

1366 RH

1737

18936 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

From the Offg Collr of Nellore Reporting the result of the investigation into cases Nos 2 3 & 4 against the Cr Head Sheristadar Soondaragherry Cr Ramanja Row.

23

To The Secretary to the Board of Revenue Fort St George.

Sir,

1. In pursuance of the intimation given in my letter of the 12th Instant, I have the honor to communicate the result of my investigation into the remainning three cases against the Head Sheristadar Soondaragherry Ramanja Row.

2 Case No 2 involves a charge of Ramanjarow having accepted bribes at two different periods from Choondy Anka panaidoo for the furtherance of his views in regard to the succession to the Choondy Zemindary on payment of 500 Rupees was made in the year Munmadah or 1835, and a second payment of 946 Rupees in the year Doormookhee or 1836, both were arranged through Aumoo-loor Parareddy a wealthy Ryot in this District, a friend of Ramanjarow & with whom Unkapanaidoo had kept a running account for some years. Aumaloor Parareddy died early in the year 1837 but his son Aumooloor

Lushemenarareddy

Suchemenursareddy was examined and produced his father's accounts. These accounts are numbered respectively 1, 2, and 3 of which translates and copies are transmitted with the original Depositions in the case. For the sake of clearness, it is necessary to mention that the first sum of 500 Rupees appears to have been paid in Cash and the second sum of 946 Rupees to have been discharged by crediting 546 Rupees on account of the principal and interest of a Bond due by Ramanjarow to Pararedy and the remaining sum of 400 Rupees to a debt due by Ramanjarow to an inhabitant of Nellore named Tota Ramanjum who had also money dealings with Aumooloor Pararedy. —

3 Account No. 1 is an account current between Choondy Anka panaidoo and Aumooloor Pararedy commencing

+3d Jan.y 1835 with the 10th decreasing moon of Magha, year Parthiva which was commenced by Anka panaidoo depositing 3000 Rupees with Pararedy. — In this account

account is entered the first payment of 500 Rupees on the 6th decreasing moon Margaseram of the year Munmadah. — This same account Current of Anka panaidoo is debited with the 2nd payment of 946 Rupees as having been paid to Soondaragherry Ramanjarow

+24th June 1836 on the 10th increasing Moon of Adeka ashadham of the year Doormookhee, making the total payment 1446 Rupees. —

4 Account No. 2, is an account of Soondaragherry Ramanjarow with Aumooloor Pararedy, in which the sum of 546 Rs. stands credited to Ramanjarow as received on the 6th de-

4th July 1836 creasing Moon of Adeka ashadham of the year Doormookee Viz.t Rupees 420 an account of the principal of a Bond of Ramanjarows and 126 Rupees on account of interest. —

5 Account No. 3 consists of Extracts from the Jama Kurch Poorooja or general account of receipts and disbursements of Aumooloor Pararedy for two years Munmadha 1835 and Doormookhy 1836 consisting of 108 Cadjans. — The Poorooja is an account prepared from the rough chitta in the latter every item is entered on receipts and disbursements one after

another

another, as they occur; and after the Cowroozy or regular account is made up, the rough Chitta is sometimes kept and sometimes destroyed, as the use of it is superseded by the regular account, the Cowrooza.—

6 The first Extract it will be seen is from the 25th and 26th Cadjans of the Cowrooza in which is the

11th Decr. 1835 entry of 500 Rupees on the 6th decreasing Moon of Margaseraw year Munmadha paid to Choondy Ankapanaidoo on account of Ramanjarow.—

7 The second Extract is from Cadjan No. 66 in which

4th July 1836 in the 6th decreasing Moon of Adheka Aushadhum year Doormookhee are the following entries.—

Amount received from Tota Ramanjum on account of Soondarangherry Ramanjum. — — 400

Amount

Amount received from Soondra= gherry Ramanjum for a bond .... Rs. 420
On account of Interest 126
546

8 The 3rd Extract is from Cadjan No. 68 in which on the 10th Increasing Moon of Adeeka Aushadhum year Doormookhee there is a debit to Choondy Ankapanaidoo of 946 Rupees on account of Soondarangherry Ramanjarow.—

These payments therefore on account of Ramanjarow appear in three different accounts in the Jumma Kurch Cowrooza or the general account of receipts and disbursements prepared from the rough Chitta or daily account of receipts and payments and in the separate accounts of Choondy Ankapanaidoo and Ramanjarow with Annoolor Pararedy.—

10 Independently of these accounts are two letters produced by Luchemenursareddy from Coondla

Venkatanursoo

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

Venkatanursoo the Vakeel of Choondy Ankapanaidoo to Pararaeddy dated 13th. decreasing Moon Adheka Aushadhum (year not stated but must be Doormookhee) and the 4th. Increasing Moon Bhadrapa=dam, year Doormookhy. The first letter bear in the Margin the signature of Choondy Ankapanaidoo. The originals of these letters I have forwarded but Luchemenursareddy has intimated his wish that they may be taken care of as that which bears the signature of Ankapanaidoo is, I understand, the only voucher they have of his, for the payments of the 946 Rupees and which since the unsuccessful issue of his claim to the Choondy Zemindary he may feel inclined to get rid of if possible. Translates of these two letters are herewith forwarded. It will be observed that supposing the letter bearing the signature of Ankapanaidoo to have

† 11th. July 1836

† 17th. Sept. 1836.

A & B

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

have been written in the year Doormookhee of which I think there is not a doubt, the date of it (11th. July 1836) is subsequent to the dates of the payments entered in the accounts already noticed of which that of 500 Rs. was in December 1835 and that of 946 in June and July 1836. It will be seen however in the sequel that a few days after the first payment of 500 Rupees a bond for 2000 Rupees was executed by Ankapanaidoo to Pararaeddy in which that sum was included. In regard to the 946 Rupees Luchemenursareddy has explained in his Deposition of the 1st. February 1840 that that sum was debited to Ankapanaidoo and credited to Ramanjarow upon Ankapanaidoo's word, but that afterwards Pararaeddy wrote to him and obtained from him a letter in the shape of a voucher. That letter is the one he has produced marked **B** and there is reason to credit this statement for Ankapanaidoo's signature seems to

to have been attached to the letter to give it the character of a Voucher. It was unnecessary otherwise, it is not attached to the other letter A. An inspection of the letter B affords reason to believe that the account given of it by Luchemenursareddy and the purpose for which it was written is correct. He explains further that the term 1½ C.P. used in that letter signifies one C.P. thousand five hundred Rupees, of which only 946 Rupees was credited to Ramanjarow on account of Bonds and in money as mentioned in the letter. The first payment of 500 Rupees made in December 1835 seems to have been included in a Bond for 2,000 Rupees executed by Ankapanaidoo to Parareddy, and which about two months ago was sold to Cautumreddy Vencatreddy the C.P. Head Canjoo of Ullore, a circumstance which Vencatreddy has C.P. declared to be true. The Bond

has

has been produced by him and is now in his possession. It bears date the 3rd Increasing Moon of Pooshyeum, C.P. year Munmadha corresponding C.P. with the 22nd December 1835 and C.P. purports to have been a balance struck upon their accounts up to that date.

No. 6. There is also a Memorandum of certain items of account made on the back of a native letter (C) produced by Luchemenursareddy and the items he declares to be his father's hand C.P. writing. The original letter and a translate of the Memorandum on the back of it are sent among which will be found the entry of 500 Rupees to "Rowgaroo." This Memorandum is stated to have been made at the time the account between Ankapa Naidoo and Parareddy was settled on the C.P. 22nd December 1835 and the bond for 2,000 Rupees executed by the former.

In

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

No. 7

12. In his first Deposition dated 5th. December 1839 explanatory of the entries in the accounts Puchinenurvareddy stated as the time of those payments he was not managing the family affairs but used occasionally to make entries in the accounts as his father dictated and that he does not know through whom the money was paid to Ramanjarow but that 1446 Rupees &c were given by Unkapa Naidoo to Ramanjarow on account of the Choundy Zemindary business, that in regard to the first payment of 500 Rupees, &c persons belonging to Unkapa Naidoo came for the money which they carried and paid to Ramanjarow but who those persons were, he did not know. In regard to the item of 946 Rupees, he deposed that at the desire of &c Ramanjarow expressed to his father Pararedy, he (Pararedy) carried a &c sum of 546 Rupees to the discharge of an old Bond principal and interest

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

interest executed by Ramanjarow to Pararedy, that as to the remaining 400 Rupees Ramanjarow owed a balance to Sota Ramanjum an Inhabitant of Nellore and as he (Sota Ramanjum) was indebted to his (Witness's) father on &c some other account, he assigned over the balance due to him by Ramanjarow and received a credit in account to the said amount of 4000 Rupees. —

No. 9

13 In his second declaration dated the 1st. February explanatory of the circumstance already noticed of the dates of the letters from Unkapa Naidoo and his Vakeel to Pararedy being posterior to the dates of the entries in the accounts. He states that Choundy Unkapa Naidoo spoke to Ramanjarow about the Choundy Zemindary business and agreed to pay 4000 Rupees for that purpose that a sum of 500 Rupees was paid to Ramanjarow on the 6th. decreasing + 11th. Dec. 1835 moon of Margaseeram of the year

Munmadha

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Munnadha leaving the balance of the amount agreed upon 3,500 Rupees, that Unkapa Naidoo having received 2,000 Rupees from Pararedy inclusive of the said sum of 500 Rupees, Pararedy obtained a bond from him for the said sum in the year Doormookhee as far as he recollects in the Month of Poosheyum that he on Puchemenur Pararedy sold the Bond to Cauturreddy Vencatreddy an inhabitant of Ulloor about two months ago, that in regard to the balance of 3,500 Rupees due on account of the sum agreed upon, Ramanjarow had on told Pararedy that if he would for the present get a sum equal to on the principal and interest of the bond executed by him to Pararedy, so that the interest might not run on to a large amount, as also a further sum of 400 Rupees on account of the balance due by him (Ramanjarow) to Sola Vencatramanjum, the remainder on could be paid after the business was settled. —

Compt. L.R.

In

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 10. 14. In the 3d declaration Luchmenurra-reddy was called on to explain the Summakurch Pooyah or account current, consisting of 10 Cadjans which since his first examination he had produced in corroboration of Pararedyji's separate accounts with Unkapah Naidoo and Ramanjarow. —

No. 8 15. The witness next examined was Cowoor Vencataramaniah, the private Goomastah at that time of Ramaloor Pararedy and employed in writing his accounts. He speaks to the authenticity of the two Cadjan accounts No. 1 & 2 which were partly he states written by himself. This man it appears left the service of the Ramaloor war about two years after Pararedy's death. —

16. The two entries of payments to Ramanjarow in the Account No. 1 of 500 Rupees and 946 Rupees are, he states his own hand writing, that Unkapa Naidoo wrote an order upon Ramaloor Pararedy to pay, in the first instance, 500 Rupees to

Ramanjarow

Ramanjarow upon which he paid it to Venkapah Naidoo's people who conveyed it to Nellore accompanied by Parareddy who returned to the Village in two or three days and had the account written by him / Witness /

17. In regard to the item of 946 Rs. the Witness deposes that Parareddy settled the account between Ramanjarow and himself and debited 946 Rupees to Venkapa Naidoo account Viz. 546 on account of Ramanjarow and 400 Rupees through Sota Ramanjum who owed a balance of 400 Rupees to Parareddy That as there were disputes among the Chondy war about their Zemindary Venkapa Naidoo came to Parareddy and spoke to him to get his Zemindary business settled in his favor, that he would give orders upon him for money and that he should pay them accordingly. Witness was present when this took place. On his cross examination he deposed that Venkapah Naidoo sent to Parareddy

1833. Parareddy was in the year Vejya at Gundaree ram, but the day and month he did not recollect, that he saw Venkapa Naidoo's first order for the payment of money to Ramanja row, and which was accordingly paid.

No. 11. 18. The only other witness examined in support of the charge was Cautemreddy Vencatareddy Moonsiff of Ullor, and he was merely called to speak to the purchase of the bond for 2000 Rupees executed in December 1835 by Venkapa Naidoo to Paracoddy and which has been already sufficiently noticed.

No. 13. 19. Ramanjarow called two Witnesses on his defence. The first was Sota Vencatramanjum who denies that Ramanjarow assigned over to Parareddy a debt of 400 Rupees and who denies also that Parareddy ever gave him credit for that sum on Ramanjarow's account. The intention in the examination of this Witness was to shew that he had made advances of grain, as the Witness states to the amount of 1000 Rupees to

Ramanjarow

*1832/33 Ramanjarow in the year Nundana or the famine season of Fudy 1242 and that that account had been settled and a receipt taken, and from which the conclusion intended to be drawn was that Ramanjarow owed Vencatramanjum nothing at the time the 400 Rupees are said to have been credited in the latter's account with Pararedy for an equivalent sum due to him by Ramanjarow - on the matter of the re- -ceipt the Witness states (answer 7) that he recollects he gave a receipt but he can't re- -collect when it was given not even the year in which it was given, nor can he positively say how many years ago it was given - He states that there were no other dealings between him and Ramanjarow except in the

†1832/33 matter of the rice supplied in the year Nundana, that there were dealings between him (Wit- -ness) and Pararedy and that he had the account of those dealings in his (witness's) house -

20. The dealings between this Witness and Pararedy arose out of the grain contracts

contracts for the supply of the convicts in the Nellore Jail - The nature of these contracts and who the bonâ fide contractors were are — matters of notoriety, are known to every one in the Nellore Town, Vencatramanjum was nothing more in reality than the Goomastah at Nellore appointed by Pararedy to manage the matter with the Court - Aumoolor -

No 16. Luchemenursareddy in his Deposition of — the 22d February states that his father — contracted to supply the Jail with grain, and employed Vencatramanjum to manage it. -

21. This witness is also notorious for his habits of inebriety and on being sum- -moned to give his evidence was found by the Peon in such a state from that — cause that he was unable to attend — the Cutchery - Till within a few months before he was examined he was a Jail Peon, he states that he was entered as a peon on the Jail Establish- -ment but did not do peon's duty, that previously

previously to his gaining a subsistence by being employed in these Jail contracts he was an under Abkary renter for six years, and previously to that he had been a Talook peon on a pay of $3\frac{3}{4}$ or 4 Rupees per mensem, but that he did not do peons duty, that his father all along held the situation of a Talook peon and that he himself may at times have been employed as a tuscawooga Doo or person sent on daily batta to the Villages to collect money.-

No 14. 22. In his second Deposition dated 21st February he states that he knows of Choondy ankapanaidoo having executed a Bond to Parareddy for 2000 Rupees because he attested it, that he knows the particulars of the sum of 2,000 Rupees for which the bond was executed and that there was no item in it of 500 Rupees paid in Ramanjarow's name.-

23.- Ramanjarow next produced.

a

a receipt of Tota Ramanjum for the price of the rice furnished to him in the year 1832/33. Kundanah but neither his own account of those delings or Vencataramanjums accounts of them and which he (Vencataramanjum) stated to be in his house were produced, nor any application made by Ramanjarow to postpone the enquiry till they could be produced.- a bare receipt was filed and acknowledged by Vencataramanjum which it is my firm conviction was made out after the commencement of the enquiry into this case, and of course nothing was more easy if Tota Raman-jum assented to it, and he was not likely to dissent, when he is known to be a man of the Court Shenistadar Erogoodee-pauty Vencatachellum, between whom and Ramanjarow there has long been a close intimacy.- The receipt produced by Ramanjarow is dated the 10th October 1835, is on unstampt paper and without

the

the signature of a single attesting witness, the latter, a proceeding totally at variance with the established usage among natives who seldom if ever receive such document, especially when given for so large a sum without attesting witnesses and on unstamp paper - of course any execution of a receipt recently would have led to immediate detection if executed on stampt paper and was open to detection if there had been attesting witnesses. The safest plan was undoubtedly to omit both and this course was accordingly pursued. -

24. The following is a translation of the receipt. -

D in Telugu list of cave No.3.

Receipt executed by Pota Vencataramanjam to Soondaraghetty Ramanjum Puntlu -

The price of the rice supplied for paupers from 23.d July to 10.th October 1833 is 1193 Rupees.

Payments.	Rupees.
5.th January 1834	438.
1.st July 1835	440.
2.d+ October year not stated	150.
10.th October - year not stated	165.
	1193.

+This date is altered, but it appears to be as inserted.

As you have paid me the above sum. I have

have received it. -

This is a receipt executed in my own hand writing. -

10.th October 1835. /signed/ Vencatramanjum.

