Lushington was appointed
in the Forest Dept. in 1884, and papers
from that year up to date relating to
Mr Lushington have been examined.
The following is a brief reference to the
basis the remarks made in respect of
that officer's efficiency or otherwise.

(i) In para 2 of B. P. Forest No. 632
of 8.11.87 the Board asked Mr A. W.
Lushington to explain the delay of
four months in bringing to the notice
of the F.S.O. certain ~~in~~ paths running
through the block notified under
Section 4 in the Gaujam St. The
explanation (printed on page 2 of

13.12.87

~~for~~ B.P. $\frac{1}{13.2.88}$ 68 was considered unsatisfactory both by the Board and the Government.

(ii) In his Inspection Report of May 1892 on the forest in the Ganjam district, Mr E. D. M. Hooper did not report favourably ^{on} the work previously done by Mr Lushington as D.F.O. of that dist. The Board remarked as follows: "Mr A. W. Lushington's work as D.F.O. evidently left very much to be desired in all directions, but the fact that the exigencies of the service required his being put in district charge before he was properly fitted for it forms some excuse for his shortcomings".

(iii) In B.P. $\frac{1}{6.12.92}$ 687 the Board of Revenue called upon Mr Lushington to explain why he did not make enquiries as to the existence of three ^{within} villages in the Jagannath Prasad reserved forest in the final notification of which no mention of the villages was made. The Board ~~con~~ and in B.P. $\frac{1}{19.4.93}$ 415 his considered the explanation unsatisfactory and remarked that he must discontinue his dilatory practice of ~~running~~ ^{running} for months over the boundaries of proposed locks and that he should show much

in f.o. $\frac{1739 \text{ mis}}{13.3.88}$ (O)

in B.P. $\frac{1}{17.2.93}$ 112

1892 - unfavorable (map)

para 19 of B.P. $\frac{1}{17.2.93}$ 112 (S)

para 8 T

1892 - unfavorable (Dec)

in f.o. 1794 mis 15.5.93. (X)

better work if he was to retain the ^{in the Dept} position to which he had previously been promoted.

(iv) In para 2 of the B.P. in f.o. 1883 mis 20.3.88, the Board of Revenue reported that Mr Lushington was an efficient officer.

$\frac{800}{27.3.99}$

See $\frac{1}{28.3.88}$ See

Board's Reference (Jan. 1) No 528/13-2

(Cen 11904/99)

To the Under Secretary

Embrey's letter of Rs

of Rs 237-10

Subba Rao ^{temporary superior} of forest

disturbance by issuing permits which were never accounted for the money credited

The Conservator's memorandum clearly shows that the detection of the fraud was delayed not by any defect in the system of issuing or collecting permits but by laxity and negligence on the part of the officials, Forest and Revenue, who had the means of ~~checking~~ exercising check over the issue of permits and the collection of money.

The extent to which the several ^{are responsible} officials concerned will appear from the following.

- (i) Of the total sum of Rs 237-10, Rs 40 were misappropriated by the ^{officer} Sub-ranger (Subba Rao) while he was in charge of the Karaupudi sub-range. The fraud in respect of this sum was discovered by the Ranger six months after its occurrence and would have been detected earlier if ^{it is reported} the Ranger had, according to the district rules, ^{checked} the sub-ranger.

(X)

Code

accounts had been checked in the range office. The Ranger's explanation was that the failure to do his duty was due to pressure of work, but the Collector did not consider the explanation satisfactory.

(ii) The person who succeeded Subba Rao to the charge of the Karaupudi range was one Suri Rao Naidu. If this man had reported to the Ranger that Subba Rao did not deliver him the permit book in handing over charge of the sub-range, the fraud would (it is reported) have come to light in August (instead of, as it did, in October 1896). Suri Rao Naidu's explanation was that Subba Rao told him that the matter had previously been reported to the Ranger.

