3,000—5-3-95.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2386

DATED 3rd June

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that Mr. Dibbukata
has applied to T.D.C. [illegible] for
[illegible] of [illegible] on the [illegible]
of the [illegible] Mafeli, Penukonda

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Judicial

(1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1225

Judl

Order No. 942 dt 19-4-98

Transferred to the Revenue Department.

From The Collector and District Magistrate of Anantapur

Report No. 12.

Dated 6th April 1898.

Received 8/4/98

Registered 9/4/98

Enclosures Two (One in original and one separate packet)

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwarding the explanation of M.R.R. D. Venkata Sastriyar Treasury Deputy Collector regarding his conduct in a local fund case on the file of the Head Assistant Magistrate of Penukonda.

Ag: Under Secretary

M.R. 16/4/98

To the Rev: Dept.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

No Anantapur Collector's Office,
Camp Guntakal, 6th April 1898.
1625

From
Bannatyne Macleod Esq., M.A. Bar.-at-law,
Collector of Anantapur.

To
Chief
The Secretary to Government,
Department,
Madras.

Sir,

In reply to your memo No. 392 dated 12th February 1898, I have the honour to forward the explanation of M.R.R. D. Venkata Sastri garu, Treasury Deputy Collector and Vice President District Board Anantapur with reference to question iii asked by the Honourable M.R.R. P. Ratnasabapathi Pillai avl. The officer's explanation was delayed owing to the bad state of his health on account of which he has now taken Privilege leave. I have recently suggested the desirability of his giving up the Vice Presidentship. In cases of this kind it is more difficult to procure a magisterial Conviction than to punish departmentally and the failure of the case

FROM

THE COLLECTOR OF

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

DEPARTMENT

Madras.

Dated
Despatched } 189 .
Received

No.

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

is perhaps due to this fact. In Mr. Leighton's case, the advisability of dealing with the Local Fund Engineer departmentally has been recognised. I do not find that D. Venkatasastri had any personal motive in zealously conducting the enquiries in question. He acted under the orders of my predecessors Messrs Manavedan Rajah and R. H. Shipley. No doubt his position has rendered him unpopular with certain parties. His remarks shewing that Mr. Macmichael's judgment was erroneous are not in good taste but he is, I conceive, entitled in a matter like this to maintain his own opinions, and shew that he acted bona fide. And not in a way which has been characterized by the Head assistant Magistrate as perjured and not truthful or scrupulous. Para 7 of

of the explanation deals with these Remarks. D. Venkata Sastri was in the early part of his career a Zealous Police officer and he has perhaps allowed himself to use too freely the methods occasionally resorted to by such officers.

I have the honour to be
Sir
your most obedient Servant
Bernard Lyne Mitchell
Collector

Ex
6.4.98

Code Class. INDIAN TELEGRAPHS Monthly Number. 2010

To (Office) From (Office)

Words. Days. Hour. Minute. Official Instructions.

To (Person) From (Person)

CHIEF SECRETARY'S 15 APR. 1898 GOVERNMENT OF

32 Words Form.

? Rec.

Recd. from LN. 6.4.98 Sent to LN. Clerk for

At Hrs. Mts. by At Hrs. Mts. by Telegraph Master.

U G P—No. 281 T—17 10 95—60 00000.

OOTACAMUND 14-4-98

The Hindu. 13th January 1898.

GROSS MISCONDUCT OF A DEPUTY COLLECTOR.