No.15. 25. The other witness called by Ramanjarow was Dooggesetty Soobbiah a Banian, an Inhabitant of Cherloopolleny He deposes that he was acquainted with Annaloor Parareddy, that he recollects a conversation, he /Witness/ had with Parareddy at the Zillah Court about Ramanja Row, and that it related to a balance. That he /witness/ came to Nellore to receive some money due to Wubbareddy Ramireddy on account of grain supplied to the Jail, that he accompanied Parareddy to the Court - Some conversation then took place regarding the payment of this money, at the close of which Witness asked Parareddy if Ramanjum Puntlu owed him any balance, and that he answered in the negative. This he recollects took place about 1½ year previous to Parareddy's death. -

26. - The Witness then proceeds to mention

a

Ramanjarow will have been understood by the enquiry in case No. 1. regarding the Codoor and Reddypollem cultivation. He writes — Mooloomoody Narrainreddy's accounts and is supported by him. —

27. I endeavoured to procure the — attendance of Venkapa Naidoo who I understand was at Madras and personally directed one of his Vakeels who was at Nellore to write and request him to proceed hither, but he did not come and his statement therefore has not been taken. It is more than probable that he would have denied the matter as he has an interest in denying, and none in avowing a debt, nor is it likely he would acknowledge having corrupted a public officer of Government especially when under the influence of a feeling common to all natives of rank and station, that the payment of a bribe to a public servant is disgrace to their own name and character. This feeling is strong and generally speaking, nothing will induce a native of rank to avow that he has

paid

a recent conversation he had with Ramareddy's son Luchmenursareddy. They met, it would seem, accidentally at the ford on the other bank of the Pennar. After some preliminary conversation regarding the money for the cotton supplied by Ramareddy to the late Mr. Morat the witness states that Luchmenursareddy said as if asking his advice, that he had been told to insert in his accounts as if somebody had paid some thing to Ramanjarow, and that his Mother and Grand Mother did not like it — Witness in reply observed that he should have nothing to do with such a business. They came on to Nellore in conversation and then separated — The witness then states that Mooloomoodee Narrainreddy resides in his (witness's) Village and that he has known him from Childhood — I may here mention that the witness is the friend of Mooloomoody Narrainreddy whose intimate connection with

Ramanjarow

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

paid a bribe to a public servant.-

Para. 5- 28. The first point in Ramayarow's defence which may seem to require explanatory remark is that wherein he observes that there appears to have been no complaint made in this case- I first had information from a respectable Reddy of certain accounts exhibiting payments to Ramayarow being in the possession of Aumaloor Parareddy's son, Luchmenurareddy- I was not sanguine that he would give them up, for Ramayarow and his father had been great friends- However after some hesitation he consented and delivered them to me.-

29- The 2d exception taken by Ramayarow is in regard to Luchmenurareddy's age- He observes that Luchmenurareddy had deposed that the dealings between Ramayaroo and his father had commenced in the year Vyaya* and between his father and Ankapa Naidoo in the year Paurdeeva+ and

+1825/26

*1826/27

Fort St. George 24th December 1840-

that he is about 20 years old upon which Ramayarow observes that on comparing his present age with the years above named Paurdheva and Vyaya he must have been then 4 or 5 years of age, and about 14 or 15 years of age in the year Prammadha in which year he deposed to Ankapa Naidoo having spoken to his father about the payments of money to him/Ramayarow/ I see no force in this objection Lutchemenursareddy is able to speak and of course has spoken to the periods since which dealings have existed between his father and Ankapa Naidoo, and his father and Ramayarow from his fathers accounts which are in his possession and which partly he /Lutchemenursareddy/ wrote although at that time his age may not have exceeded 16 he had been for a year and half previous writing his fathers accounts in conjunction with a Goomastah- Although still a young man he is a person possessed of more than ordinary intelligence, and it is strange if under these circumstances and the eldest son, he should not have had

had an intimate acquaintance with all his fathers concerns-

Para 6. 30 The next objection made by Ramanjaroo is an alteration in account No 1. of 100 Rupees to 500 Rupees and there are he observes "some other items in=cluded in this item and a total made "of them in this total 100 Rupees are only included not 500 Rupees- To explain this difference it appears that some lines have been newly written-

31. There is no alteration whatever in account No 1. nor is any total made in that account in which 100 Rupees is included and not 500 Rupees- Raman=jaroo has inadvertently made this remark on account No 1. whereas he no doubt intended it for the Poorooza account in which there is an alter=tion of 100 to 500 Rupees- But this appears to me to speak decidedly in favor not against the account and was manifestly an error when the entry was first made. The account

stands

stands as follows-

Total receipts from 10 decreasing moon Margaseram to 4th Decreasing moon Poosh yum of the year Munmadha 1835/36	Rupees 13090-	3/16
Deduct Disbursements from 6th decreasing moon Margaseram to 4th decreas=ing moon Poosh yum	12698-	15/16
Remainder	391-	4/16
Amount of a mistake in the Chowdywar item bearing date 6th decreasing moon of Margaseram	400-	
Surplus Disbursement	8-	12/16
Then follow immediately several items of receipt on the 4th decreasing moon of Poosh yum the total of which is	223-	8 1/2/16
From this stands deducted the amount of Surplus Charges shewn above Vizt	8-	12/16
N.T receipts	214-	12 1/2
Deduct- Disbursement from 4th to 3d Increasing moon of Poosh yum	306-	1/2
Surplus Charges	91-	4/16

There

There is another obvious mistake also in this account for in the last noted disbursement of 306 Rupees the date should be decreasing moon of Pooshyum instead of increasing the disbursements up to the 4th decreasing moon of that Month having been already given in the account which precedes as shewn above —

32. I submit to the Board whether the original entry of 100 Rupees and which is included in the total of 12,698 Rupees was not evidently a mistake in preparing the account from the rough Chitta. Whether the correction would have been made by a remark and additional entry of the 400 Rupees at the bottom instead of altering at once the entry to 500 Rupees and altering the total also. The mistake would seem not to have been discovered till the account up to that date was written, it was then discovered and corrected as above shewn and the net surplus charge

charge carried on immediately underneath. It is clear that the correction was made when the account was written or the following totals in the account would have been all wrong which they are not, and certainly at that time in 1835 there could have been no notion of a complaint against Ramanjarow—

33. Ramanjarow next proceeds to observe in Para 8 that Veera Venkatapah Naidoo died on the 26th November 1836, that the former Collectors recommended that the Zemindary should be conferred on him, and that it will therefore appear that Venkatapa Naidoo died 1/2 year subsequent to Munmadha [1835] the year in which Ankapah Naidoo is said to have spoken to Parareddy to speak to the Sheristadar to get the Zemindary for him —

34. The circumstance here mentioned at any rate tells against its being a made up affair against Ramanja Row for in such case nothing would have been

Fort St George 24th December 1840-

been easier than to have made the periods of payment to Rasanjarow more proximate to the period of his conduct being called in question to have made them either immediately antecedent or even subsequent to Veera Venkatapa Naidoo's death. But what are the facts. From the death of Comara Mottaraauze in September 1827 Ankapa Naidoo kaschrishi=ed the hope of succeeding to the Zemendary. On the 28th September 1827. Two days after Mottaraauze's death, he petitioned Mr Smalley and gave two Petitions on the same subject to the Board in June and September 1829 No 317 and 565. He appears also to have given a Petition to Government in 1831 praying for the restoration of the Zemendary —

The question of succession was in fact open up to the late decision of Government and the Board's recent Proceedings submitting it for the final decision of Government manifestly prove that

Fort St George 24th December 1840-

that up to that period there was nothing conclusive against Ankapa Naidoo's claim but even admitting that the chances may have been decidedly in favor of Veera Venkatapa Naidoo Ankapa Naidoo as well as every one else was well aware that he could not long prove a stumbling block in his path and that he would leave no issue, my information led me to believe that even in the latter end of 1835 he had been for nearly two years bed ridden with ulcers, which I reported to the Board in my letter of the 8th December 1835 and on the 11th of the same month the Choundy Dawcen officially reported the same mentioning that he has been bed ridden for 5 years from ulcers. In the natural course of things he could not therefore be expected to live very long. But it is not a little singular and strongly corroborative of the entries in the accounts and the Statement of Luchamenarsaredoly that from the year 1831 when he last petitioned

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

petitioned Government till 1835 Anka pa
naidoo does not from the Register in this
office appear to have given a single peti-
-tion either to the Collector, the Board or the
Government in respect to his claim to
the Zemindary. Ramanjarow became
Head Sheristadar on the 15th June 1835
in that year though the month has
not been ascertained. Anka pa Naidoo
paid his visit to Parareddy to speak to
the Sheristadar in December of that
year. A sum of 500 Rupees appears by
Parareddy's accounts to have been paid
to Ramanjarow and in June of that
year Anka pa Naidoo commenced anew
his petitions. He petitioned the Govern-
-ment on the 14th June 1835 / No 806 of
1835 / praying that the permanent Cowle
for the Choundy Zemindary might be
granted in his name. He petitioned
the Collector to the same effect in June
and October 1835 and again in
September 1836 stating his right to
the

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

the Zemindary all antecedent to Veera Ven-
-catapa Naidoo's death. He gave four Petitions
to the Collector regarding his claim to the
Zemindary in January 1837 and one in
February of the same year —

Para 7 in No 47. 35 Ramanjarow seems to
lay stress upon Lutchemenursareddy say-
-ing that his father and Anka pa Naidoo
met and spoke on the subject in the year
Munmadha 1835 while the Gomastah &
Cowoor Venkataramanah mentions &
Anka pa naidoo as having come and
spoken with Parareddy in the year
† 1833. Vizya. In the first place Lutchemenur-
-sareddy distinctly declares that he
does not know when Anka pa Naidoo
and Parareddy met previous to the
occasion he mentions in 1835 but that
they had not met since. The occasion
referred to by the Gomastah is
clearly a different one to that
mentioned by Lutchemenursa-
-reddy. This is evident from the
declarations themselves. On the occasion
spoken

spoken to by the Gomastah, nothing passed between them in regard to the Sheristadar- The Gomastahs' deposition is as follows- "As "there were disputes among the Choundyaar "about their Zemindary Ankapa Rai- "ndoo came to Parareddy and spoke "to him to have his Zemindary busi- "-ness settled in his favor- That he "would write orders for money and "that he should pay the money to "the persons in whose favor the Sunk- "-has were written without demur- He said this and went away — This appears to have been a visit to engage Para- -reddy's assistance, and obtain his assent to drawing upon him in favor of persons to whom payments of money might be requisite, but there is not a word nor even an allusion to Ramanjarow himself or to Para- -reddy speaking to him for Ankapa Raudoo —

Ans 8 answer to Q. 9.

36. Now what is Lutchemanar- -sareddy's Statement / answer to Q. 15. 20th Feb? "Ans / Ankapa Raudoo / said that our Zemendary

Zemindary business was not yet settled that he (my father) must speak to Soondaraghurry Ramanjarow Puntoolou get it settled and that he (Ankapa Raidoo) would pay him / Ramanjarow / 4,000 Rupees —

37. This visit of Ankapa Rai- -doo to Parareddy I may observe was in the same year in which Ramanja- -row was made Head Sheristadar- Lutche- -menursareddy does not recollect the month but could it be ascertained I have little doubt it would be found to have been about the period of Raman- -jarow obtaining that appointment- The accounts shew the first payment of 500 Rupees to Ramanjarow to have been made early in December between five and six Months after he had been Head Sheristadar —

Para 9 in No 17- 38 Ramanjarow next observes that nothing is mentioned in Poodla Venkatnursoo's two letters about the 500 Rupees- There was no occasion to refer to

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

to this 500 Rupees in those letters. It had been included in the settlement of account made in the latter end of December 1835 when Anekapa Naidoo executed the Bond for 2,000 Rupees to Parareddy. That payment therefore had been settled by the Bond, and accordingly deducting that 500 Rupees from 4000 Rupees the sum agreed upon the remainder only Viz. 3500 Rupees was mentioned in Poondla Venkatanarsoo's letter which was written in the latter end of 1836. Ramanjarow observes that his name is not mentioned in these letters. It is seldom that names are mentioned in such papers the corresponding parties know without name who and what is meant. These letters standing alone might be considered weak, but they do not stand alone, they have been explained by the son of the person to whom they were addressed and they stand coupled with entries in three different accounts.

The mention of 1/2 entered in the letter bearing Anekapa Naidoos' signature

Compd. J.R.

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

signature for bonds and money stands corroborated by an entry in the accounts shewing 548 Rupees to have been actually carried to the redemption of the principal and interest of a bond of Ramanjarow and 400 Rupees to have been carried to the credit of a Cash account of Sota Venkataramanjeem to whom Ramanjarow was indebted in that sum.

Para Nos 37. 39. Ramanjarow next observes that Account No 2, Viz. his account with Parareddy does not appear to be a true account. He admits however that he had dealings with Parareddy and that he purchased of him Jaffnapatam Palmiras. These it will be seen from an item in account No 2 but as Ramanjarow on his own admission had dealings with Parareddy why did he not produce his own account of those dealings which there is no doubt he must have had by him.

40. The last observation I shall make on Ramanjarow's defence is in regard to what he states in Para 11 namely that if the circumstance of 548 Rupees having

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

having been credited to his bond and 400 Rupees applied to discharge his debt to — Tota Vencataramanjum were true, the said sum of 946 Rupees ought to have been credited in the Cadjan Account No 2 that is Ramanjarow's account with Parareddy —

41 How Ramanjarow has come to this conclusion I cannot comprehend — The whole sum was a payment made on account of Ankapamandoo whose account is accordingly found debited with the whole sum Viz. 946 Rupees Of this the sum required to clear off Ramanjarow's debt to Parareddy Viz. 546 Rupees was credited to Ramanjarow and the remaining 400 Rupees was credited to Tota Ramanjarow who owed that sum to Parareddy and to whom Ramanja Row was indebted to the same amount and which was to be wiped off between Ramanjarow and Tota Ramanjum — It is perfectly clear that Ramanja Row's account with Parareddy could not

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

not be credited with this 400 Rupees — Ramanja Row received credit for it from Tota Ramanjum and Tota Ramanjum from Parareddy —

42. I cannot discover the slightest ground to suppose that there is any thing made up in this case, and one fact not to mention others, appears to me conclusive upon this point — Why, I may ask if it were a thing made up should the very unusual method of giving credit to a Bond exhibiting the principal and interest be resorted to, instead of an actual payment of money — why should the principal of that Bond have been shewn in odd Rupees — Bonds are not usually so, again why should the remaining sum of 400 Rupees instead of appearing as a cash payment to — Ramanja Row be credited to the Account of a third person for Ramanja-row of a person who from the evidence he gave had clearly not entered into

their

their plans. Is it likely that Para-
reddy would gratuitously release a
third person from a debt he owed
him when for the furtherance of
any design against Ramanja Row
it was wholly unnecessary, would it
indeed could it, have been thus had
the matter been made up. Ramanja
Row in no part of his defence denies
the existence in plain terms of the
bond which [illegible] in his Account
(No 2) shews to have been discharged
though in Para 11 he insinuates as
much. He admits that he had
some dealings with Parareddy. that
he purchased Ceylan Palmyras of
him, an item which may be seen
in the account No 2, which he says
is not a true account and he admits
that he had dealings with Tata
Ramanjum and the latter also
admits

admits that he had dealings with Para-
reddy. The suspicious character of Tata
Ramanjum's receipt produced by
Ramanja Row has been already
noticed. It is neither on Stampt paper
nor attested by Witnesses and Ramanja
Row might have proved the receipt
if it were a correct one by the pro-
duction of his own account of those
dealings, but this he did not do, and
the bare receipt therefore strongly
suspicious on the face of it, stands
unsupported by a tittle of evidence
except that of the person who gave
it. Upon the most attentive and
impartial consideration I can give
to the circumstances of this case
as they appear in evidence, I cannot
divest myself of the conviction of
Ramanja Row's dishonesty.

Case No 3 43. The next case, No 3, arose as follows
The

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

The papers of Etamookala Parareddy, a Reddy and the private Agent of the late Jaghеerdar of Woodiagherry were at the suggestion of the Commissioner seized. On their examination an entry was found in his Summah Khurch, or account of receipts and disbursements for the year Vellumbee consisting of 55 Sheets of a payment on the 4th May 1838 of one hundred Rupees to Ramanja Row on account of a channel of irrigation regarding which there was a dispute between Shayeepet a Village of the late Jaghеerdar and one of the Govern-ment Villages in the Caleyherry Taluk. The 100 Rupees is first entered in this account as a receipt from Shayeepet as Village Collections, Parareddy held the rent of that Village from the late Jaghеerdar.

No. 1038/39

The

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

The same payment appeared also on the same date in Parareddy's Roarooza or Journal but in this last account the place, Escapully, to which the money was sent and the person into whose charge it was given, to be paid to Ramanja Row are mentioned. That person was Uttoty Pauparah a personal friend of Etamookala Parareddy and a wealthy Reddy who, during the life time of Coomara Mattaranje the last Zemindar of Calwoundy, had the rents of a large portion of that Zemindary.

44 After this, I directed the Tahsildar of Woodiagherry to take immediately from the Curnums of Shayeepet their original Cash Chitta for the year Vellumbee, and transmit it to me, which was done.

No 1 45. In the paper herewith forwarded, will

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

will be found translates of the entries in Parareddy's Chitta and Journal also of the Cash Chitta of the Curnums. In the last the daily receipt and disbursements are not entered, the entries being only from time to time for a certain number of days and on referring to it, it will be seen that in the Disbursements from the 2d to the 10th Increasing Moon of Vyeaghum, year Velumbee, there is an entry as follows.

Set to Cavaly in charge of Mahatoud Venkatramoodoo.—

	Pagoda
65 Company's Rupees	16¼
34 Newly Coined Rupees	8½
2 Half Rupees	½
	25

In Parareddy's Journal Kurch account this 16 Rupees stands credited to the Sayerpet Collections and is immediately

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

immediately beneath the entered as a payment to Ramanjarow.—

I then proceeded to examine

46 Vittaty Panjalah.— He deposed that Eatamakala Parareddy being sick he went to see him and returned, that after coming and remaining with Parareddy one or two days, he (Parareddy) gave into witness's hand 100 Rupees telling him that it was to be paid to Ramanjarow, and that he (Witness) should take and pay it to him and return and that he accordingly took the 100 Rupees accompanied by some of his own people and paid it to Ramanjarow at Escapanilly.— He states that Parareddy told him it was for the Shayepett Channel business. On his cross-examination by Ramanjia Row he states that he arrived from Cavely (the Village in which Parareddy resided

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

resided at Escapully about sun set and early the next morning went to the house where Ramanja Row was putting up and told him that Parareddy had sent the money when he directed him to deliver it to a Brammin who was there and to go, that he accordingly gave it to the Brahmin and went away, that as far as he recollects the Brahmin was the only person there at the time but that he does not know his name.

47- Uttoty Pauliah having been the person who as appeared from Parareddy's Accounts and his own Deposition to have received the money from Parareddy and paid it to Ramanja Row and the only Witness therefore who could speak to the payment there was no further evidence admissible in support of the

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

the charge and Ramanja Row was directed to give in a list of the Witnesses he would wish to examine on his defence. Before however it was furnished, I was under the necessity of leaving Nellore for the Summah- lundy and not wishing to put Ramanja Row if it could be avoided to the inconvenience and unpleasantness of following my butchery. I requested my Head Assistant, Mr. Purves, who was at Nellore to take the examination of his Witnesses which was accordingly done. Three Witnesses were examined. The first was Ambatty Venkatramoodoo Ramanja Row's Head Bearer. He deposes to what

No 3 is also admitted by Ramanja Row that at the period when the payment is shewn to have been made, Ramanja Row was at Escapully.