(iii) The duty of checking permits and recovering them in the Krishna district divisions, it would appear, on the village munsiff; the village munsiff of Karaupudi and the Tahildar of Palnad are therefore held partly responsible, the former for not having reported the fact of his receiving permits not entered in the mo-

also a temp. supervisor

This is too condensed to be intelligible WS

I can't understand this WS

and in the method

I don't understand

I don't know whether any system of check which would be entered into the man but upon it is possible or has been worked out?

not having noticed the same. Lastly the delay in the detection of the fraud appears to have been caused by the fact that no check of permits was made in the District Forest office.

As regards the further defalcation of Rs 197-10 committed by Subba Rao while in charge of the Narasaraopet sub-range, the Conservator does not appear to think that any of the checking officials can be held definitely to blame, as the fraud was discovered very soon after it was committed.

The only question for consideration appears to be therefore whether the whole or part of the Rs 40 should be recovered and if so, from whom.

2 In the papers forwarded there is nothing to show that either the occurrence of the defalcation or the detailed report thereon was communicated to the Accountant General, as required in Art 20 of the Civil Account Code. The way therefore now lies

u/a

letter 8/10/96

Code

from the facts as reported in
 the me ^{congregational} ~~memorandum~~ ^{the} ~~defalcations~~ appear
 to be clearly due to the
 most disgraceful
 laxity of all superior
 Officers, the D.T.O.
 Mr. Lushington included,
 since he had had seen
 that the permits were
 checked in his office.
 Mr. Lushington seems
 also to blame in
 allowing the investigation
 to be conducted slackly,
 whereby the offender
 was able to escape &
 also in ^{not} reporting the
 matter fully ^{promptly} to superior
 authority.
 Apparently no ^{merit}
 punishment awarded is
 as censure to the Ranges.
 The yearly administration
 reports complain of the
 conduct of the subordinate
 staff. Submitted that
 in case of the broad & clear

528/13.2.99

Strictly inflicted, the
 continued bad conduct
 of the staff can hardly
 be a matter for
 surprise.

For orders
 whether the misconduct
 of the officer concerned
 & the leniency with which
 it has been treated
 should be noticed by
 the Govt.

The
 6/3/81

The sum lost to Govt.
 may be formally written
 off the accounts

A separate Memo
 is put up below regarding
 Mr. Lushington's general
 laxity. He should be severely
 censured for neglect of
 supervision on his part
 it be a ^{having} ~~shown~~ ^{shown} ~~as~~ ^{as}
 to be censured the

memo. 9 18/3/81

makes except
 The sum of
 Rs. 20/-
 It is not clear
 whether the sum
 was any
 system of check
 endorsement of
 10/-

Item 141 of the C
 Code

C.I.
 10/2/101

be called upon to share
cause why he did not be
considered, but I think we
may leave it alone -

Any officer entrusted
with the collection of fees or
permits will find some
way open for temporary
embezzlement, if he be a
rogue, in spite of
all checks & precautions. How far

instance can
10-4-99 - prevent occur we
embezzlement of
collections by V. of
Officers? No syllable
check can prevent of

Please see draft order submitted.

8m
12.4.99

Secy

11/11/99
22/10/99

M. J. R. / i

tain per d c

et

or

lo

0
3,800-17-12-99

2
3
m
K
a
o

Read Board's Refers 7 no 528/13.2.99
(Cuo 1190799)

G.O. mis no. 1325 of 24th April 1879

Sanction is accorded for
writing off the accounts the sum of
Rs 237-10-... embezzled as reported
by the Board of Revenue.

2 From the papers forwarded
it ~~does~~ appears that the occurrence
of the defalcation was ^{not} intimated
to the Accountant General ^{and} that
^{no} ^{report} ^{that} ^{Spicer}
²⁰ detailed ^{was} sent to him as
required by art 20 of the Civil Account
Code. ^{If these steps have not been}
^{communicated} ^{between} ^{the} ^{Spicer}
⁸²² ^{now} ^{be} ^{supplied}
(fr. o).

11/11/99
22/10/99

M. J. R. / u

? Exam
Please consult Mr. M. J. R.

11/11/99
24/4/99

omit
8m
12.4.99

To the B.S. 8K with encls:

.. A. J. ^{with} ^{copy} ^{of} ^{Conservator} ^{Success}

11/11/99

$\frac{0}{9}$, 3,000-17-12-08.

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 189

DATE _____

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURE TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

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