We shall publish to-morrow the full text of the judgment of Mr. McMichael, M A, I.C.S., Head Assistant Magistrate, Pennukonda, in the case against Mr. M. Appadurai Mudaliar under Section 161, I.P.C., which will amply repay perusal. The judgment shows how the accused, Mr. Appadurai Mudaliar, Hospital Assistant and Chairman of the Union in Hindupur, has been persecuted in his latter capacity, by his enemies. The eccentricities of this officer have been the subject of comment before this, but the judgment of Mr McMichael, which is remarkable for its judicial temper and thoroughness of scrutiny of the evidence in the case, is a revelation of the character of a high officer, Mr. Darba Venkata Sastry. He figured as a witness for the prosecution, and thisis what the Magistrate says of him:—"The cross-examination of D. Venkata Sastry has elicited facts which go to shew that the witness cannot be regarded either as truthful or scrupulous. He has certainly perjured himself. He has pretended ignorance of facts, which he must have known; for instance, he pretends to be ignorant of the contents of a judgment in a suit, in which he himself was the defendant. As for his scrupulousness he admits that the Chairman of the Madaksira Union told him that he had paid the Local Fund Auditor a bribe of Rs. 100. He was morally convinced of the truth of this, yet he took no action at all in the matter and made no report about it to the President. This Chairman, he admits, is his friend. On the other hand in Hindupur, after merely hearing a rumour to the effect that the accused had been taking bribes, he went out of his way to write off to the President of the District Board for authority to receive and enquire into petitions against the accused. His conduct in Hindupur up to the 14th January was practically an invitation to the enemies of the accused, to bring false charges against the accused. So much for the disinterestedness of these witnesses."

Mr. McMichael closes his judgment with this observation: "I can only express my sincere regret that he (the accused), has been put to this heavy expense by this enquiry," after stating his opinion that the case is a concoction. Comment is superfluous. We trust the Government will take notice of Mr. Venkata Sastry's conduct as he deserves.

The Hindu. 15th January 98.

ALLEGED CHARGE OF BRIBERY.

Discharge of Accused and Strictures on a Deputy Collector.

The following is the Judgment of Mr. MacMichael, Head Assistant Magistrate of Anantapur, in the case against Mr. Appathorai Mudaliar, Local Fund Overseer and Chairman of Penukonda Union, for alleged bribery. We referred to this Judgment in the *Hindu* of Thursday last, and we may repeat once more that the document will repay perusal for the very serious strictures it contains upon the conduct of a responsible officer of Government :—

The accused has been prosecuted by the President, Taluk Board, Penukonda, under Section 161, I. P. C., and under clause V of Section 165 of Act V of 1884. The complaint is that as Union Chairman, Hindupur, he received illegal gratifications from certain inhabitants of Hindupur for reducing their house-tax and allowing them to build pials. The prosecution of the accused was sanctioned by the President of the District Board, Anantapur, in his memo. No. 895, dated 24th September, 1897.

2. The first prosecution witness, J. Sreenivasiah produced his accounts which have an entry of five and a half rupees paid to the accused on 13th March 1895 for a pial. He says that the accused raised an objection to the construction of the pial ; he paid the accused the above sum as a bribe and was allowed to proceed with the pial.

3. The 2nd prosecution witness, J. Adheppa, produced accounts showing an entry of ten rupees paid to the accused on 20th March 1894 for a pial. He says that he writes his father's accounts. His father J. Subbiah, 6th prosecution witness, says that he paid the accused ten rupees because the latter objected to his building a pial.

4. The 3rd prosecution witness, Dasa Naraniah, produced accounts in which is an entry of nine rupees paid to the accused for reducing the house-tax on certain buildings occupied. He made the entry at his father's request, but he does not know whether the money was paid or not. His father died recently.

5. The Seventh prosecution witness, K. Ramaswamy says that he has to pay rupees 3-12-0 of house-tax for his house and Rs. 1 8 0 for each of his four godowns, whilst his neighbour, N. Koudiah pays altogether only Rupees 3-12-0 for his house and four shops. The accused told him that if he opened windows in his godowns and paid him a bribe, his tax would be reduced.

6. The 10th prosecution witness, Tadhi Venkatanarayanaiah, produces accounts showing a payment of eight rupees to the accused on account of a cesspool. He says that he paid two rupees himself to the accused ; the rest he paid to Muniappa, a subordinate of the accused, to be paid to the accused. He paid the bribe because the accused threatened to have him fined unless he did what he was wanted to do.

7. The 11th prosecution witness, Katta Gundiah, produces an account showing a payment of eight rupees to the accused which he says he paid in order to get his house-tax reduced. It was not however reduced.