The

Fort St. George 24th December 1870.-

The intention by this main evidence was to shew that from his situation as Ramanja Row's Head Bearer he was constantly in attendance and that Uttaty Panjiah did not come and speak with Ramanja. -row at Escapully at the period when he is asserted to have brought and paid the 10s Rupees.-

48.- The 2nd Witness is Acharanje Veeraraghavayah. He states that he is well acquainted with Uttaty Panjiah because when Uttaty Panjiah has come to Bellare he has employed wit- -ness to write or do any thing required to be done regarding his private affairs but although he in this way he had done business for him 4 or 5 Months ago the Witness had no recollection of what business it was. He states further that 12 or 13 days previous to giving his Deposition he

Fort St. George 24th December 1870.-

he (Witness) met Panjiah at Ranga Naick- -pett when he came for the festival at that Pagoda; that a conversation took place between them respecting Ramanja Row, which arose from his name being incidentally mentioned, upon which Panjiah said - that he had once before come to Bellare and that some of the people in the Collectors Cutcherry, told him that somehow or other Ramanja Row's name must be got into Etamanakala Parareddy's account; that now they were saying that he must give evidence, that if he did not give evidence his business would be much damaged and that if he did, it would be speaking unjustly. All this took place, it would seem from the 6th Question - and answer, in the Immediate vicinity of the principal entrance of the Ranga- -Naickpett Pagoda where there was a large concourse of people assembled for the feast. He subsequently says (Answer to 18th Question) that from what Panjiah said

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

said Ser / Witness / was impressed with the notion that he had been told by the Cutcherry Servants to get Ramanjarow's name into Catamaikala Parareddy's Accounts, but he says Pauperiah did not mention the names of any servants - This Witness states himself to have been employed for two Months previous to giving his deposition by a pleader in the Zillah Court, where he attends to obtain service - His evidence may I think be allowed to stand without comment His character is well known at Nellore and I mistake if it could not be shewn that he has on occasions proved himself to be a convenient witness -

No 4

49. The 3d and last Witness - examined by Ramanja Row and Dumpoor Saabbiah, who it seems was called to speak to Uttaty Pauperiah not having come and spoken with Ramanja Row during the time he remained at Eskapelly - See the Witness leaving he appears been at Eskapelly with

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

with Ramanjarow from the time of his coming to that of his leaving that place - The Head Bearer having mentioned this Witness as the Brahmin in attendance upon Ramanja Row at Eskapelly, he is asked whether Uttaty Pauperiah gave him any money there to which he answers in the negative and that he never saw Uttaty Pauperiah there - This man was formerly employed as a Peishcar in the Sub Division and dismissed by the then Sub Collector Mr Parker for making a false estimate - " - of produce after which he says he "wandered about here and there" but not getting any employment went to his Village, established cultivation and has since supported himself by it -

A B C

50. Among Parareddy's papers were also found some letters bearing on the subject translates of which form the enclosures Nos 8 9 & 10 - The originals are also forwarded for the Boards inspection two of them are from Uttaty Pauperiah to Catamaikala

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Clavinootrala Parareddy, and the 3d to
Parareddy from Abbas Ally Khan the
late Sayheerdar. In the letter Attoty
Panpiah writes that "all the papers relative
"time to that Channel have
"come to the Head man;
"As the business cannot be
"expected unless as much
"as 2 are expended in
"that case I write to this
"effect that you may know
"it" In the 2d Letter B
of Attoty Panpiah he
writes "I have received
"your letter and sent by
"post and understood the contents

I

Compd. J. R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

"I have accordingly taken care about the
"Channel - as he has said that as they are now
"in the trouble of the settlement it is not
"practicable to enquire into that business
"until the settlement is done it will be
"enquired into" In Abbas Ally Khan's
letter C it is written as follows -

"You have mentioned -
"about the Channel Case - Abdool Raheem is
"not here but has gone on account of Money
"when he comes I will send him - You
"have written to say that I must send
"Rahcem Sahib together with a sum of
"350 Rupees about this Channel business -
"When there you represented to me that
"100 or 150 Rupees would do and now you
"mention that a sum of 350 Rupees is
"required - I am much astonished - You have
"lately taken away Takeeds of the nature of
"Documents about the Channel business
"You have not yet sent them - I require
them

"them necessarily - you must send all those
"papers to me - You have occasion for money
"but nothing else."

51. Although in the foregoing letters the Village of Shayeepett is not specifically named there has been no other Channel dispute but that of Shayeepett since I have been in the District in which the late Jagheerdar of Woodiagherry has been a party concerned. Shayeepett at the time of the Channel dispute was held in rent for a term of years by Etamsookala Parareddy

No. 11. 52 Ramanja Row in his defence admits that he was at Eskapully when the Money is said to have been paid to him but that the two persons who were constantly in attendance on him declare that during the period he was at Eskapully Uttoly Paupiah never came and spoke with him - If further evidence had been allowable respecting this it would have

have been proved that several persons saw Parareddy at Eskapully on that occasion Ramanja Row has adopted the invariable course pursued by Natives when so circumstanced and declares the Accounts a fabrication and the whole affair got up by his enemies Uttoly Paupiah has no particular business as Ramanja Row affirms with Choundy - The only business he had was to receive for Members of the Family to whom arrears of allowances were payable under the recent final Orders of Government, the sums they were entitled to, and in conformity with Petitions from the Parties themselves, who I believe owed him Money - He had no other business or concern with Choundy in my Cutcherry. The notion of any thing having been fabricated in this case appears to me absurd for Parareddy's papers were quite unexpectedly seized.

53 My belief is that Ramanja Row

not

not only received this sum of 100 Rupees from Pararedy the renter of Shayepett, but a sum also from Abbas Ally Khan, the actual proprietor, allusion, it will have been seen, has been made to a payment on account of this Channel business in the letter C from Abbas Ally Khan to Pararedy, and in an Abstract Account found amongst the papers of his Vakeel Cader Ally purporting to be an Account from the Month of $\frac{\text{May}}{\text{Suffer}}$ of Fusly $\frac{1838}{1247}$ to the end of the Month of $\frac{\text{August}}{\text{Jamadi Sany}}$ of Fusly $\frac{1838}{1248}$ there is an entry of 200 Rupees paid to the Sheristadar 54. The late enquiries give strong reason to believe that there was some dirt in this Shayeepett Channel business The Tahsildar was entirely in favor of the Jagheerdar's Claim and so grossly so as to grate all former papers support-ing it while he stopt short and was silent regarding after proceedings which had

had decided the former dispute against the Woodiagherry Village a dispute connected with this Channel had com-menced in 1803. It was finally decided against the Jagheerdar by the Collector in 1805. The recent case arose from an application on the part of the late Jagheerdar to deepen and widen the Channel leading to the Shayeepett Tank for the purpose of obtaining a larger supply of Water, Across this Channel passes an agueduct to Convey water to the Paddy lands of the Government Village of Poorpoopellem. The effect of deepening and widening the Channel, would have been to render the Agueduct, which had been constructed with reference to the former width and depth of the Channel, useless, and probably to bring it down altogether. The Tahsildar's report and other papers were all referred to the Sheristadar with whom I talked over the matter, and

and gave my final Orders to the Moonshee to prepare the Draft according to my view of the Case — The decision was to this effect, that the Jagheerdar was at full liberty to clear out his Channel but not to exceed the limit of Width and depth prescribed by Mamool, and that if he did so in any way to injure the Aqueduct across it, he should within a reasonable time, repair it at his own expense, and if he failed to do so that the Channel would be shut up entirely — Ramanja Row observes that nothing was done by him that he offered no assistance to any one, in fact that he did not interfere with the matter —

55. Ramanja Row admits that the papers were referred to him, nor can he deny that I spoke with him regarding them immediately before my decision was given. If however the Assistance which a person holding the situation of

of Head Sheristadar could give were limited to what he could effect in his own person at the Hoozzoor Cutcherry, it would be comparatively trifling, if a Collector himself looks sufficiently into the business which comes before him, but there is a far more easy and dangerous way of rendering assistance and which I have grounds for saying has been resorted to by Ramanja Row, though I cannot speak to its having been done in the present case of the Shayesteh Channel, namely a private intimation to a Tahsildar how and in whose favor to frame his report, which is backed up by the Sheristadar's personal influence at the Hoozzoor and aided by other means at his Command, such as the suppression of former Papers, to give the European Authority an incorrect view of the facts and information on which he is called upon to decide. I call such a system dangerous because

because there are but slender means of detecting it, of discovering whether the information furnished by a Tahsildar is correct or not. It is dangerous because in most cases the Collector is obliged to found his decision upon the Statements and information furnished by the local Officer, and when a hint from the Head Sheristadar is, as it undeniably is, all powerful with a Tahsildar, there is no security that the Collector's decesion will be consonant to justice and propriety. The Collector must in most Cases confide in the information furnished by the local Officers, and the same principle applies to Collectors and the Board of Revenue, but if there be a possibility that the sources of information are distempered and corrupt, it saps the very foundation of the proceedings and decisions of the higher Authority. It is very evident therefore that the greatest assistance may

may be given to parties by a corrupt Sheristadar though so cloaked as to make it appear outwardly that he had no more concern in the matter than going through the papers with the Collector and taking his orders on the Case. The fact however is this, that whether a Sheristadar can assist parties or not, the universal belief is that he can, and Parties will be ready to pay for his influence and assistance where they have litigated cases or other business at the Cutcherry of sufficient interest and importance to make it worth their while.

56. With reference to the case in which Atoty Paupiah was sent up to the Criminal Court as noticed in the concluding part of Para 6 of Ramanja Row's defence, it is proper to mention that the parties on an appeal to the Provincial Court were acquitted of the charge upon which they were sent up.

The

Case No. 4

57. The remaining Case is that of a payment of 100 Rupees to Ramanja Row by one Cassavarauze Vencatroyadoo to procure him a situation.—

58. Vencatroyadoo gave me a Petition in March 1839 stating that there were some circumstances which he wished in person to represent to me— On being sent for, he mentioned what forms the matter of charge in this case, and his Statement was taken down in

No. 1 writing— and was as follows— that as he did not get any employment though he had attended the Cutcherry as a Candidate for the last 2 years. Ramanja Row sent for him when the Cutcherry was on Circuit at Indoocoorpett and told him that Hoogghully Ram Row /Ramanja Row's Nephew/ had something to say to him, that if he /Deponent/ took care about it, and came by the time Ramanja Row arrived at Nellore, the Gentleman

Gentleman would favor him with a situation, that he relied upon his Word and executed a Bond to one Bezzawada Para=reddy an inhabitant of Wootoocoor and living in the house of Davereddy Veerareddy /his fatherinlaw/ at Moodevarty and brought a sum of 100 Rupees, which he took to Ramanja Row's house, and delivered to him; that upon this Ramanja Row and Ram Row spoke together in English, which language he /Deponent/ does not know. That Ram Row then told him that Ramanja Row had said that the situation of a Mazoomdar Goomastah in the Talamunchy Talook was vacant and that he would get him that situation, that since that time he had been attending upon them, and that in the mean time the vacant Talook Goomastahship of Talamunchy had been filled up— that he represented this forcibly to Ramanja Row who said that he would speak to the Gentleman, and in eight days have his /Deponents/ business

settled

settled favorably, but he did not do so and therefore after Ramanja Row's return again to Nellore he (Deponent) asked him either to return his money or to procure him a situation, that Ramanja Row then used some improper language to him, and sent him about his business, that in consequence of his (the Deponents) having threatened to Petition the Collector in regard to the abusive language Ramanja Row had used towards him, he returned him 98 Rupees out of the 100 which he (Vencatrow) had paid him, and that the remaining two Rupees were still unreturned up to the day of giving his Deposition. Vencatroyadoo then proceeds to detail other circumstances which relate to the conduct of another public Servant Cory Runga Row which can have no connection with the charge against the Sheristadar. He deposes further that when he went to Ramanja Row's house to pay the 100 Rupees no one accompanied him

him but Hoogghelly Ram Row, but that Surrauze Narrainapah was sitting with Ramanja Row, but left on a hint from Ram Row, that in the Bond he executed to Bezzawada Parareddy it is stated that the money was required on account of service and would be discharged by instalments after he got a situation, that the Bond was executed in the name of his Elder brother; that in regard to the repayment of the 98 Rupees, the Speon of Hoogghelly Ram Row named Janakeeraumoodoo came and said that the Sheristadar wanted him, that he went accordingly, that there were Rupees before him, when he said here are your Rupees. Take them and go off quickly to your Village if I am restored to my situation I will get you employment, but if you remain here, and make noise you will die suddenly. Venkat Row further deposed that he did not at the time count the Rupees but counted them after he left and found that there were 98 Rupees only

on

No. 9

Commences 17th December and ends 15th January 1839 the Cutcherry reached Indoocoorpett on the 17th January 1839 and left on the 22d.-

59. On his cross examination by Ramanja Row he states that he does not recollect the day or hour, when he (Ramanja Row) spoke to him at Indoocoorpett but that it was in the Month of Pooshyum of last year when the Cutcherry was on Circuit at Indoocoorpett, that the persons present were Ramanja Row, Hoogghelly Ram Row and Deponent, and that he does not know what other persons may have been inside the house, that he remained 4 or 5 days at Indoocoorpett and then proceeded to his Village Juldunky and after trying for 8 or 9 days without success he went to Moodeevurty with his brother and asked Bezzawada Parareddy and Davareddy Veerareddy and they gave him 100 Rupees.—

60. He deposes further that when he and his brother went to their house, Parareddy and Veerareddy were there and also one Sashapah who writes their accounts and that a Capoo named Moondlapoody Nuraredd came

came there, but whether the Capoo was there by the time they had come, or came afterwards he did not recollect— On asking for the loan of the money Para:reddy and Veerareddy required security for the repayment and upon their agreeing to repay it by monthly instalments of three or four Pagodas as written in the Bond after he (Deponent) got service they gave the money He states further that he took the money to Ramanja Rows' house one night between 9 and 10 o'clock and that when he went into the room Ramanja Row's sister Rungama was standing near, that Surrauze Narrainapah was at a little distance off that the money was all in Company's Rupees, and no smaller Coins— He states in Conclusion that on the money being returned to him by Ramanja Row he discharged 80 Rupees of the Bond and kept the remainder for his own expenses. Davareddy Veerareddy having come to Nellore and asked him to repay the money as he understood that it had been repaid by

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

by Ramanja Row kept his Goomastah Sashapah at Nellore and returned and that he (Deponent) having kept 18 Rupees for articles he had already taken from a Banian paid the remainder Vizt 80 Rupees over to the Goomastah and endorsed the payment on the Bond— This re-payment of the 80 Rupees he recollects was 4 days after he had received the 98 Rupees from Ramanja Row—

No. 13. 61 In his 3d. declaration this witness was further cross examined by Ramanja Row. in respect chiefly to a receipt which it was asserted he had given to Hoggkelly Ramrow. in regard to which he says "you (Ramanja Row) paid me 98 "Rupees. afterwards you understood that I "Complained to the Gentleman that I did "not receive the remaining two Rupees and you sent "one acharloo who lives in your house and "whose name I dont know to call me to "your house. I said I would not come to "your house thinking that you would do me

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

"me some harm or other. One or two days "afterwards you sent your Son in law Ram "Row saying that it was understood I had "complained that the Rupees they had paid "had not been paid and that he Ram Row "should pay the money which was short and "take a receipt that somehow or other he was "to satisfy me and get me to go to the "Village where I reside, that it was through "him (Ram Row) that Vencatrow (Deponent) "had brought and paid the money. Ram Row "asked me to receive the balance due and "give a receipt I asked him if the receipt "should be in his name or Ramanja Row— He said it was all the same and as he was "present he asked me to give the receipt in "his name and I gave a receipt to Ram Row"—

62 The receipt he says was written on the pial of the front door of Mullavarapoo Audeemoorty's house between 12 and 1 O'clock in the day but he does not recollect whether Audeemoorty was there or not or any one else excepting a man who had accompanied Ram

"Ram Row with an inkbottle and pen—
The receipt he declares was not attested by
any one, that it was in his own handwrit:
:ing but the contents he does not recollect.

63 Ramanja Row next produced
a receipt which the deponent Cafsavarauze
Vencatroydoo at once declared not to be the
receipt he had written and given "Some
"of the letters" he observes "seem to have
"been made to resemble my handwriting, but
"it is not my handwriting nor is it my
"signature."

64 The following is a translation
of the receipt.

"Receipt which Cafsavarauze Vencat:
:row caused to be written to Hoogghelly Ram Row
on the 2nd Increasing moon of Chaetrum year
Veharee.

"As you have caused to be paid
the sum of 100 Rupees which you have bor:
:rowed through me together with interest it
has been received.

"This receipt is caused to be written
with

with my free will."

/Signed/ Vencatrow.

Witnesses
Mullavarapoo Andeemoorty.
Marked Putsavally Pauliah.

65. The witness deposed further that
Ram Row had a year previously Vizt in the
month of Palgoonum of the year Havalumbee
told him to speak with one Yerragerla Conda:
:reddy about lending him 200 Rupees, but
that he replied he was not a Soucar and
could not do it, but about five or six
months afterwards having gone on some
business to Wootoocoor he mentioned it in:
:cidentally to Condareddy and one Coturn:
:reddy Soobareddy, who asked what he
Deponent had to do with it, and whether
Ram Row could not himself come and
ask for it if he wanted it. He declares fur:
:ther that he never procured a loan for
Ram Row that on the day the receipt
was written Andeemoorty one of the
attesting witnesses was not at all there,
that he /deponent/ saw nothing of him.

that

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

that he (Audeemoorty) is a friend of Ramanja Row and frequents his house, and that he thinks for that reason he has given evidence in his favor.