8. The evidence of the Court witness, Madisetti Venkataramaiah, was dispensed with by the prosecution. As it was in consequence of a petition presented by him to the Vice-President, District Board, that this case was brought, his evidence was considered important, and the defence was allowed to cross-examine him. He has no personal knowledge of the charges brought against the accused. He says that he got his information from his father who told him that the accused told him that certain people had given bribes to the accused. The father of this witness was cited by the prosecution, but his evidence was dispensed with.

9. The 5th prosecution witness, D. Venkata Sastri, is the Vice President of the District Board, and conducted a preliminary enquiry into the case. The 9th prosecution witness, Subbi Row, was formerly Union clerk under the accused. These two witnesses have no direct knowledge of the facts. The Union clerk produced a statement prepared by him showing the difference in house-tax in the Union for certain houses for the years 1894-95 and 1895-96.

10. The prosecution theory briefly is that the accused as Union Chairman took advantage of a resolution of the Penukonda Taluk Board (No. 13, 31st January 1894) to reduce the house-tax and took illegal gratifications for so doing. The resolution runs as follows:—"The Board resolves that when a house and a shop are in the same building with internal communication the one with the other, they shall be taxed as one house. In other cases the shop shall be separately taxed." It is admitted that many merchants of Hindupur did take undue advantage of this resolution by opening small holes in the walls of their shops and thus getting 3 or 4 shops taxed as one. The facts on record are in direct contradiction to the prosecution theory. The resolution was passed in spite of the strenuous protests of the accused. Even after it was passed, the accused entered another strong protest against it and was severely snubbed for his pains. It is evident that from the beginning the accused clearly presaw what the result of the resolution would be, and did his very best to prevent it. Finally, in September 1896 he again addressed the President of the Taluk Board in the matter again pointing out the unscrupulous use which the merchants were making of the resolution. This last letter of his was written months before there was any whisper of a complaint against him; it cannot be urged that it was written in order to have a defence ready at hand.

11. As regards the directly incriminating evidence against the accused, it is to be noted that the witnesses are accomplices and therefore their evidence should be viewed with caution. The evidence of an accomplice is usually untrustworthy for three reasons, because he is likely to try to shift the blame from himself, because he is an immoral character, and because he expects to be pardoned if he makes a full disclosure against his partners in crimes. In the present case the first reason does not hold good, for, the witnesses by incriminating the accused have equally incriminated themselves; but, the other two reasons certainly do apply. In addition to these general reasons for disbelieving the prosecution evidence, there are plenty of particular reasons for disbelieving the evidence of each witness. For example, the 1st witness is positive that he noted the transaction in his book on the same day as he paid the accused the bribe. He is equally positive that he paid the money on the same day as the accused passed the order about the pial. Now, the entry in the accounts is dated 13th March 1895, the accused's endorsement to the witness is dated 25th April 1895! The order the accused gave him was to restrict his pial within the limits given in his title deed, yet, he did not remonstrate with the accused for taking a bribe without showing him any special favour, nor did he complain to any one. He says he spent about twenty rupees on his pial, but, there is no entry of any such expenditure in his accounts. The accused once charged him for nails once. Though the witness said that the two account books produced by him always correspond, he had to admit that several entries that were found in the one were not in the other. I may say at once that the general demeanour of this and other similar witnesses was not that of men who were telling the truth. I have not the slightest doubt that they all perjured themselves before me. It is clear from the admission of various witnesses that the important witnesses are all closely connected together; yet, they have all tried to make out the contrary. It is a significant fact that in the three cases in which the accused is said to have taken bribes for pials and a cess-pool, there is nothing at all to show that these pials and cess-pools were ever built. The entries in the accounts describe the expenditure in great detail, though the witnesses admit that in cases of such miscellaneous expenditure they are not in the habit of entering details. Lastly, in several cases there are blank pages before and after the incriminating entries, which are very suggestive of forgeries.