No. 2

66 The next witness examined was Davareddy Veerareddy inhabitant of Moodevanty and the person who jointly with Bezzawada Parareddy lent the 100 Rupees to Cassavarauze Vencatrow. He deposes that about or upwards of one month ago Cassavarauze Vencatroydoo and his elder brother Soobaroydoo executed a Bond either in his (witness) or Parareddy name, he does not perfectly recollect which that he merely told Parareddy to give them a sum of 100 Rupees for the Bond when Vencatrow and Soobarow were present and that he then went to the fields, and Parareddy gave them the money. He states further that when Vencat Row asked for the Rupees he said he would pay them to the Sheristadar and obtain a situation and pay at the rate of 4 Pagodas a month in discharge of the debt. He said that the Sheristadar had told him that he would get him a situation

Date of Deposition 23d March 1839.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

situation if the money were paid, and that Moondlapoody Nursareddy, and Anuntarauze Sashapa were present when he (Vencatrow) said so. This witness produced the Bond which is executed on a Cadjan leaf and of which the following is a translate-

No. 3

"Vayada Puttrum or Bond payable by in-
"stalments executed by Cassavarauze Sooba-
"roydoo to Bezzawada Parareddy on the 10th decreas-
"ing moon of Maghum year Vellumbee-

9th February 1839

"As we have this day borrowed of you
"a sum of 100 Rupees equivalent to 25 Pagodas
"on account of Circar employment, the
"instalments fixed for the payment of
"the said sum with interest at the rate per
"mensum of three quarters of a Pagoda and a fanam
"for 100 Pagodas are as follows.—
"By two months commencing from this
"date a sum of 4 Pagodas and afterwards at
"the rate of 4 Pagodas per month after pay-
"ing the principal and interest of the
"Bond, I will take back my instalment
"Bond. This is executed with our consent in
"Soobaroydoo's own hand writing.—
"Signed Soobaroydoo"

Witnesses signature of Anuntarauze Sashapah on
D° of Moondlapody Nursareddy.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

On the Bond is the following payment

24th March 1839 — 10th increasing moon Chaitrum year Seekary 80 Pagodas

No. 4. — 64. This witness also produced a Cadjan headed Cajavarauze Soobaroyadoo's account of which the following is a translate and appears to have been kept as a separate account of the Bond and the payments made in discharge thereof.

Cajavarauze Soobaroyadoo's Account.

10th Decreasing moon of Magham year Velumbee or 19th February 1839 — Paid for situation for Vencatroyadoo Madras Rupees 100 or Pagodas 25 for which they executed an instalment Bond to us with interest at 3/4 Pagl and 1 fanam per ℳ per diem

10th Increasing moon Chaitrum year Vekaree corresponding with 24th March 1839. — Amount paid into Sashapa's charge at Nellore Rupees 80 equivalent to Pagl 20

68. The entry in this account shews that the 100 Rupees were all in Rupees and confirms Vencatarow's statement on this point Bezzawada Parareddy was unable to attend from illness when

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

when the matter was first enquired into & and was reported also to be ill when summoned again on the recommencement of the enquiry and to have gone to a particular Village in the Cavaly Talook to get cured but on a reference made to the Cavaly Tasildar to send him to the Hoozoor if not too ill he reported that he had not come to the Village named, and that he could gain no tidings of him. He has therefore not been examined, and I did not think it necessary to keep the case open till he could attend as Ramanja Row said he did not require to examine him and moreover his evidence in support of the Charge could only have referred to points on which there was already evidence sufficient and indeed indirectly admitted in the defence Vizt. The loan of the money to Cajavarauze Vencatarow and his brother and their execution of the Bond.

No. 5. — Date of Deposition 25th March 1839. — The next witness examined was

69 Moodlapoody Nursareddy who deposes that about one month and twenty days ago, Cajavarauze Vencatarow came to Moodevarty and

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

and asked Bezzawada Parareddy and Daveredy Veerareddy for a sum of 100 Rupees saying that he wanted it to procure a situation; that a Bond was taken from Vencatarow in favor of Parareddy, and 100 Rupees paid, and that he attested the Bond as a witness that he did not hear it said the money was for the Sheristadar but that it was for a great man in the Cutcherry, that the Sheristadar's name was not mentioned but that he understood that by the great man the Sheristadar was meant. The cross examination of this witness by Ramanja Row does not call for remark--

No. 6.

70 The next witness examined was Anantarauze Shashapa the Goomastah.

+ 9th February 1839. He deposes that on the 10th decreasing moon of Maghum Cupavarauze Vencatroyadoo and his elder brother Soobarow came to the house of Bezzawada Parareddy and Veerareddy, that Soobarow told them that the Sheristadar Ramanja Row promised to get Vencatrow a situation that if 100 Rupees were paid he would get

Compd. S.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

get employment which should be repaid at the rate of 4 Pagodas per Mensem and asked them to give him the Money, that they agreed and produced the Money, when Parareddy asked them for a Document and they executed a Bond upon a Cadjan leaf for the sum of 100 Rupees with interest, that he (Deponent) and Moondlapoody Nursareddy attested the Bond as Witnesses. The cross examination of this witness by Ramanjarow does not call for remark--

No. 7.

+ Commences on the 16th January and ends 14th February 1839.

71 Cupavarauze Soobbaroyadoo was next examined and deposed as follows.

"In the month of Maughum last year --

"Vencatroyadoo came from Nellore to our "Village Juldunky and asked me for a sum "of 100 Rupees saying that Ramanjarow had "told him that he would get him a situation "if that sum were paid to him. I told Vencat- "row I had then no Rupees but he was importu- "nate saying that unless I had the Money given "him, he would not remain in this country. -- "Then I and Vencatroyadoo came to Bezzavada "Parareddy at Moodevarty and I executed a Bond to

to Parareddy in my name and caused One hun-
=dred Rupees to be paid to Vencatrow." The
Witness then identified the Bond produced
by Davareddy Veerareddy as the one he exe-
=cuted. He further deposed that after getting
the Rupees, he and his brother Vencatrow came
to Nellore, and having left him there proceeded
on to his own Village Juldurkey, and that eight
days afterwards he received a letter from his
brother at Nellore saying that he had had the
Money paid to Ramanjarow. This letter, having as
he says "a sort of document which ought not to be
kept," he tore it up. He deposed further that his
brother had subsequently told him that he had re-
=ceived back 98 Rupees from Ramanjarow, that he
had kept 18 Rupees of that sum for his own ex-
=penses and had repaid 80 Rupees to Bezzavada
Parareddy, and that he (witness) was told the same by
Parareddy. The witness states further that four months
afterwards he paid the remaining 20 Rupees to
Parareddy, the 100 Rupees he borrowed he says
were all Company's Rupees.

72. Ramanjarow examined two witness-
=es

on his Defence. The first was Mullavara-
=poo Audymoorty who appears as one of the
attesting witnesses to the receipt of Cafsavarauze
Vencatrow produced by Ramanjarow. His evidence
is to the following effect, that on the 2nd Increas-
=ing moon of Maughum of last year Hoogga-
=helly Ramrow wanted 200 Rupees for a Hoondee
he was desirous of getting on Madras in favor of
his elder brother Hooghelly Seenah and de-
=sired witness to borrow it from one Davareddy
Singareddy of Moodevurty with whom he had
friendship and that he (Ramrow) would repay
it with interest. The witness then told Ramrow
that Singareddy had died and that it would not
be possible to get the Money in any other quarter.
When this conversation with Ramrow took place,
Cafsavarauze Vencatrow he says was present,
and mentioned that he was acquainted with
Davareddy Veerareddy and that if the principal
and interest were paid he would obtain from him
a loan of 100 Rupees. The witness afterwards
told Ramrow to execute a Bond for 100 Rupees
and to get the Money and to speak in some other

No. 12
17th January 1839.

quarter

quarter for the remaining 100 Rupees but that he (witness) did not think there was any other person who would lend it. Ramrow he says asked Vencatroydoo in whose name the Bond was to be executed, who replied that they would not lend the Money if it were in Ramrow's name, and that he would by some means or other obtain the Money from them and give the Bond in his name and that Ramrow should keep favor on him for thus assisting him. The witness further deposed that Vencatrow had afterwards told him, that Ramrow had got the Money and had executed a Bond, and Ramrow also told him the same. He then states that on the second increasing moon of Chaitra Year Veekary he was at the Village of Mopoor on his Sayer duties and on the 4th or 5th increasing Moon, he did not recollect which, after his return to Nellore, Vencatrow who was in the habit of coming to his house on his way to the Cutcherry told him that Hooghelly Ramrow had paid him 98 Rupees on account of the Money which he had obtained for him, and that he had written the payment at the foot of the Bond

17th March 1839.

19th & 20th Dec.

He

He then proceeds into other detail as to what took place between himself and Ramrow in regard to the latter having paid two Rupees short of the principal sum, and not having paid interest which it is not material to enter into here. He states however that Ramrow brought and paid the two Rupees which had been short paid in the first instance and one Rupee as interest. that Vencatrow said on receiving them that he would give a receipt and bring Ramarow's Bond that evening or the next day, that Vencatrow accordingly gave a receipt in his own hand writing to Ramrow and told witness to attest it, although he objected to doing so considering it unnecessary, but that he did at length attest it. He states further that 5 or 6 days after this Vencatrow told him that he had the next day returned to Ramrow the Bond on which the payment of 98 Rupees had been entered, but that Ramrow had not

returned

returned his receipt though he had asked him to do so, and pressed witness to get the receipt for him. witness then told Ramrow that it was not proper to keep the receipt after the Bond had been returned who said that the receipt could not be given but must remain with him (Ramrow).

73 On his cross examination he states that unless he sees the receipt he does not recollect whether there was any other attesting witness to it besides himself that he has no recollection that many persons were present. On being shewn the receipt he stated that the other person Putsavully Paupiah whose mark in attestation the receipt bears, was a person occasionally employed by Sayer renters, but at the time the receipt was given was not in service but was attending himself (witness) and that about four months ago he proceeded to Madras where he died. The said Paupiah he says was present when the receipt was

executed

executed. He states further that he did not get the Hoondee for which Ramrow wanted him to obtain a loan of 200 Rupees though he heard from Ramrow himself that he had sent a Hoondee. As it appeared from this witness's own statement and which is borne out by the Official records that on the 17th of March 1839 the date of the receipt said to have been executed by Cassavarauze Vencatrow and to which he was an attesting witness. he (the witness) was at Mopoor while the receipt was executed at Nellore. He explained upon a question (16) put by

19th 20th March 1839. Ramanjarow that on his return to Nellore on the 4th or 5th Chaitram Vencatrow said that Hoogyhilly Ramrow had paid 98 Rupees three days previously

17th March. or on the 2nd increasing Moon which had been credited in the Bond, and that the same date was given to the receipt that it and the payment in the Bond might correspond. That Bond the witness says he never saw but was told by Ramrow that it was executed upon plain paper.

No. 14 74 The last witness was

Sarrauze

Surrauze Narrainapah who was called to deny his having at any time seen Cassavarauze Vencatrow at Ramanjarows house.- It will be recollected that Vencatrow mentioned this man as having been with Ramanjarow in the upstair when he took the Rupees up to him in company with Ramarow.-

75.

It will be useful here briefly to recapitulate the circumstances of this case as they appear in evidence. Some time between the 17th and 22nd January 1839 when the Cutcherry was at Indoor-corpett the proposition appears to have been first made to Cufsavarauze Vencatarow by Ramarow the Sheristadar's Nephew that on the payment of 100 Rupees, Ramanjarow would obtain a situation for him. Vencatrow accordingly proceeds to his brother at Juldunkey in a distant Talook mentions the same to him and applies to him for the Money. and after an ineffectual attempt for some days to obtain it in those parts, they both proceed to Moodeverty and apply to one Bezzawada Parareddy and his father in Law Davareddy Veerareddy, who

who live together as an undivided family, to lend them the 100 Rupees. They mentioned to these persons the purpose for which the money was wanted namely to pay the Sheristadar for a situation for Vencatrow. The Reddies lent them the money on their executing a Bond, for the amount payable with interest by certain instalments after Vencatrow obtained service. The loan and the Bond are admitted and the Bond and account already noticed shew that the money was borrowed in order to procure service. The Bond is executed on the 9th February and the 100 Rupees carried by Vencatrow in Company with Ramrow the Sheristadar's Nephew and paid to Ramanjarow on what day is not precisely stated,- but Vencatrow's brother Soobbarow states that 7 or 8 days after his return to his Village, he received a letter from his brother at Nellore mentioning that he had paid the Money to Ramanjarow and it may be presumed therefore that the

the payment was immediately antecedent to his letter to his brother. On the morning of Vencatrow's first examination before me — Viz.t the 21st March 1839 he states that 98 Rupees were repaid by Ramanjarow and that he applied 80 Rupees of it in discharge of his Bond debt to Parareddy and accordingly on the Bond itself, and also in — Vencatrow's account produced by Veerareddy there is an entry of 80 Rupees paid on account on the 24th March. A payment of 98 Rupees to Vencatrow by Ramanjarow is admitted and a receipt taken bearing date the 17th March 1839. Though Vencatrow admits ~ ~ ~

Bond in his posfession, to have shewn its payment in his accounts, to have called the attesting witnesses to the Bond or at any rate to have called any one who had ever seen it, but so far from there being a tittle of evidence to support the assertion of there being any Bond of Ramrow's to Vencatrow and in discharge of which this 98 Rupees is said to have been paid, there is the most suspicious circumstance of a Receipt for the Amount given as security till the Bond was returned, still being in the posfession of Ramrow, although the Bond as would appear from Mullavarapoo Audeemoorty's evidence had been returned. If there had been really a Bond of Ramrow's and if that Bond had been returned which Audeemoorty's evidence goes to shew it had been, why should the receipt given in the first instance be still kept by Ramrow. Ramanjarow's witness Audeemoorty declares that he pointed out to Ramrow the

the impropriety of keeping the receipt after the Bond had been returned, who said that it could not be given back but should remain with him. If there was no Bond, it is evident that the receipt was a Voucher which could not be returned, but if there were a Bond and that Bond had been returned, the continued posfession by Ramrow of the receipt given till the Bond had been returned was wholly unnecessary. The obvious conclusion to the best of my judgment to be drawn from the above facts is that the receipt given by Vencatrow was simply a receipt given when the whole amount of the bribe had been repaid and that Ramrow's Bond is a made up story; not the slightest allusion is made to any Bond in the receipt, and the receipt bears date the 17th March, some days prior to the date on which Vencatrow says he gave a receipt, while it is admitted by the

attesting

attesting witness Audeemoorly that it was not actually executed till the 19th or 20th having been antedated to make it correspond with an entry in this pretended Bond of Ramarow's - Vencatrow fairly and openly admits his having given a receipt, which if the matter had been made up against Ramanjarow, it would have been as easy for him to have altogether denied, and which he would in such case most likely have denied as any admission of the sort would be calculated to weaken rather than support the charge - My suspicions of the receipt produced by Ramanjarow are greatly strengthened by what has passed under my own eye in respect to Ramarow's propensities in the way of fabricating signatures and documents -

7th There are many obvious reasons for coming to the conclusion that there is no fabrication in this case - Though the Bond may be deemed ambiguous as

as to which of the two meanings the word used in it (கூலி) may be taken whether business or employment still the account explains it and is explicit enough as to the purpose for which the money was wanted namely for a situation - The Bond was executed on the 9th February and the money lent at a time when Ramanja Row was in full possession of my confidence and favor - The witness moreover are consistent - Had it been a made up case, surely the evidence of the actual payment of the money to Ramanjarow would not have been left to a single witness Vencatrow - Nothing would have been easier or more natural than that his brother Soobarow, who went with him to procure the money should have accompanied him on the occasion of its payment, but instead of this we find his brother after having procured the money for him returning at once to his own Village - If it had been a made up case, Vencatrow would surely not have mentioned a third person Surrauze Narrainapah as having been with Ramanjarow when he brought the money a person known to be employed

employed by Ramanjarow in secret and confidential matters, and whose brother and himself have all along managed his Condriga at Suckapully Goodoor, The naming of this person was wholly unnecessary and only furnished means for weakening his own Statement as he must have been certain of the evidence of Narrainapah would give Again if it were a made up case, is it likely that the letter from Vencatrow at Nellore to his brother mentioning that he had paid the money to Ramanjarow would have been destroyed, that it would not have been forthcoming when it was so easy for Vencatrow to have written a letter to that effect and to have produced it -

77 Then as regards the defence namely that Ramahrow wanted 200 Rupees for a Hoondee on Madras and applied to Casavarauze Vencatrow to get the loan of a portion of it for him — Vencatrow was an escpectant for employ and had been

been so for some time, of a Curnum Caste and like most persons so circumstanced had scarcely the wherewithal to support himself and yet such was the person to whom Ramrow then holding the office of Sayer Darogah in the Hoozzoor Cutcherry on a salary of 50 Rupees per Mensem, and the son of the sister of the Head Sheristadar, applied to procure him a loan of 100 or 200 Rupees - Is such a thing to be credited for an instant - Is it to be believed that himself one of the principal servants of the Cutcherry and one of the Head Sheristadar's nearest relatives could not borrow 100 or 200 Rupees without having recourse to a person of the description of Casavarauze Vencatrow -

78 In the concluding part of Surrauze Narrainapah's declaration it is endeavoured to be shewn that Ramanjarow had nothing to do with appointments — I admit that as a general rule I endeavour

to

to discover and select those whose claims I think the strongest, but I am in very many cases thrown upon the Sheristadar for information in respect to the character and qualifications of the Candidates and I have always made it a rule in regard to the higher appointments in the Talooks to make them in communication with the Sheristadar and generally have observed the same rules even with the subordinate appointments - It so happened that on this occasion the vacancy was filled up without reference to the Sheristadar by the transfer of the Salamunchy Goomastaship of a person already in the Service, and whose qualifications were well known, which is no doubt the reason why any reference to the Sheristadar was unnecessary - The Vacancy occurred by the death of a Mazoom Goomastah in Salamunchy Talook on the 7th February 1839, which was filled up on the 28th of the same Month -

79 Ramanjarow mentions in his defence that Davareddy Veerareddy has

enmity towards him because he was removed from the Office of Village Moonsiff of Moodeverty which he attributed to Ramanjarow - The occurrence to which he alludes took place four years before Vizt in June 1835 and Veerareddy had no reason to suppose that Ramanja Row had been at all instrumental in it - The person Lingareddy who had, as his father had before him, held the Office of Village Moonsiff and was the largest Puttadar in the Village petitioned to be restored - He had been removed two or three years previous on account of some obstacles he had thrown in the way of having the cattle of the Village counted, and upon a consideration of all the circumstances I considered that his punishment had been sufficient and restored him, the parties were sent for into my presence and the matter personally enquired into by myself and my orders given in their presence -

80 I think it right in closing this report to transmit for the information

of

Numbered from 1 to 6

of the Board as an appendix, translates and originals of certain papers which have come into my possession since the presumption of the Woodiagherry Saghire which of themselves I think furnish strong grounds to distrust Ramanjarow's integrity in the discharge of his Official duties –

81 I have endeavoured to state all the cases I have investigated as perspicuously as I am able, and it remains for the Board to decide – my own opinion in the matter has been indicated in the remarks I have had occasion to make in the course of my report and it seems almost unnecessary therefore to declare my belief that Ramanjarow has been corrupt – His thirty years period of service is no proof that he has been in his previous service an honest servant though it may be considered as proving that he has discharged the duties of his

his office to the satisfaction of his official superiors and that he is possessed, which every one who knows him must admit, of more than ordinary talent and fitness for official business –

I submit that the Official superior in a Court or Cutcherry can only form his judgment upon what falls under his own observation, upon the outer man as developed in the talents and attention to business which the servant evinces, while all within and in secret may be impure and corrupt and which from the absence of complaint, the strong reluctance felt by natives to complain against a person holding an office of influence and authority and the difficulty of proof of which Ramanjarow is fully sensible having himself

on

19033 Fort St. George 24th December 1840

on one occasion remarked to me that no bribery Case could ever be proved, may during a long period of Service have escaped the knowledge or even Suspicions of his immediate official Superior.