12. A point pressed by the prosecution is that the prosecution is entirely disinterested as neither the original petitioner, M. S. Venkataramaniah, nor the Vice-President of the District Board had any personal interest in getting the accused convicted. It is clear from the evidence that these two witnesses have struck up a rather close friendship with each other. Venkataramaniah obliges Dr. Venkatasastri by buying fruit and other articles for him and sells cloths to him. They apparently write each other pretty frequently. Venkataramaiah had had a grudge against the accused for sometime previous to his petition. It was on the 14th January that this witness presented his written petition to D. Venkatasastri at Hindupur. The latter was then at Hindupur making enquiries into some irregularities committed by Local Fund Overseer, Sanjeevee Mudaliar. He believed that the accused was doing his best in Hindupur for Sunjeevee Mudaliar. In consequence of this he got the accused transferred from Hindupur to Dharmavaram. This transfer was ordered on the 11th January, and it was on the 13th January that Venkataramaiah orally complained to him about the accused. There is no doubt that at this time Venkatasastri was very angry with the accused. On the evening of the 13th January, he told the accused that, if he did not leave Hindupur by that night's train, he would wire to the President and have him dismissed. The natural inference from all this is that this witness was very badly prejudiced against the accused, and was only too willing to believe any complaint that might be laid against him. Venkataramaniah saw his chance and took it; he did not go to the Taluk Board President as he naturally ought to have done to complain; but, he went to his friend, the Vice-President. The cross-examination of Mr. Venkatasastri has elicited facts which go to show that the witness cannot be regarded either as truthful or scrupulous. He has certainly perjured himself. He has pretended ignorance of facts which he must have known; for instance, he pretends to be ignorant of the contents of a judgment in a suit in which he himself was the defendant. As for his scrupulousness, he admits that the Chairman of Madaksira Union told him that he had paid the Local Fund Auditor a bribe of Rs. 100. He was morally convinced of the truth of this, yet he took no action at all in the matter, and made no report about it to the President. This Chairman, he admits, is his friend. On the other hand, in Hindupur after merely hearing a rumour to the effect that the accused had been taking bribes, he went out of his way to write [illegible] to the President of the District Board for authority to receive and enquire into petitions against the accused. His conduct in Hindupur up to the 14th January was practically an invitation to enemies of the accused to bring false charges against the accused. So much for the disinterestedness of these witnesses.

13. A very important point in the case is the great mystery regarding the source from which the information against the accused was received. The prosecution seems to have carefully avoided the point. The witnesses all say that they told no body about the bribes they had paid or about the entries in their accounts. Venkataramaniah says that he got his information from his father who was told by the accused himself that certain persons had given him bribes. This may be taken for what it is worth; but even if it is accepted, it does not explain how Venkataramaniah knew about the entries in the merchants' accounts. If he got this latter information the same way, then the accused must have known all along that these merchants had incriminating evidence against him which might by accident come to notice at any time. Now, if the accused had sufficient influence with the merchants to levy black-mail wholesale from them, he certainly had also sufficient influence to prevent their retaining such evidence against him in their accounts. It is also a noteworthy fact that in the original petition presented to the Vice-President, there is not a word about the accused taking bribes.

14. The prosecution evidence, if true, shows that one Muniappa, a subordinate of the accused, is equally guilty of bribery. It is not quite clear why this man has not also been prosecuted. The fact that he has not goes in favour of the defence. The defence allege that Venkatasastri threatened both this man and the Union clerk with suspension or transfer unless they gave evidence against the accused. At all events it is a fact that Venkatasastri himself suspended the Union clerk and got Muniappa transferred.

15. It would be possible to give further reasons for believing the whole case to be a concoction, but in my opinion there is no need to do so. The case against the accused has not a leg to stand on. The accused was Chairman of Hindupur Union for ten years, and his administration appears to have been particularly successful. If his character is really what the prosecution makes out, it is very strange indeed that there was never a word about his conduct for so long. I discharge the accused under Section 253, C. P. C. and can only express my sincere regret that he has been put to such heavy expense by this

Read End of the Jd 1962
19.4.98
CRC 2983 of 98

Note

As Vice President of the District Board Anuradapura, Mr R Ry D. Venkata sastri gave Treasury Deputy Colln. of the District, worked up a case of bribery against the chairman of the Hurdlepurs Union In acquitting the accused in the case, the Head asst Magistrate, Mr Mac Michael, remarked that Mr R D. Venkata sastri who was also the 5th witness for the prosecution was neither truthful nor scrupulous and that he had certainly perjured himself. This remark of the magistrate formed the subject of a question by the Hon P. Ratnasabhapati Pillai in the

p 14 of the Hd asst magists judgment
flag Z

D III on p 2 of the Leg: Depl: Paper
in the Judicial CRC 577/98
flag O.

Legislative Council and, in reply, the Govt promised to call for a report on the point. The present contains the report referred to.

The Judicial Dept called for the report but as there is nothing in the papers which affects M.R.Rg D. Venkata Sastri as a Magistrate, they have been transferred to the Revenue Dept.

It is submitted that the Revenue Dept has nothing to do either with the papers for Venkata Sastri's conduct as a Dy Collr is not in question.

As Vice President of the Dt Board, M.R.Rg Venkata Sastri worked up the case against the Union Chairman and it is for the Local and Municipal Dept to say how far V. Sastri was justified in the means that he adopted to secure the conviction of the accused, and whether the strictures passed by the Magistrate were deserved or undeserved.

If the Govt thinks that the matter should be dealt with in the R.D. a revised note will be submitted

VVM 2.10.33

It seems that it is for the L.S.G. to deal with the report in the first instance, making any necessary references to R. D. as to the man's character as a Dy Collr for. Does L.S.G. Dept agree to this view

S.R. 3/10/33

L.S.G. Dept

As the L.S.G. think that they should deal with the case upon the

S.R. 3/10/33

Note I don't see any Question
– with the office now note on
Facts.

SB
2578

Note submitted accordingly.
6/5/98.

Reserve will observe that the interpellation related to the conduct of a "Deputy-Collector". His rank as a high Government servant was evidently a determining fact.

2. Again, the judgment referred to animadverted on the Dep.ty Coll.rs perjury & want of scrupulousness. There can be no doubt which of these is the more important charge. When a Dep.ty Coll.r who has been deputed to work up a case against a public servant is put in the witness-box, cross-examined as to reflections made against his character in a judgment to which he has been a party, if he chooses to perjure himself (if he did so) by denying knowledge of the contents of the judgment, it would seem that Reserve would be justly indisposed to accept the findings of L.v.W as to the guilt of the Dep.ty Coll.r. It would have, I apprehend, to look into the merits of the

matter for itself; & it might therefore with greater propriety do so in the first instance.

3. The minor charge is comparatively very minor. It is that the Depty Com. did not report a statement made to him by the Chairman of a Union to the effect that the latter had paid a bribe to the L.F. Auditor. This was an error of judgment which deserves censure, but is not comparable to the crime of perjury.

4. For the reasons given in pars. 1 & 2, this Depn is of opinion that the report of the District Mag.e & Com.r be dealt with in Revenue.

H.T.
4.5.98.

Read end of the J.D.
No 942 dt 19-4-98.
Crl: 2983 of 1898

Note.

As Vice President of the DC Board, Ar
Capur, Mr R Raj D. Ven
Ca sastri Gapur, Treasu
Deputy collector & the
District, under the orders of the
Rajahmundry, investigated
a case of bribery
in which
against the chair
man of the Hindu
Union, On acquitta
the accused, the chairman
case, the Head ass
Magistrate, Mr Ma
Michael, remark
ed that Mr R. D.
Venkata Rao the wi
was also the 5th witn
for the prosecution
was neither truthf
nor retrospective and
that he had certa
by perjured hims
This remark of the
Magistrate forms
the subject of

Mr Jl 1898

After going
through, I am convinced that
there is nothing on which Mr
Thomas could base any censure
either on prosecutor or ma-
gistrate. Mr Thomas Michael
considered pursuing himself by
further deed & guarantee of facts
Mr he must have known
— e.g. the contents of a
judgment in a suit in the
Rajahmundry was depth. This
seems to me that the
first two did guarantee of all
the contents of the judgment,
but he did not. He stated
the pronounced facts, that
the judgment was of a certain
tenor, but he said he did not
remember the exact words in the
[illegible] of the oral Magistrate's judgment
judgment without his records.
It is quite possible he did
not, & at all events that
was a matter not material
which case in Mr [illegible] he had
to and were a [illegible]

question by the Hon'ble P. Rattaiasabhapati Pillai in the Legislative Council and in reply the Govt promised to call for a report on the point.