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector

Nellore
Prin.l Collector's Office
19th June 1841
Comp.d J.R.

Account

19034 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

Case 2. No. 1.-

Account of chouty Cauvenayane Bungaroo Coonara Ankapa naidoo 10th of the decreasing moon of margaseram in the year Pardeva corresponding with 3d January 1826.-

	CRs.	CRs.
Received thro' Nabee Sahib		3,000
Paid to naravapuntoola Sectarampuntooloo on the 4th of the decreasing moon of Vysakum year as per your Sanakha	80	
D.o to Nabee Sahib	80	
D.o on account of Raja bahader. prices	5	
Total Rupees		165
D.o to Rojookhoordoo Poorooshottum puntooloo on the 7th of the increasing moon of Bhadrapadam as per your Sanakha	100	
D.o into the hands of a Peon on account of the charges of Nagaree	29½	
D.o on account of a piece of Rajabahdar	5½	
Total Rs.		135
D.o to Poollajee Puntooloo on the 14th of the increasing moon of D.o as per Sanakha	20	
D.o to Rojookhoordoo Poollajee Puntooloo on the 12th of the decreasing moon of Carteekum as per D.o	20	
D.o to Daday Mahomed on account of Cloths as per order	10	
Total		30

	Rs.	Rs.
Paid on the 10th of the increasing moon of Marga-		
seram on account of Cloths as Pr. Tanakha	15	
Do. on account of the wages of a Peon	5	
		20
Do. on the 10th of the increasing moon of Phalgoonum		
on account of a piece of Cloth delivered to		
Nabee Saheb	5	
Do. to Ramasevaya on the 1st of the decreasing		
Moon of Chaitrum of the year Suvojeetoo as Pr.		
Tanakha or assignment	70	
Do. to Do. on the 8th of the decreasing Moon		
of Aushadham as per Do.	100	
Do. on the 15th of the increasing Moon of Carteekam		
as per Tanakha given at Nellore	400	
Do. on account of a Tanakha given to Poollajee	100	
		500
	Total	600
Do. to Poollajee on the 5th of the increasing moon		
of Margaseram as Pr. Tanakha	150	
Do. on account of a Hoondee payable at Madras		
given to Rajookhoordoo Poollajeepuntoolu on a former		
date or on the 2d of the decreasing		
moon of Phalgoonum of the year		
Pareedhavee	100	
Do. on account of a Tanakha to Poollajee		
on the 10th of the increasing moon of		
Phalgoonum of Vijaya	60	
		310
	Total	1010

	Rs.	Rs.
Paid on account of Palmeira pieces Given to		
Moongamoor Lutchmenurso Puntoolu on the 14th of		
the increasing moon of Margaseram of the year		
Survajeetoo as Pr. Tanakha	50	
Do. to Raghavacharlu on the 11th of the decreasing		
Moon (of Do.) as Pr. Do.	100	
Do. to Daday Mahomed on the 7th of the decreasing		
Moon of Pooshyum as Pr. Do.	100	
Do. to Daday on the 4th of the decreasing Co.		
Moon of Magham, on account of a Tanakha		
of one hundred Rupees	70	
Do. to Poollajee Puntoolu at Madras	30	
		100
Do. to Daday on the 12th of increasing moon of		
Phalgoonum as Pr. Tanakha	90	
Do. to Ragahavacharlu	10	
	Total	100
Do. on the 14th of the decreasing moon (of Do.)	100	
Do. to Daday on the 9th of the decreasing Moon of		
Chaitrum year Survadhary as Pr. Tanakha	19	
Do. on account of batta to Adavegandoo	5	
Amount ordered in a letter to be paid		
at Madras	46	
	Total	70

	Rs.	Rs.
Amount paid to Daday on the 8th of the increasing moon of Vysakhum as Pr. Tanakha		30
Amount of a Hoondee payable at Madras given to Rojookhoordoo Poollayee Puntooloo on the 7th of the decreasing moon of adhekadushadhum of the year Subvadary		30
Amount paid on the 15th of the increasing Moon of Jaystum as Pr. bond taken in the name of Ramlow		245
Do. being the value of a pair of under garments measuring 36 Cubits delivered to Dauday on the 10th of the increasing moon of Shravanum		8½
Do. paid on the 11th of the decreasing moon of Bhadrapadam		50
Do. paid as per letter on the 11th of the increasing moon of Margaseram		50
Do. being the value of one pair of under garments furnished on the 8th of the decreasing moon of Phalgoonum is Pags. 2 57/64 or		11 9/16
Do. paid to Adeny on the 7th of the increasing moon of Chaitrum year Vedrooty		100
Do. to Mooladarapah on the 12th of the increasing moon (of Do.)		150
Do. Do. to Dauday Sahel on the 6th of the increasing moon of Vysakham in part payment of a Tanakha		34

	Rs.	Rs.
Amount being the value of a piece of Bundermuttem furnished lately or on the 15th of the increasing moon of Chaitrum is 1 1/8 Pagoda or		1
Do. paid to Dauday on the 8th of the increasing moon of dushadam as Pr. Tanakha already given		50
Do. paid to mooladarapah on the 2d of the increasing moon of Shravanum on account of a Tanakha		60
Do. being the value of a painted woomen Cloth taken by Mooladharapah on a promise of sending the price thereof		4 3/4
Total		64 3/4
Do. paid to Daudapa on the 8th decreasing moon of Do.		60
Do. Do. to Do. on the 8th Do. of Maughum in part payment of a Tanakha of 50 Rupees		18½
Do. Do. for Do. on the 8th of the decreasing moon of Phalgoonum on account of Do.		31½
Do. paid on the 4th increasing moon of Maghum year Khara		50
Do. Do. on the 10th Do. of Shravanum year Numdana on account of a Tanakha		50
Do. Do. to Rajookhoordoo Ramarow on the 15th increasing Moon of Bhadrapadam on account of Do.		24
Do. paid on the 12th increasing moon of Ouseveejum		50

Amount paid on the 7th of the increasing moon of Margaseram in part of a Sanakha of 500 Rupees — 200

Do. Do. to Ramiah on the 5th of the decreasing moon (of Do.) in part of a Sanakha of 500 Rupees — 150

Do. paid on the 5th decreasing moon of Poosheum in part of Do. Do. — 100

Do. Do. on the 14th of the decreasing Moon of Maghum in part of Do. Do. — 50

Do. Do. on the 2d of the increasing Moon of Vyse-khum year Vejia on account of a Sanakha — 50

Do. Do. on the 9th decreasing Moon of Jaystum on account of Do. — 125

Do. Do. on the 1st increasing Moon of Aushadhum — 23

Do. Do. to Rajookhoordoo Rungarow on the 9th decreasing Moon of Aushadhum — 52

Do. Do. to Rungarow on the 1st of the increasing Moon of Srawanum — 20

Do. Do. to Do. on the 1st of the decreasing Moon of Do. — 130

Do. Do. paid to Nabee Sahib on account of grain on the 15th of the increasing Moon of adhika Bhadrapadam as per Sanakha — 200

Do. Do. on the 5th of Do. of Nejabhadrapadam — 200

Do. Do. on the 6th of Do. of Kartee Kum — 50

	Rs.	Rs.
Amount paid for the expences of Poondla Venkatnarsoo when he came from Madras on the 5th of the decreasing moon of Poosheyem	1¼	
Do. Do. on the 30th of the decreasing moon in part of a Sanakha of 100 Rupees	70	
Do. Do. on 8th increasing Moon of Phalgoonum on account of a Sanakha Vizt. Amount for which a letter was given to Madras	90	
Do. paid to Rungarow	60	
		150
Do. Do. to Rungarow on the 6th increasing Moon of Poosheum on account of a Sanakha of 100 Rupees		30
Do. received on the 12th increasing moon of Jaystum year Jayah on account of the bonds of Mooladharapa		4¾
Do. paid to Mooladharapah on the 12th of the increasing moon of Jaystum as Pr. Sanakhas	54 5/4	
Do. Do. on account of cloths formerly furnished	4¾	
Total		550
Do. of a Hoondee given to Bandeer on the 7th of the increasing Moon of Aushadhum		20
Do. paid on the 7th increasing Moon of Srawanum		100
Do. paid on the 10th of the decreasing Moon on account of a Sana Kha		80

Amount paid to Ramarow on the 6th of Do. of Bhadrapadam in part of a Tanakha of fifty Rupees — 40

Do. Do. to Canegherry Mooladharapah on the 12th of the increasing moon of ausvejam as per letter written by Dandaparadoo to Narsareddy — 70

Do. Do. on account of a former Tanakha of fifty Rupees — 10

Total 80

Do. Do. on the 3d of the decreasing moon of Caurtee Rum — 200

Do. Do. 11th of the increasing moon of Phalgoonum in part of a Tanakha of 150 Rupees — 100

Do. Do. on the 8th of the increasing moon of Chaitrum year Nunmadah — 50

Do. Do. on the 2d of the decreasing moon of Bhadrapadam when Came to Gungaurum — 10

Do. Do. on the 1st of the increasing moon of ausvaejum — 15

Do. Do. on the 7th of the decreasing Do. — 35

Do. Do. to Ramanoojum on the 1st increasing moon of Caurtee Rum — 21½

Do. Do. on the 8th of the increasing moon of ausvejum — 78½

11th Dec. 1835. Do. Do. on account of Ramanoojarow on the 6th of the decreasing moon of Margaseeram — 500

Do. Do. to Ramarow — 30

Total 531

Amount paid to Ramiah on the 2d of the decreasing moon of Pooshyem — 35

Do. Do. to Do. on the 4th of Do. subsequent to the execution of a bond — 101

On account of Chengooraudze — 40

Total 141

Do. Do. on the 3d of the increasing moon of Maghum — 100

Do. Do. to Ramiah on the 15th of Do. — 150

Do. Do. on the 4th of the increasing moon of Jayetum year Doormookhy — 40½

Do. Do. on the 8th of the decreasing moon of Margaseeram year Nunmadah — 15

Do. Do. paid at Vellore on the 10th of the increasing moon of Chaitrum year Doormookhy — 16½

Do. which was caused to be paid to Soondaraghery Ramanoojumpuntoolos on the 10th of the increasing moon of adhika aushadhum — 94 6

21st Dec. 1836. Paid for half a piece of Cloth called Padoogoo-madatarakod measuring 2½ Cubits in breadth given to Mooladarapa at Vellore on the 13th of the decreasing moon of adhika aushadhum.-

Paid for half a piece of Do. Do. Do. Do. delivered to Poondla Vobanah on the 2d of the increasing moon of Nija aushadhum.-

Paid for the Batta of Poondla Vobannah on the 5th of the increasing moon of Shravanum ——— 1

Quantity of Peeshanum Paddy furnished to Rojoo: Khoorsoo Ramrow on account of assignment written to aumaloor on the 11th of the decreasing moon of Margaseram ——— Candy 1

Amount paid on the 9th of the increasing moon of Phalgoonum to Hirers as Pa. letter ——— 25

Do Do to Rojoo Khoordoo Rungarow formerly, that is on the 5th of the increasing Moon of Maghum as Pa. Panakha ——— 50

Do Do to Rungarow on the 14th of Do on account of Batta of Poondla Obunnah as per order of Daudeenaidoo ——— 2

Do Do to Do on the 6th of the decreasing Moon as Pa. Panakha ——— 10

Do Do to a Peon on the 12th Do as per Do ——— 10

Do Do to Raunarow on the 12th Do of Phalgoonum as Pa. Do ——— 50

Do to Poondla Obunnah ——— 10

——— 60

Quantity of Peeshanum paddy delivered to Lubeeb as per Panakha on the 8th of the increasing Moon of Phalgoonum ——— Candies 5

A true translation/

/Signed/ F. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector.

Case 2 No. 2.-

Account of Soondraghetty Ramanoojum Puntooloo of Nellore from the year Vijaya or 1826/27.-

Amount paid on account of iron nails on the 6th of the decreasing moon of Maghum ——— Rupees 9 12½/16

Do Do on account of grain contract on the 11th of the decreasing moon of Vysakhum of the year Survajeetoo ——— 200

Received in discharge of the Contract 12½ Candies of coarse paddy furnished at Chintachaleka on the 15th increasing Moon of Aushadhum, which at the rate of 4 Pagodas a Candy is Pagodas ——— 50

Do on account of Ceylon Palmeeras on the 6th of the decreasing moon of Chaitrum of the year Vijaya ——— Rupees 210.-

Amount paid being the value/as Pa. account/ of Ceylon Palmeeras & iron nails Vera sent for from Madras & suspplied, on the 14th of the increasing moon of Vaisakhum ——— Rupees 223.

Do Do being the price of 80 Palmira reapers sent for from Madras and furnished on the 4th of the decreasing Moon of Vysakhum year Survajeetoo ——— Rupees 84

Charges of exportation and Rahadarry ——— 3¾

Freight of a Vessel ——— 20

Total ——— 107¾

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

Amount received from Chamoodoogoonta Veneata-
ramareddy on the 15th of the increasing
moon of Margaseram _____ 130 2/2

Do. paid in a Hoondee given to Madras on a
former date or on the 12th of the decreasing
moon of Anaveejum year Survadary _____ 30

Do. received on the 8th of the decreasing moon
of Jayastem year Khara _____ 200

Do. of loss sustained by exchange of the said
Sum _____ 1/4

Do. paid in a Hoondee given to Madras on the
6th of the decreasing Moon of Aushadhum 100

Do. of price of Ceylon Palmera rafters, nails
&c. _____ 850 450

Do. received from Vausa Vencatramareddy on a
former date or on the 11th of the decreasing
moon of Saystum _____ 300

Total amount advanced 1,020 4/16

Payments. Pagodas 255 40/256

In grain _____ Pagodas 50

In Rupees 840 1/2 or _____ 210 2/16

Total 260 2/16

Balance due to them 4 12/128

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Amount paid on the 5th of the increasing
Moon of Sravanum _____ Rupees 40

Do. Do. on account of Rafters on the 5th
of the decreasing Moon of Vysakhum
year Rundanah _____ 40 1/4

Do. Do. as a loan on the 10th of Do. of Sra-
-vanum year Vejia _____ 100

Received on the 3d increasing Moon of Aneveejum 33

Do. on the 3d Do. of Phalgoonum _____ 50

Amount paid on account of Vasa Veneata-
-ramareddy on the 6th decreasing Moon
of Aushadhum _____ 360
Year Jaya

Amount paid on the 11th increasing Moon of
Caurteekum _____ 80

Total of our account 670 1/4

Total of their account 103

Balance due to us 517 1/4

Amount received from Poondla Obooloreddy on
the 5th increasing Moon of Saystum of the year
Rummadka _____ 80

4th July 1840. Do. received on account of a bond on the 6th
of the decreasing Moon of adheka aushad-
-hum year Dieramookhy _____ 420

On account of interest 120

Total 546

(True translate)
(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Print. Coll.r
Translation

Fort St. George 24th December 184

Cadjan No. 3.

Translation of the items in the Cadjans Nos 25 & 26 selected from the private Cadjan Account produced by Aumaloo Lutchemenarasareddy.

Receipts up to the 5th decreasing Moon of Pooshyam of the year Munmadaka ——— 13090 3/16

Disbursements

11th Decr 1835 — 6th decreasing Moon of Margaseram

Amount paid to Nalaloor Raghavacharlu. 1/4

Do Do to Nungaroo Nagasem — 20

Do Do on account of Batta for the Warrant notice in Vanumbanka Gunnereddy's Case — 1 1/8

Do Do on account of Jonna Seed being the produce derived from Jaghoor Runga pakky fields ——— 1

Do Do to Cheendy Ankapanaidoo on account of Ramanjarow 500

Thro' Ramrow ——— 30 ——— 530.

Do Do to Chalamalasetty Ramasawmy on account of a Hoondee given in favor of Aumenchenla Nursanah 15.

Do Do to Westeheer Venkataramareddy 4

Do Do to Muddee Kristnadoroo account of Maureemreddy Ramreddy for the expences of a Mat at Padoogopaudoo 20

Do Do to Kynambedee at Nellore ——— 10

(True Extract)

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse

Print. Collector

Cadjan

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Cadjan No. 66. Encre 1 in No. 3.

4th decreasing Moon of adheka aushadhum of the year Doormookhy.

	Rupees
Remaining on hand ———	25 11/64
Receipts	
Sale proceeds of he buffaloes ———	65
Amount received from Mauraboyana Pariah thro' Aumala Dausoo ———	48
Do Do from Goondlapully Seshiah thro' Coora-paty Soobeah on account of the joint concern of Abkarry rent between us and Poolla Codundaramereddy ———	30
6th decreasing Moon	
4th July 1836 — Do Do from aumaloor Narrainreddy thro' Alum Adevegaudoo for 6 Spades ———	4
Do Do from Indoopoor Ramareddy thro' Adeve-gaudoo for Do Do ———	4
Do Do on account of 31/32 Nisp of Indigo manufactured in the Vat at Padoogopaudoo ———	2 7/8
Do Do from Nalaloor Ragavacharloo ———	3
Do Do from Saluum Appiah ———	10
Do Do from Nullacaluah Mauniem ———	2
	12
Do Do from Pola Ramanoojum on account of Soondaragherry Ramanjum ———	400
Do Do from Soondaragherry Ramanoojum for about 120 On account of interest ——— 126	546
Do Do from Yarabolee Pareselly on account of a painter ———	3

(True Extract)

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse

Print. Collector.

Cadjan

Enclosure 2 in No. 3.

Cadjan No. 68.

26th June 1836 10th Increasing Moon of adeka aushadhum of the year Doormookhy

	Rupees
Amount paid to Surranze Nannainapah	5
Do Do on account of batta to serve a warrant Notice	1
Do Do to School Master named Arroviah	2
Do Do to Ingeova Chedumbariah for a shade	1
Do Do to Dasary Poliah for Do	7
	8
Do Do to Munchieinilla Swaramiah for Do	1
Do Do to Cotra Sambamoorty for Do	1
Do Do to Kylasum Veerasawmy for 2 Shades	2
Do Do to Audear Rungapah on account of thinnaddy for Cotton	1-
Do Do on account of batta at Gungavaram	1/4
Do Do to Somayajeolo	1
Do Do for Jaggery	1/2
Do Do on account of the buffaloes purchased at alloor	10 3/4
Do Do to Seeniga Chendriah	10
Amount advanced for Offiah's Mauneium at Nullacalavah Pandrage	2
Do Do on account of Naidupalem Moolapata Neeniviah's Suit appertaining to Joint concern of Abkary rent between us & Poolla Cotundaramareddy	1
Do paid for the batta of Soonga Nanosmuntoo on account of Cotton trade this Audear Rungapah	1/4
Do Do to Anoomalasetty Malacondapah at Chittapully	12
	12 1/4
Do Do to Poolyundla Ramasawmy of Valapodoo at Nellore	2
Do Do to Poondla Nanainreddy this Carnum Vencata	4
Do Do on account of batta for a Summons of Vengareddypollem Chundy Cummenayance Comara Bungaroo Cotta Paraidoo on account of Soondraghery Ramanajum	1/2
	9 1/2

True Extract

(Signed) J. C. Monhouse

Principal Collr

Case 2. No. 4.

Translate of a letter from Poondla Venciah nursoo to Aumoolooor Panareddy dated Monday 13th decreasing Moon in the Month of adeka aushadhum (year not stated) must be Doormookhee

By the letter, which I have lately written and from Cunneghenny Nursummaraidoo you would have understood the news In the matter spoken of to our particular friends at Nellore about our affairs you have written that they told Wobuna and Mooladerapa at present a sum not exceeding 1½ on account of bonds and in Money should be paid, and the remaining 2 should be paid hereafter when the business is effected. you and Wobunamay speak together and consider about our affairs being made to turn out favorably and have a guarantee for it, act as appear to you proper as to whether it should be done now or by and by and take care that the matter turns out favorably; Do not act so that the Money be paid & the business not done favorably - Take care that you have a good guarantee for the business & do as ought to be done towards him - The Rajasdry Mooladharapa is going to Madras - you will

Fort St. George 24th December 184

will assist him with money he requires for his expen-
ses and manage that the business there and here is
done properly- From beginning I intended that
all my affairs should be done through you. The
money now with the Circar should be expended
through you for this business both at Madras
and here / Nellore / but I will not spend it
for any other thing- you will therefore bear
it well in mind do as appears to you proper
at the time to be done both there and here, and
manage so that my business may be settled
favorably- These circumstances are written
as ordered by Caumenany Bungaroo
Ankapanaidoo- Bear these particulars
in mind and write me whatever it may be
of importance to be written.-

(True Translate)

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse

Case 2 No 5- Print Coll.

Translate of a letter from Pondla Venkat-
nursoo Aumeeloor Parareddy dated 7th
Increasing Moon Bhadrapadam year
Dasarneakhee - 17th September 1836.

My Master Caumenany
Bungaroo Lemara Ankapanaidoo has
directed me to write as follows.-

When we came to Nellore

we

+ alluding it appears to the surplus Choultry funds in deposite in the Treasury.-

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

we spoke through you to Ramanjarow and
other servants about my affairs. They said that
they would have the report written and sent
off, and get the business done properly- subse-
quently much time have elapsed- Besides I
& Veera Venkatapanaidoo have settled our dif-
ference and you know that he has addressed
an Arzee that the Talook may be put in my
possession. At that time the Collector said
that he would write his report and send it
together with the Ranzeenamah and Arzees.
In the mean time he went for the settlement
of the Sydapoor Talook after his return to Nel-
lore it is not known what endeavours have
been made about my affairs. You and Nursareddy
were my Chief protectors from the beginning, therefore
you will write letters to Nursareddy principally
to manage matters in Madras, and the burthen of
speaking strongly to the servants here & of getting
the business done favorably is with you- You will conse-
quently request strongly with Ramanjarow ascer-
tain what has been done in the matter, and when
the report will be written, and write the same to
me- Bear these particulars in mind, and write me
whatever may be importance to be written. You will
speak strongly to Ramanjarow, and see that the re-
port is written soon; you will make the utmost
endeavours about this, and manage that if the
report / should be written quickly.-

No Signature

/ True Translate /

/ Signed / J. V. Stonhouse

Print. Coll.

Translation

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Case 2 No. 6

Translation of a Memorandum of certain items of accounts made on the back of a Native letter marked C and produced by Aumaloor Lutchmenarsareddy—

Amount of Total	5741	5
Former account of Madras	993	8
Subsequent Dr ——— Dr	920	4
Amount of Ramiah's bond	374	—
Amount for which an account was received subsequently in account of a bond for one hundred and fifty	18	8
To Chendsoranze	40	—
To Rowjaroo	500	—
Paid again to Ramiah	30	—
Amount subsequently written about from Madras	100	—
	8732	9
Amount paid in ready cash on account of 2 bonds	6974	—
Remainder due to us	1758	9
Deduct Interest	1141	— —
Amount of a mistake is Rupees 200 one half of which remitted is	100	— —
	241	—
Balance	1504	9

(Sd) Translated
/Signed/ P. V. Stonhouse
Prin. Coll.

Encl. 2 R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

Case 2 No. 7.

Translate of a declaration of Aumaloor Luchmenarareddy, son of Aumaloor Parareddy, inhabitant of Gungavaram in the Nellore Talook, before the Principal Collector of Nellore dated 5th December 1839.

1-2. In the Cadjan account No 1 consisting of 14 Cadjans which you have already produced before me and which existed between your father Parareddy, and Canenany Coonara Authapa Naidoo of Chendy, there are two items, viz. 946 Rupees received on the 10th Andhekra Ashadhem of the year Manmadha and paid to Soondaraghery Ramanjarow Puntooloo, and previously five hundred Rupees received on the 6th decreasing Thom of Margaseram of the same year paid on account of Ramanjarow. State all the circumstances you know regarding them.

A. I did not see the said Rupees paid. I was not concerned at that time in managing our affairs, but I used to write occasionally the entries in that account as directed by my father. Authapanaidoo paid to Soondaraghery Ramanjarow the sum of 1446 Rupees. the total of

of the said two items on account of the Choundy Zemindary business.

2.D. Do you know through whom the Money was paid to Ramanjarow.?

A. I dont know.

3.D. How did dealings first Commence between your father and Choundy Ootchapanaidoo?

A. At first on the 10th decreasing moon of Margaseram of the year Pareedhawee Choundy Ootchapanaidoo deposited three thousand Rupees with my father and used subsequently to draw upon it when he required, the account of the payments on that account and the balance is that which I lately produced before you and which is now shewn to me. Previous to that there existed no dealings between him and us.

4.D. The Cadjan accounts Consisting of 2 Cadjans Numbered 2 which you have produced before me appears to be an account of the dealings which existed between your father and Seenduraghierry Ramanjarow.

How

How did dealings first Commence between them.

+ 1875.

A. In the year Vaya. Ramanjarow used occasionally to receive loans in ready Cash and to repay them partly by Cash payments and partly by grain. Thus Commenced the dealings between him and my father.

5.D. Were there dealings between your father and Ramanjarow up to your father's death. and when did your father die?

A. Yes there were dealings between them as long as my father was alive. my father died in the month of Margaseram of the year Doormoodhee.

6.D. In the account No 2 it is entered that the amount received from Channoodrogeenda Venkatarunreddy on the 15th Increasing moon of the month of Margaseram of the year Suvvajeethe was 130½ Rupees, that the amount received from Vasa Venkatrunreddy on the 11th decreasing moon of Jaishtum in the year Dhara was 300 Rupees and that the amount received from Pondla Vobulreddy on the 5th Increasing moon of Jaishtum, year Manmadha, was 80 Rupees.

m

on whose account were these Sums received and how?

A I do not Know why these persons paid that money, I was not then much engaged in looking after the affairs, my father told me that as there existed dealings between Pandia Vobulreddy and us, he desired him/my father/ to debit in his account as having been received by him/Vobulreddy/ eighty Rupees and to give Credit for that Sum in Ramanjarow's account and I accordingly wrote it so in the accounts.

J.D. In the said account &c. No 2 there is Credited a Sum of 420 Rupees on account of the Bond dated 6th decreasing moon of Adhe Ashadhum of the year Durmeekha and 126 Rupees for interest, making a total of 546 Rupees. what was this money about?

A Of the Sum of 546 Rupees paid by Chocondee Venkatapa Naidoo to Soondaraghery Ramanjarow on the 10th Increasing moon of Adhe Ashadhum of the year Durmeekha as entered in the said account No 1. We at the desire of Ramanjarow, which he expressed to my father placed

placed a Sum of 546 Rupees to the Credit of the Principal and Interest due as above stated on account of the Bond formerly executed by Ramanjarow to my father. as for the remaining 400 Rupees Soondaraghery Ramanjarow owed a balance to Seta Ramanayjums an inhabitant of Vellore and as this man was indebted to us on some other account, he assigned over to us the balance due by Soondaraghery Ramanjarow to him to the amount due by him to us, in consequence of which we received the remaining Sum of 400 Rupees as a Credit on that account.

J.D. Was the aforesaid Sum of 546 Rupees a discharge in full of the principal and interest due on account of the Bond Stated to have been executed by Ramanjarow to your father?

A Yes it was a full discharge.

J.D. How was the second item of 500 Rupees paid by Choondy Venkatapa Naidoo to Ramanjarow, received by him?

A Persons belonging to Venkatapa Naidoo took in ready Cash the said Sum of 500 Rupees, and paid it to him. I do not Know

who

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

who these persons were.

10 Q. By whom were the said two accounts Nos 1 and 2 written?

A. They were written partly by me and partly by our Goomastah Cowoor Venkatarow-maniah as he has no business with us at present he gave up our service and is now living in his house at Cowoor.

(Signed) A. Luchemenurseraddy.

Taken before me this 8th day of December 1839.

(Signed) T. W. Stonehouse.

Principal Collector.

17th February 1840.

The witness is put upon his oath.

11 Q. You are now upon your oath. Listen to the whole of your deposition which is now read to you. Do you state upon Oath that all the Circumstances mentioned in it are true?

A. I have heard. I will state upon Oath that all the circumstances mentioned in this are true.

(Signed) A. Luchemenurseraddy.

Sworn to before me this 17th day of February 1840.

(Signed) T. W. Stonehouse.

Principal Coll.r

Deposition

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 2. No 8.

Deposition on oath of Cowoor Venkataramaniah an inhabitant of Cowoor and aged 30 years. 28th January 1840. Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.

By Principal Collector

12. Were you formerly in the service of Annaloor Pararaddy?

A. I was.

13 Q. Look at the two Cadjan accounts now shewn to you Nos 1 and 2. Do you know those accounts and is any part of them written by you?

A. I have seen them, I know them and part of them was written by me.

14 Q. Look at the two entries in account No 1 viz. 500 Rupees paid to Ramanjarow on 8th decreasing moon Margaserand (year Munmadha) and 946 Rupees paid to him 10th Increasing moon adhekka Aushadum (year Doormoothee) are those items your handwriting? State what you know of these payments?

A. I have seen. They are my handwriting. The Choondy Zemindar Venkatapanaidoo wrote an order upon Annaloor Pararaddy to pay in the first instance 500 Rupees to Ramanjarow after which he paid it to Venkatapanaidoo's people.

Do

Fort St. George 24th December 1810.

4 D. Do you know whether the money was paid or not?

A. The money was given to his (Ankapanaidoo's) people and he Parareddy accompanied them to Sellore.

5 D. Was the money paid to Ramanjarow or not, at Sellore?

A. He (Parareddy) came to Sellore together with the money carried by those people and returned to the village in two or three days afterwards, and had the account written by me.

6 D. What do you know about the items of 946 Rupees?

A. Parareddy settled the account between Ramanjarow and himself, and debited 946 Rupees to Ankapanaidoo's accounts, viz. 546 on account of Ramanjarow and 400 Rupees through Tota Ramanjarow which were Carried to their Credit.

7 D. The Sum of 400 Rupees does not appear debited in Ankapanaidoo's account on account of Tota Ramanjarow but the whole Sum of 946 Rupees appears debited on account of

Fort St. George 24th December 1810.

of Ramanjarow. How is this?

A. Five hundred and forty five Rupees and four hundred Rupees were Credited Separately to Ramanjarow and Tota Ramanjarow in their respective accounts, and the total debited in one Sum in Ankapanaidoo's account on account of Ramanjarow.

8 D. What Connexion was there between Ramanjarow and the 400 Rupees Credited to Tota Ramanjarow?

A. Tota Ramanjarow owed a balance of 400 Rupees to Parareddy. I know nothing more about it.

9 D. Do you know on what account these two Sums of 300 Rupees and 946 Rupees were paid to Ramanjarow?

A. As there were disputes among the Choondywar about their Zemindary, Ankapanaidoo Came to Parareddy and spoke to him to have his Zemindary business settled in his favor. That he would write orders for money, and that he should pay the money to the persons in whose favor the Sunnahs were written without demur. He said this and went away. If he wrote any

any order if he had money by him he used to pay immediately, and if he had not money with him he used to discharge the instalments by one or two payments.

By Ramanjaram

10 Q. Were you present when Anthapanaidoo spoke thus with Pararedy?

A. I was present.

11 Q. In what year, what month, on what date, at what time and in whose house, Did Anthapanaidoo speak with Parareddy?

A. He came and spoke with him in the year Vijaya at Gangamaram in Annaloor Pararedy's house, the month and date I dont recollect. The time of the day about one jamu, or 9 o'clock in the morning.

12 Q. Did you yourself hear the above said Conversation between Parareddy and Anthapanaidoo, or did Parareddy or any else tell you of it?

A. While they were Conversing together I heard as I was sitting near them at about a distance off writing accounts.

13 Q. Were any other persons present besides yourself?

Sd.

A. Some weavers had come there on account of some piece Goods.

14 Q. Did they hear the Conversation, or were they near enough to hear the Conversation?

A. They were at a little distance off and dont know whether they heard or not.

15 Q. Who directed you to write in the account the above said entries of 300 Rupees and 946 Rupees?

A. Parareddy directed me to write the entry of 946 Rupees. He made me write both entries.

16 Q. You have deposed that Anthapanaidoo first wrote an order for five hundred Rupees who told you so, and how do you know it?

A. The amount I dont recollect, Anthapanaidoo wrote an order for money, and the money was accordingly paid. I saw the order.

17 Q. What was stated in the Purshaw?

A. I have no recollection of the Contents of the whole letter. It was stated in the letter that he had written an order for

Sd.

so many Rupees and that he should pay the
Sum to Ramanjarow.

18 D. You have stated above that
Rupees of the order were delivered to Anlapa-
naidoo's people, do you know who they were?

A. I dont know their names

19 D. In whose service are you now?

A. I am without Service

20 D. Are you not writing any one's
private accounts?

A. I do not write any ones accounts
Some misfortune having befallen me, I remained

21 D. How do you maintain yourself
in Comfort?

A. I used heretofore to live in my fa-
afterwards having obtained Service
with Annaclaw Parareddy, I came and remained at his

22 D. Have you not some Curnam Ker-
meerassy in Comfort?

A. I have a Share.

23 D. Did you write all the entries
the Cadjan in account No 1 in which there
are the two Entries of 600 and 900 Rupees, or did

did any one else write them?

A All entries on the side on which
there are these two entries were written by me,
Some of those on the other Side were written
by me, and some by Annaclaw Parareddy's dap Luchmenarsoo

24 D. Did you see to what and
to whom Anlapanaidoo gave orders for money and
can you state the Circumstances mentioned in them?

A I have no recollection of the
number of orders Anlapanaidoo gave, and the Amount.

N.B. The previous question repeated and
disallowed as it does not refer to
the two orders for money to be paid
to Ramanjarow and even if allowa-
able the witness's reply sufficiently
meets it.

By Principal Collector.

25 D. Were you in the habit of seeing
the Tamil Chits or orders given by people on Parareddy?

A If any persons brought Chits
when I and Parareddy were together, I used to
read them and inform Parareddy, when I was
not present Parareddy used to read them and
afterwards deliver them into my Care.

When

By Ramanjarow.

26. D. When did Parareddy die?

A. About 3 years ago

27 Q. In what year did he die?

A. I do not recollect, but think it was Doormookhee.

28 Q. After Parareddy's death, did you write the private accounts of the family?

A. I continued in their service for two years after Parareddy's death, subsequently as there was not much to do and as a family misfortune befell me I remained at home.