2. The current noted at the head of the note contains the report referred to.

3. The judicial dept called for the report but as there is nothing in the papers which affects the RR D. Venkata sastri as a magistrate, they have been transferred to the Revenue Dept

4. The District magistrate has sent up all the records of the case, in the judgment on which, the remarks against D. Venkata sastri were made, and the latter has also transferred the

XIII on p2 of the Leg Dept Pap with Jud Cons 577/98.

explained by. His conduct in prosecuting on this case fraught did not justify the Mag. in saying he was perjured. As this was a cross-petitioners case, to ~~only~~ examine the pleader in two parts but he ~~is~~ was reported as a man who paid his peons a bribe, though he reported rumours. In his deposition he denies that he reported rumours & that he had no evidence, besides his ~~own~~ knowledge, but a bribe was proved. This does not show cross-petitioners.

Jg
1/6/98

p 73 of the records

detail in his explanation, the several observations after the head asst magistrate in the judgment. But the major portion of the records sent up by the District magistrate and a great portion of the Dy collectors explanation seem to have no direct bearing on the questions at issue which are (1) whether the Dy collector prepared himself and (2) how far he was responsible in making reports of the misconduct of appellants to his superiors.

5. As regards the first charge of perjury RR D. Venkata Sastri in his cross examination said: "There was a suit filed by

"a Hospital Assistant
Equipe against me
for treating a woman
kept by me. I was
summoned and
gave evidence. I con-
tested the suit and
a decree was passed
against me. I don't
know what remarks
the DC Munsiff made
in his judgment about
my veracity"

It is with special
reference to the above
depositions of D. V.
Sastri that the magis-
trate remarked
that the Dy Collr
had "certainly per-
jured himself". For
Mr. Michael observed
"he (D.V. Sastri)
has pretended
ignorance of facts
which he must
have known; for
instance, he pretends
to be ignorant of the
contents of a judgment-

p 14 of the judgment

p 31-32 of his explanation

"in a suit in which
he himself was the
defendant."

6. Venkata Sastri
explains that he had
no motive to pretend
ignorance that the
suit ~~was appealed~~ referred
to occurred in 1891
and that it was not
possible for him to remember
all details in a
matter that transpired
7 years ago.

7. It is a question
whether this explana-
tion can be accepted
as satisfactory. It is
difficult to believe
that Venkata Sastri
forgot the facts of the
particular case and
particulars; and he had
a motive perhaps in
pretending ignorance
of the details because
the case arose out of
his relations with a
woman which did

not argue well for
his moral character
& submitted that
the Head Asst Magistrate
~~appeared~~ had suffi-
cient warrant for
remarking that
Venkata Sastri was
not truthful ~~in fact~~
~~in the course of the~~
~~enquiry~~
~~to assist the Court~~
~~in arriving at the~~
~~truth~~

8. The second re-
mark of the Head Asst
Magistrate against
the Dy Collr was that
the latter was wanting
in scrupulousness
in making ~~reports~~ to his
superiors. Venkata
Sastri stated that
he thought it his duty
to report all rumours
of official misconduct
where necessary to his
superiors and that
he had always done
so. It appears however

At the same time it may be
noted that the matter about
which he was questioned had
no bearing on the case before
the Court & most magistrates
would probably not have
allowed the question. Further
it is 2nd submit, most
improbable that the Dy Collr
did remember exactly the
remarks made by the Dist
Judge in 1891. He has to be
noted that he did not deny that
the Dist Judge made reflections
on him but merely that he did
not remember the remarks the Dist
Judge made. I submit that in the circ
the distance was quite justifiable.