29 Q. Do you know how long before his death Parareddy was sick or in what state he was?

A. I think he was sick for about two months.

(Signed) Cowcer Vencatarama

Taken on oath before me this 28th day of January 1840.

(Signed) F. W. Stonhouse

Principal Collector

Leasers Esq.

Second Declaration of Ammalcor Suchemenuswa

Son of Ammalcor Parareddy about the difference in the dates

dates entered in the accounts and that of the Tunkhas before the Principal Collector of Nellore.

In Anklapanaidoo's account a Sum of 946 Rupees was debited on account of Soondaragherry Ramanjarow on the 10th increasing moon of adhekka anushadhum of the year Doormookhee of which 546 Rupees were Credited on account of the bond and interest due by Ramanjarow to Ammalcor Parareddy on the 6th decreasing moon of adhekka anushadhum of that year, and a Sum of 400 Rupees Credited on account of the balance due by Ramanjarow to Tota Ramanjarow. The dates inserted in the tunkha letters written by Anklapanaidoo to Parareddy are monday the 13th decreasing moon of adhekka anushadhum and the 7th increasing moon of Bhadrapadam. The cause of the adjustment in the accounts being as above stated, prior to the dates of the Tunkhas, is as follows.

Choondy Anklapa Naidoo spoke to Soondragerry Ramanjarow through Ammalcor Parareddy about the Choondy Zemindary business and agreed

to

to pay 4,000 Rupees for that purpose - a Sum of
500 Rupees was paid to Ramanjarow on the 8
Decreasing moon of Margaseeram of the year Ma
-nadha, leaving the balance of the amount agre
-ed upon 3500 Rupees. Cheendy anKrapanaidoo has
received 2900 Rupees from Pararedy including
the Said Sum of 500 Rupees, Pararedy obtain
a bond from Venkatapa Naidoo for the Said
Sum in the year Doormookhee as far as
I recollect in the Month Poosheyum -
Sold that bond to Cantumreddy Venkat
an Inhabitant of Nellore about 2 Months
ago and obtained a written agreement
him in which it is Stated that he Shou
Collect the Sum due on account of the bond
-charge the balance payable by me to Elaw
-Balawar and pay me the remainder.

In regard to the balance
3500 Rupees due on account of the Sum
-pon. Ramanjarow told Pararedy that if he
for the present get a Sum equal to the
principal and interest of the bond exe
by him to Pararedy So that the interest
not run on to a large amount as also
further Sum of 400 Rupees on account of

balance due by him to Tota Vencataramanayan
the remainder could be paid after the busi-
-ness has been settled. Pararedy confiding
in Unkapa Naidoo's word accordingly debited Unkapa
Naidoo's account and credited that of Ramanjarow
He / Pararedy / afterwards wrote a letter to
Unkapa Naidoo and got from him a letter
in the shape of a Voucher; The terms used
in that letter Viz mean one thousand five
hundred Rupees of which 946 Rupees only were
placed to the credit of Ramanjarow. This is
the cause of their being some discrepancy in the
dates Sent there is no real discrepancy. —

1st February 1840. Signed / A Lachemenarsareddy.

Given before me this 1st February 1840

Signed / J. V. Stonhouse

Asst. Collector

12th February 1840.

2 You are now upon your oath.
Listen to this your Ky Sept which is now read
to you, Do you declare upon Oath that the Cir-
-cumstances therein mentioned are true?

A I have heard, I will declare upon
Oath

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Oath that all the circumstances therein mentioned are true.—

Signed A Lutchemenursareddy

Sworn to before me this 12th day of February 1841.

Signed J.V. Storehouse

Principal Collector

Case 2. No 10.

3d Declaration on Oath of Amalcor Satchmenar-sareddy Inhabitant of Gangawam and aged about 20 years before the Principal Collector of Nellore dated 12th February 1841.—

1 Q What account is that which you have produced containing 108 Cadjans?

A It is my Jama Kurch Powzy for two years. It is the account of receipts and disbursements extracted from the rough chitta Accounts.—

2 Q What is the nature of the rough Chitta?

A Every item is entered as it occurs in which receipts and disbursements are entered one after another as they occur.—

3 Have you got that Chitta from which the above said Cadjan account of 108 Cadjans was extracted?

After

Fort St George 24th December 1840.—

4 A After writing the Jamma kurch accounts sometimes the rough chitta is kept and some times torn up. I must see whether the rough Chitta from which the aforesaid Jama kurch account was written is forthcoming or not.—

5 Q Who is Poondla Venkatanursoo the writer of the letter to your father Parareddy marked No 9?

A He is choondy Venkapa Naidoo's Vakeel. But, whether he is now at Madras or in his Village I do not know.—

6 Q What Vakalut business does the aforesaid Poondla Venkatanursoo do for Choondy Ankapa Naidoo?

A He is employed in all Choondy Ankapanaidoo's affairs whether at Nellore Madras or elsewhere.—

7 Q Do you know how long he has been in Ankapanaidoo's service?

A I dont Know.—

8 Q Have you any other letters in your possession written by Poondla Venkatnursoo to your father Amalcor Parareddy?

S

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

A I have others but they are not upon this subject.

8 Q Was there any Settlement of Anka panaidoo's Account when he executed the Bond for 2000 Rupees?

A The accounts up to that time were settled.

9 Q Up to what day, Month, and year were the accounts settled?

A I dont recollect.

10 Q Do you Know in what Month or year or date the Bond of Soondaraghery Ramanajarow which was discharged by a Crediting to him the 540 Rupees was executed?

A I dont Know.

11 Q Are there any others who know these circumstances besides yourself?

A There are none.

12 Q Was there ever a Settlement of accounts between you and Ramanajarow?

A It was settled in my father's life time.

Dr

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

13 Q Do you Know for what reason this Bond was given by Ramanajarow to your father Parareddy?

A I dont Know.

14 Q Did you ever see that Bond?

A I never saw it.

15 Q Do you Know what was the rate of Interest on the Bond?

A I dont recollect.

(signed) Luchemenursareddy.

Taken on Oath before me this 19th day of February 1840.

(signed) J. D. Stonhouse

Principal Collector.

16 Q You have stated that as far as you recollect the year in which Unkapanaidoo executed the Bond to your father Parareddy for 2000 Rupees was in the year Dooramookhee. It appears from Unkapanaidoo's account No 1 that the payments up to the close of the year Jaya Amounted to nearly 6000 Rupees and deducting the Sum of 3000 Rupees originally deposited by Unka=panaidoo the balance due even up to the end

1 end of Joya would amount to nearly 3000 Rupees being nearly one thousand Rupees more than the amount stated to be due - and for which a bond was executed at a period Subsequent to the year Joya - The said account does not contain any entries of receipts between Joya and Doormoukhee - How do you explain this?

A The aforesaid balance was not struck only as per Account Rec Besides the sum of 3000 Rupees deposited by Untapanaido with my father he also deposited 2 or 3000 Rupees with my Uncle Nursareddy at Madras and Anthapanaidoo used to receive money there also. when my father looked over the accounts here, he got also the account from Madras and after seeing both Accounts a balance of 2000 Rupees was struck at that time for which Amount he obtained a Bond from Anthapanaidoo.

7 Q How long has your Uncle Nursareddy been at Madras?

For

A For about 20 years.

(signed) Luchemenursareddy.

Taken before me this 12th day of February 1840.

(signed) F. B. Stonehouse

Principal Collector

Case 2 Rec 11.

Deposition of Cautumreddy Vencatareddy aged 45 years Moonsiff of Ullur on oath before the Principal Collector of Nellore dated 12th February 1840.

12 Q Have you in your possession any Bond executed by Caumenany Bungaroo Cormara Anthapanaidoo?

A A Bond for 2000 Rupees executed by Chondy Anthapanaidoo to the deceased Annalour Parareddy was made over to me by his Son Luchemenursareddy.

2 Q Do you recollect the date of the Bond?

A I dont recollect.

3 Q Cannot you recollect the Month or year in which the Bond bears date?

A The year either Manmadha or Doormoukhee.

How

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Q2 How long ago was this Bond made over to you?

A. About 2 Months ago.

Q2 Why was it made over to you?

A. There is a bond to the amount of 1600 Rupees executed by the deceased Aumaloor Parasuddy to Catamoorkala Paramddy - Luchmanumsa's reddy having no other means of discharging the Bond, made over this bond of 2000 Rupees in discharge of that bond and obtained a Carareamah from me binding me to pay him any sum which might remain after discharging the amount of the Bond and the interest thereon and also the sum of 60 Rupees by Aumaloor Luchemeanursareddy to Cantumreddy Ramachundreareddy, as well as other charges and so gave the Bond to me.

Q2 The Bond for 1600 Rupees was a debt due by Aumaloor Lutchmanursareddy to Catamoorkalah Paramddy. How could this debt be discharged by making over to to you Anthopamaidoo's Bond for 2000 Rupees?

A. I was to recover the amount

Fort St George 24th December 1840

amount of the Bond and discharge Catamoorkala Parareddy's debt.

(Signed) Uncatareddy

Taken on Oath before me this 12th day of February 1840.

(Signed) J. O. Stonhouse
Pt. Collector

N.B. Uncatareddy has produced the original Bond for 2000 Rupees which bears date 3rd Increasing moon Pooshyum year Runmadha corresponding with 22nd December 1835 and purports to have been the balance struck upon the dealings between them up to that time.

(A true translation)

(Signed) J. O. Stonhouse
Pt. Collector

Case 2 Rupees 12

Fourth Declaration of Aumaloor Luchmenursareddy on Oath before the Principal Collector of Nellore dated 20th February 1840.

By Ramanjeew

Q2. In what year were you born?

N.B. The Witness having stated his age to be 20, this question does not appear necessary. Did

Fort St George 24th December 1840

2 Q Did you get any Vakalatnamah registered in this Court to present a motion any where that you were a minor and in what year did you do so?

A I cannot recollect.

3 Q Is it the registering the Vakalatnamah which you don't recollect or the year?

A I recollect neither

4 Q Do you know how many times Choondy Anthapanaidoo came to your Father since the year Vaya?

A I know of his having come once but further I dont know.

5 Q When was that?

A In the year Rummadha.

6 Q Do you know in what month he came?

A I dont recollect.

7 Q You have stated that your father and Anthapanaidoo once met, in what Village was it?

A In our Village.—

Did

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

8 Q Did your father go to any other Village where Anthapanaidoo resides or to any other place and meet since the year Vaya, besides the one occasion on which Anthapanaidoo came to your father?

A Anthapanaidoo remained at Nellore for some days on the occasion on which he came to our Village. At that time my father used now and then to come and speak with Anthapanaidoo.

9 Q Did not Anthapanaidoo and your father meet together on any other occasion excepting these?

A When they may have met before that time I dont know but not subsequently.

By Principal Collector

10 Q Might not your father and Anthapanaidoo have met without your knowledge?

A They have not met subsequently but before that when they spoke together I dont know.

By Ramanjeen

11 Q Used your father during his life time to tell you with whom he was carrying on dealings and what business

business he was doing you being then a Minor?

A All matters he did not tell me, but he used to tell me about those things which had to be entered in the Accounts.

12 Q Was there any Goostamak appointed to write your father's accounts during his life time?

A Cowroor Venkatacowniah was the Goomastah. He and I used both to write the accounts.

13 Q Used you to accompany your father when he went to the places or villages where he was carrying on dealings, or to remain at home, and write Accounts?

A I used not to go any where but to remain at home and write the accounts.

14 Q Did you hear the conversation which took place between your father and Ankapanaidoo, when they met in the year Manmadha and do you recollect what it was?

A I heard, and I recollect it.

By Principal Collector

15 Q State what was the Conversation?

A He said that our Zemindary business

business was not yet settled that he (my father) must speak to Soondaraghurry Ramanjarow Pantolu and get it settled, and that he Ankapanaidoo would pay him (Ramanjarow) 5000 Rupees.

By Ramanjarow

16 Q You have stated that your Goomastah, and yourself were writing the Accounts used me to write the account when the other was absent or to do so when both were present?

A We used to write when both were present.

17 Q You have stated a conversation that which passed between Ankapanaidoo and your father when they met, do you recollect that that was the whole of the Conversation that passed from the time of seating himself till he got up and went away?

A Ankapanaidoo remained a whole day in our House. On one occasion this was the conversation which passed. What conversation passed at other times I dont know.

18 Q How does it happen that you went and heard this Conversation on this one occasion?

A I

Fort St George 24th December 1840

A I was writing the accounts near them, at which time these words passed.

19 Q You have stated that you and your father's Goomastah were writing the Account - are you / Deponent / so writing the accounts since the year Vayah?

A No - I was writing the accounts for a year or year and a half previous to the Munmadha.

20 Q In the deposition you have already given you have stated that there existed dealings between your father and myself since the year Vayah - do you know whether a separate bond was executed for those items which are entered since the year Vayah in the Cadjan account No 1 purporting to be on account of dealings or whether the Bond was executed for other items?

A I dont know. It appears from the account to be a Bond executed for the items inserted in the account.

By Principal Collector 21 Q A Memorandum marked No 4 of items made on the back of a native

Ettor

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

letter and which you have produced is shewn to you, whose handwriting are those items?

A The letter is not my fathers writing but all the other items are my fathers handwriting.

By Ramanjarow 22 Q Do you Know when they were written?

A They were written when Unkapanaidoo came in the year Munmadha and when a settlement of his account was made.

/Signed/ Sulchemenursareddy

Taken on Oath before me this 20th day of Febuary 1840.

/Signed/ J. C. Stonehouse
Asst. Collector

Case 2 No. 13.

Deposition of Tello Vencatramanjum Inhabitant of Nellore and aged 35 Years witness for the defence dated 20th Febuary 1840 before the Principal Collector of Nellore - on Oath.

By Ramanjarow 1 Q Do you Know Aumaloor Pennaddy?

A I know him.

2 Q Did I assign over to Aumaloor Pennaddy that

that a sum of 500 Rupees was to be paid to you or did I cause it to be paid?

A It was not assigned over, nor was it caused to be paid through his hands.

32 Did Aumalcon Caramdy ever give credit to you for the sum of 500 Rupees for me?

A No.

42 In the famine year of Kundana did I buy from you any rice to feed paupers?

A I gave you as a loan upwards of 1,000 Rupees.

52 Did I pay you or not, the price of the rice?

A It was paid me

62 Was the whole of the money received by you from me?

A I received it from you.

72 Was any receipt given by you for the payments?

A I recollect that I gave a receipt.

By Principal Collector 82 State the year month and date when that receipt was given?

A I do not recollect. I can tell if I

see the receipt.

92 You may recollect the year though not the month or date. Do you not recollect the year?

A The grain was given in Kundana and payments were occasionally made, I cannot recollect the year in which the receipt was given.

By Ramanjeen 102 How many years ago was the receipts given?

A I cannot positively say.

By Principal Collector 112 Was there any settlement of accounts when that receipt was given?

A It is true that I gave the receipt and that there is no balance. I don't recollect whether a settlement was made when the receipts was given or previously.

Was any payment made at the time of the receipts being given? 122

A I recollect that some balance which was due was paid off, that the account was looked into for all payments made on different dates up to that time and that a receipt was given for the whole. but I cannot represent positively

What do you mean by the whole?

By Ramanjeen 132 For

A For the whole amount of the payment.

14 Q Was the whole price of the rice payable to you up to that time made good to you up to the date of the receipt?

A It had been fully paid.

15 Q Were there any other dealings between you and me excepting about the matter of the purchase of this rice?

A None.

16 Q Did there exist any dealings between you and Amalor Parareddy?

A There did.

17 Q Is there an account of those dealings?

A There is.

18 Q Where is that account?

A At my house.

19 Q Are the items of payments made by you to Amalor Parareddy or those made by Aumalor Parareddy to you distinctly inserted in that account?

A All the payments and the money received are entered in the account.

Do

20 Q Do you know properly all the circumstances of Aumalor Parareddy's dealings and his private circumstances?

A I know them.

By Principal Collector

21 Q How do you know them?

A The circumstances which are within my knowledge I know.

By Ramanajarow

22 Q What was the nature of the connexion you had with Parareddy?

A Parareddy was the nominal contractor for the supply of rice to the convicts in the Jail but the profit and loss was mine.

By Principal Collector

23 Q How do you get your livelihood?

A I make contracts for grain and maintain myself.

24 Q Have you ever been in service?

A Yes.

25 Q What service did you hold?

A I have been in service at the Jail as a Peon.

26 Q Are you still in that service?

A I am not. I was entered as a Peon on the Said Establishment but I did not do Peon's duty.

27 Q What pay did you get as a jail Peon?

A Five Rupees.

By Ramanjarow

28 Q Do you carry on grain trade to a large extent?

A

Fort St George 24th December 1840

A I have considerable trade in grain

29 Q Did Aumaloor Parareddy at any time during his life tell you about a balance due to him by any public Servants?

A He used to tell me there was balance and he also kept his Cadjan account with me and told me to Collect the Money.

30 Q At that time did he tell you that I owed him any?

A He told me so.

31 Q What did he tell you?

A He was waiting about for some days for money which he said was due to him for Palmira beams furnished for the Choultry afterwards he told me that Ramanjarow had fully discharged the sum due by him.

32 Q In what year was this?

A I dont recollect.

By Ramanjarow. 33 Q How long was it before Parareddy died that he told you the whole money had been discharged?

A One year previous to his death.

Signed/ Vencatamanjum

Taken on Oath before me this 21st day of February 1840.

Signed/ J. P. Stonehouse

Princ Collector

Compd SR.

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Case 2 - N° 14.

Second Deposition on Oath of Tota Vencat Ramanjum before the Principal Collector on the 21st February 1840.

By Ramanoojarow.

1 Q Did Choondy Ankapanaidoo at any time execute a Bond to Aumoolor Parareddy for 2000 Rupees?

A He did.

By Pl. Collector. 2 Q How do you know that circumstance?

A. My attestation is on the Bond.

By Ramanjarow. 3 Q Do you know the particulars of the sum of 2,000 Rupees for which the Bond was executed?