(Chairman said "yes" to
a question by Mr Chetty)

that the chairman
of the Madakasira
Union ~~accused~~ told V.
Sastri that he had
given a bribe of Rs 100
to the Local Fund
auditor but V. Sastri
did not report the
chairman to the
President although
he (V. Sastri) was
morally convinced
of the truth of the
transaction.

It is upon the
incident that the
Magistrate remarked:
"As for his (V. Sastri)
scrupulousness, he
admits that the chair-
man of the Madakasira
Union told him
that he had paid
the Local Fund
auditor a bribe
of Rs 100. He was
morally convinced
of the truth of this, yet
took no action at all

"in the matter and
made no report about
it to the President. The
chairman, he admits,
is his friend. On the
other hand, Mr Hindu-
pur, after merely hear-
ing a rumour to the
effect that the accused
had been taking bribes,
he went out of his way
to write off to the Presi-
dent of the Dt Board
for authority to receive
and enquire into
petitions against the
accused".

V. Sastri says
that he reported the
Hindupur chairman
because he ~~had~~ heard
there were records
to show that he had
been receiving bribes,
while in the case
of the chairman
of the Madakasira Union,
there was only hear-
say that he gave

× chairman of the Hindupur Union

p 34 of his Expt

It is a very obvious
& reasonable one.
Mr
16.5.55

a bribe and no more.
The charge against
of scrupulousness
is a minor one and
the by call's explan
can may perhaps
be accepted.

10. The Dt Magistrate
(Mr Macleod) appears
to be of opinion that
that the strictures
passed by the Head
Asst Magistrate were
not quite deserved.
He writes:- "I do not find
that D. Venkata sastri
had any personal
motive in zealously
conducting the en-
quiries in question.
He acted under the
orders of my predecessor
Messrs Manavedan Raja
and R. H. Shipley, and
doubt his position has
rendered him un-
popular with certain
parties. His remarks xxx
show that he acted

"bona fide error not
in a way which has
been characterized
by the Head Asst
Magistrate as perjured
and not truthful
or scrupulous. ×××
D. Venkata Sastri
was in the early
part of his career
a zealous Police officer
and he has perhaps
allowed himself
to use too freely the
method occasionally
resorted to by such
officers"

Why this sneer at the Police?

11. It remains to note that M.R.Ry D. Venkata Sastri is a Deputy Collector in the 4th grade subsisting and has put in 26 years' service. He says that he is on the eve of retirement having lost all health on account of diabetes and eye complaint

"brought on by hard, wearisome and special work" he has had to do during his service.

E.H.U. 16/5/18

V.R.M. 25/5/18

Secy

It is submitted that there are very slender grounds for the sweeping condemnation passed in the Dy Collector by Mr Isaac Michael. Few respectable Native gentlemen of any position would care ~~to undergo the~~ to make a full publication of their private affairs at the invitation of an adverse vakil, the Dy Collectors statement as to the remarks passed on him by a District Munsiff 7 years ago is merely evasive & very reasonable

cannot possibly be confidently declared
so. It ~~is not~~ perjury.

To charge him with want of
scrupulousness because
he reported ~~the~~ against
the Chairman of Hindupur
when he had evidence
against him and did
not report against the
Chairman of Madakasira
when there was admittedly
no evidence is mere
special pleading.

It is submitted
that the pltf. may be
recorded.

Mlle
20.6.98

H. Jn.

I submit the draft Ltr.
Resp.

17-6-98

Read Cir No 2983/98
(Draft Judl ord 942 d 19-4-98
on letter Ref on C No 12
from the Coll & D.M.
Dharmavaram forwarding
with connected records his
explanation &c.)

G.O. Misc No. 2386 d/3.6.98.

After a careful
consideration of the
records in the matter
H.E. the Govr C is clearly
of opinion that the
Dy Collr was not
guilty of any misconduct
which calls for the
notice of the Govt.

Mlle
2-6-98

Wd/SD.

To the Judl Dept.
To the Collr
To the Dm. of Dharmavaram
To the Govt Dept.

Lr issued 8/6/98

Why?
4 Stamps

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____ } 189 .
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 OF, 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.