A I know.

4 Q Was there any item in it of 5,000 Rupees paid in my name?

A No.

5 Q Do you know Cowoor Vencatrowniah?

A I know him.

6 Q In whose service is he now?

A I dont know where he is.

7 Q You have deposed that you have got the account of dealings which existed between Aumoolor Parareddy and yourself - will you produce that

that account for inspection.²

A My brotherinlaw has gone away with the key, he will come either in the evening or the Morning. As soon as he comes I will bring it.

By Jr. Collector. 8 2 Where is he gone to.²

A He is gone to my mother-in-law house at Doppalapaud situated this side of Davaroy Pillay.

9 2 When did he go, and what is his name.²

A He went 15 days ago and his name is Narado/s Penchillo.

10 2 You say that your brother-in-law has gone away with the key, the key of what.²

A Of a painted (Morchee) box.

11 2 Are the said accounts of dealings in that box.²

A I cannot say whether they are in that box or kept separate.

12 2 Are they Cadjan or paper accounts.²

A They are a paper Book.

By Ramanjaw. 13 2 In what state was Aumoor Parareddy previous to his death.²

A He was a little unsteady in his mind three or few Months before his death.

14 2 Do you know whether any alteration took place in his accounts either at that time or subsequently.²

N. B. This question appears a very improper one but the Principal Collector allows it to be put.

A I dont know. They did one thing about me and the record is ready in the Magistrates Department.

By Jr. Collector. 15 2 Was that upon a Complaint made by you.²

A It was a complaint of Yedla Narsareddy.

16 2 Then what concern had you with it.²

A I borrowed five hundred Rupees from Yedla Narsareddy mortgaging my property to him. I paid the Money and the Bonds were with Narsareddy. Lutchme=nursareddy got those bonds from Narsa=reddy and asked him to transfer them to him saying that it was entered in their account

account that his father had paid the 500 Rupees and that Yeddla Nursareddy had got a Bond from me in his (Nursareddy's) favor. Nursareddy complained before the Head of Police stating how could he transfer the Bond when it had been discharged

17 2 When did this complaint take place?

A When Puttry Kistnarow was Tahasildar.

18 2 How long ago?

A I cannot state.

19 2 At that time was there friendship or enmity between you and Lutchmee nursareddy?

A There never was enmity. there was then and now friendship.

By Ramanjarow 20 2 You have deposed that you gave a receipt for the price of the rice which I took from you on account of paupers. I will shew you the receipt, look at it. is it the same.?

A This is the one I gave.

The

The Receipt is filed. and bears date 10th October 1835. It is on unstampt paper and no attesting witnesses.

Receipt executed by Totta Vencat Ramanjum to Soondaraghurry Ramanjam Puntorlu. The price of the rice supplied for paupers from 23d July to 10th October 1833 is 1193 Rupees.

Payments

5th January 1834	438—.—.
1st July 1835	440—.—.
Date altered but appears to be — 2nd October year not stated —	150—.—.
10th October year not stated	165—.—.
	1193—.—.

As you have paid me the above sum I have received it.

This is a receipt executed in my own hand writing.

Signed Vencat Ramanjum.

S. Ramanjarow states that he has no further Questions to ask.

By Pt. Collector 21 2. How long have you been acquainted with Aumoolur Parareddy?

Since

A Since the year Khara.

22 Q Since how long have there been dealings between you and Parareddy?

A Chiefly since the year 1833.

23 Q Since how long have you been carrying on trade in grain?

A Previous to the year Khara. 1831/32

Dodla Puttabeerameereddy in the name of Pootta Codundaramareddy made a contract for the supply of grain to the prisoners in the Jail and used to receive an advance of 2000 Rupees from the Court. The contract was managed through me. Since that time I am carrying on trade in grain.

24 Q Explain how you have carried on trade in grain and with whom?

A I have purchased grain from Codoor Balaka, Hubbareddy, Bauspareddy, Moolo-moody Narrain Reddy, Nellore Penchilreddy, Yedla Nursareddy, Varumbauk Venkataramreddy, Patchiappah Abbeereddy

Abbeereddy and several others, and have sold it for the Prisoners in the Jail for paupers and in the Bazar.

25 Q Have you any grain godowns in Nellore?

A I have not.

26 Q How did you maintain yourself before the year Khara when you commenced to have a concern in the contract for supplying the Prisoners in Jail?

A I was an under Abkarry Renter.

27 Q For how long? 1823/24

A From the year Swabhanoo to the year Sarvadharee (6 years). 1828/29

28 Q How did you maintain yourself during the two subsequent years Verodhee Vecrootee? 1829/30

A I used to remain at home to maintain myself from what I had previously acquired.

29 Q Were you ever in the private service of any one?

A When I was young I was in the private service of Cossoorla Streenevasarow. Since then I was attending personally upon Audeatcham

Audeecatcham Govindarow when he was Tahasildar and was entered on the Establishment as a Talook Peon.

30 2 What pay were you getting then?

A 3¾ or 4 Rupees I dont recollect which. He paid me from his own pocket ten Rupees. I did not put on a belt or take a cane and do peon's duty.

31 2 Did you never do Peon's duty?

A In Govindarow's time as I was entered as a Peon on the Establishment. I may have done Peon's duty.

32 2 Have you at any time within the last 10 or 15 years been employed at Teeruvacaudoo, or a person sent to collect money on daily batta?

A I may have been.

33 2 Was your father ever in public service?

A My father was always employed as a Peon in the Talooks.

34 2 Was there a final settlement of accounts between you and Aumoor Pararesy?

A They were finally settled.

In

N.B. Govindarow's son who is taking down the deposition being at the same time asked as to the circumstance of this payment of 10 Rupees, declares that he neither know of it or ever heard of it.

35 2 In what year?

A I recollect in 1836.

36 2 How were the accounts settled?

A The accounts between us were looked into and a total made after Parareddy's death I desired Lutchmeenursareddy to bring the accounts but he saying that Rungareddy was at Madras and that he must come, used to procrastinate. Lutchmeenursareddy has not up to this time brought the accounts.

37 2 You state that the accounts of dealings between you and Parareddy were looked over and a total made, what accounts were those - your accounts or his?

A The accounts of both were compared and a total made.

38 2 Then why was it necessary for you to ask Lutchmeenursareddy afterwards to bring the accounts?

A I heard that Lutchmeenursareddy was altering the accounts of other people and I was afraid and told him to bring the accounts which existed between us.

39 2 Who told you that he was altering

altering the accounts.

A I cannot particularize any person, and I state so because it was then said so by people. I had suspicion and told him to bring my account because Lutcheemenur Sareddy admitted that there was an entry in his account as if the sum of Rupees 500 appertaining to a bond of Rs 500 executed by me to others had been paid to me by his father.

40 2 How long before Pararedy's death, were the accounts between you look=ed over and a total made.?

A I cannot say.

41 2 When the account was look=ed over and the total made was the ba=lance in your favor or in his.?

A Pararedy was indebted to me.

42 2 In what amount.?

A Unless I see the account I cannot tell.

43 2 Was that account attested by Pararedy.?

A My account did not bear Pararedy's signature.

Dit

44 2 Did you at any other time see any of Pararedy's accounts.?

A I had seen my own account also the account of some others.

45 2 Who were those people whose accounts you saw.?

A The accounts of money lent in this Village, and also the accounts of sundry persons such as Poondla Nobulreddy Puchee=paula Abbeereddy &c.

46 2 You have stated in the answer to the 23d Question of this day's deposition, that the contract for the supply of rice to the Pri=soners was carried on through you, explain what you mean by being carried on through you.?

A I was called Goomastah or Agent, but for 7 Months I used to supply the grain and the profit and loss during that period was mine. For the remaining 5 Months the Contractor supplied grain to make good the advance he had received, and gave me an allowance of ½ Rupee a Candy.

47 2 Was Pararedy's contract managed in the same way.?

A It was not. We jointly advanced all the grain that was required and I used to give

Pararedy

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Parareddy a profit of 1½ Rupee per Candy of paddy

48 2 For how long was this contract with Parareddy?

A One year.

49 2 Which year was it?

A I recollect it was in the famine year of Nandana 1832/33.

50 2 Have you in each year since Khara 1831/32 had a concern in the contract for supplying grain to the prisoners in the Jail?

A As long as the system of contract was in force in the Court I had concern in it from Khara.

51 2 Was 1193 Rupees the amount supplied to S. Ramanjarow in the year Nandana given in grain or money?

A I gave rice.

52 2 When did you give up your service of Jail Peon?

A About 9 or 8 months ago.

53 2 Did you resign your situation or were you dismissed?

A I did not resign, but having taken leave I went away and before my return the Court employed some other person considering that the time of getting contract will pass by.

Put

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

54-2. Was the system of supplying the grain by contract going on up to the time of your being a Jail Peon?

A. They used to receive all the grain at once at the time of harvest and keep it in store.—

55 2 In what year or how long ago were you appointed a Jail Peon?

A. I was a Jail Peon for about ten or eleven months.—

N.B. Ramanjarow says he had no further question to put.—

(Signed) Venkataramanjum

Taken on Oath before me this 21st day of February 1840.—

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse.
Principal Collector.

Case 2 No. 15.

Deposition upon oath of Doggesetty Lobbeah Baman, aged about 46 years Inhabitant of Cherlo-pollem in the Talarunchee Taluk before the Principal Collector of Nellore dated 22nd February 1840.

By Ramanjarow.— 2nd Witness called by Ramanjarow.—

1- 2 When Aumoor Parareddy was alive did you know him?

A. I did.

2. 2. Had you much acquaintance?

A. There was acquaintance— Did

3-2. Did any conversation ever take place between you and him respecting me?
A. I recollect a conversation which once took place at the Court.—
4-2- Do you recollect what words passed-?
A. I recollect that the conversation related to balance-
5-2. What conversation took place about balance.—
A- A conversation once as to whether Ramanjarow owed any balance.—
6-2. Upon what conversation did these words pass. What did you ask at that time and what did Parareddy tell you, state that circumstance-?
A. As some Rupees were due to Wallareddy Baupareddy on account of grain supplied to the Jail.— I came for that money, as I had come Parareddy took me to the Court saying that he would take a Roonde in the Court, and get the money paid. He could not get a Roonde there, or the money afterwards as I told him that it would not do unless the money was paid, he told me that if the Court and Cutchery Servants receive their pay, he would have it paid-

upon

upon that conversation I asked him if such Ramanjeew puntoolu owed any balance, and he said that there was no balance.—
7-2. You have stated that Parareddy told you that he would have the money paid when the Court and Cutchery Servants received their pay. What had Parareddy to do with their pay.?
A. He told me that Pagadraugewar Pippallawar. Bheemaraugewar Boodum Saheb and several others whose names he stated but which I do not recollect, owed a balance, and they said they would pay as soon as they received their wages of the Month.—
8-2 How long after Parareddy had told you as above did his death take place?
A. I recollect about one and a half year.—
9-2. Do you know his son Ramoolow Luchemenarsareddy?
A I know him.
10-2. Are you in the habit of coming and going to him?
A I have much acquaintance with him but never went to Village.—

Fort St. George 24th December 1820.

11 2. Did any conversation ever take place between you, and him?

A. One day when I was coming to Nellore, He and Bheemareddy Venkiah were both coming. We all met at the ford on the other bank of the river. I then asked him what had become of Rungareddy's business at Madras. He said he was not released. I asked him if moorats money had been received for the cotton. He said that tomorrow or the day after one half of the money could be received, and that if received, he would pay our Baparedd's balance. While the conversation in this matter was taking place, He said to me as if consulting me, that he was told to insert in his accounts as if some body had paid something to Ramayarow Puntoloo, and that his mother and grand Mother did not like it. Upon his saying so, I told him that he was a young man why should he have any to do with such a business. We both came on in conversation, and Ramen to the street of Tantacharies house, and I came to the Bazar. —

Ramayarow

Fort St. George 24th December 1820 —

Ramayarow states that he has no further question to put —

By Principal Collector.

12 2. Do you know the circumstance about Mr. Moorats money and the Cotton?

A. Luchemenarsareddy was saying to me that the payment of the money for the cotton was stopped inconsequence of the death of Mr. Moorat. This was when Sareddy was alive. —

13 2. How long after Mr. Moorats death was it that Luchemenursareddy told you that half the money would be paid to-morrow or the next day?

A. Mr. Moorats death took place during the life time of Parareddy. Luchemenursareddy told me four months ago that he considered the whole as lost, but that half would be received tomorrow or the day after. —

14 2. Do you know Mooloomoody Narrainreddy?

A. I know him.

15 2. Since how long have you known him, and does he reside in your Village?

A. He lives in my Village. I have known him since my childhood —

16 2. Have you at any time been writing

writing accounts &c. for Mooloomoody Narrainreddy?

A. I have, and have also been writing accounts for the Codoorwar. I was sent for to write the accounts when the Mooloomoodywar Goomastah was not present –

17 Q. Have you ever had any suits in Court?

A – If any balance was due to me, I used to complain and frequent the Court –

18 Q. Was there at any time any suit in Court between you and Cheedala Paupasetty?

A. There was – I sued him and he sued me –

19 Q. In whose favor was the suit finally settled?

A. My suit was dismissed and a decree passed in favor of Paupasetty –

20 Q – Was any of your property sold in execution of the decree?

A. No – as I owed some money on account of having stood security, on that account my house and Cattle were sold –

21 Q – Who purchased your house?

Mooloomoody

A. Mooloomoody Govindareddy –

22 Q. What relation is he to Mooloomoody Narrainreddy?

A. He is his, Narrainreddy's, elder brother's son –

23 Q. Are you now living in that house?

A. No –

24 Q. Who are living in that house?

A. My paternal uncle's son, but we are a divided family –

By Ramayyen 25 Q. How long ago was your property sold?

A. I recollect about ten months –

26 Q. Do you know Casavacheree who was the Government pleader in this Court?

A – I know him –

27 Q. Did you give a deposition as a witness three or four months ago in a Criminal case tried in the Court against this Casavacheree. Were you at that time named as a witness on behalf of the Crown?

A. I gave my deposition and was also named –

you

Fort St. George 24th December 1820-

28 Q- You have stated that when you met Luchemenursapeddy at the ford on the other bank of the river, Bheema=reddy Venkiah was with him- Did the said Venkiah hear the conversation which passed between you and Luchemenursa=reddy regarding Ramanjum?

A As we were only three persons we did not converse secretly but publicly therefore he may have heard-

/Signed/ Soobiah

Taken on Oath before me this 22d day of February 1820-

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector-

Case 2. No. 16.

Fifth Deposition of Aumaloor Luchemenursareddy on Oath before the Principal Collector 22d February 1820-

By Principal Collector.

1 Q- What was the nature of the dealings between your father Parareddy and Sota Venkataramanjum?

A My father contracted to supply the Jail with grain and employed Venkataramanjum

Fort St. George 24th December 1820-

Venkataramanjum to manage it-

2 Q- Was the grain purchased by Venkataramanjum from your father, or how was it carried on?

A I must see the account but dont recollect-

3 Q- Was any money due to your father by Mr. Morrat for Cotton?

A- There was balance-

4 Q- Has any portion of that been paid?

A- Formerly a part was paid after my father's death-

5 Q- How long ago was that portion paid, and how much was paid?

A A portion was paid upwards of about two years ago- My uncle at Madras received it and I do not knows how much it was-

N.B Ramanjaraw says he has no further question to put-

/Signed/ Luchemenursareddy-

Taken on Oath before me this 22d day of February 1820-

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse-
Principal Collector-

To

Fort St George 24th December 1820.

Case 2 No. 17.

To

The Principal Collector of the Zillah of Nellore.

The defence of Soondraghurry Ramanjaraw suspended Head Shereistadar.

1. The Yadahst of the 20th January with which I was favored stating that I must give an answer, the Kyfeut taken from Amalor Luchemenurs areddy which was sent therewith for my inspection, and the loose Cadjan leaves numbered 1 & 2 stated to be the private account of his father Parareddy having been sent to me I have seen them. The Kyfeuts subsequently taken from the same Luchemenurs areddy, the letters which he delivered as documents, and the deposition taken from Covoor Venkataramaniah who is stated to have been formerly the Goomastah of Parareddy having been sent in order to making my defence, I have seen them also. with respect to this I respectfully state, that on seeing the depositions of the said Luchemenurs reddy and Covoor Venkataramaniah who is stated to

have

Fort St George 24th December 1820.

have been the Goomastah of Parareddy, it does not appear that they spoke about giving me any thing, or that they saw when it was given, or that they gave any thing, nor did they state that any such thing was caused to be done by them.—

2. It does not appear from the Kyfeuts delivered by Luchemenurs areddy or from any other document whether the Cadjan leaves which are stated to be private accounts were delivered by the said Luchemenurs areddy in consequence of any one making a complaint against me or from any other cause, nor does it appear what was the cause of the said Luchemenurs areddy's giving the Kyfeut. on seeing this Kyfeut it appears that it was taken on the 5th December the day after that on which you stopped making enquiry into the complaints against me and said that you would write to the Board.—

3. It is now 11 Months since I have been suspended, Luchemenurs areddy having given the Kyfeut the day after you stopped

19113 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

stopped the enquiry, it will appear from the circumstances I shall state below, that my enemies persuaded and caused Luchemenurs areddy, the son of the said Parareddy, to fabricate the private account of the dealings which it is stated there was between Choondy Ankapanaidoo and Parareddy. so that my name may appear in it, and caused him to deliver it in and to give a keyfeut, but it will be observed that it is not all true —

2- It is mentioned in the yadahast which you had caused to be written, that it appears from the keyfeut of Luchemenurs a-reddy and the private account said to have been delivered in by him that I received from Ankapanaidoo in the years 1835 and 36 the sum of Rupees 1,46 on account of the Choondy Zemindary — that of this sum 500 Rupees were paid in cash and of the remaining sum of Rupees 946 Rupees 576 were credited by Parareddy on account of

a

19114 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

a debt due to him and the remaining 400 Rupees was credited on account of a debt to the same amount due by me to Sita Veneataramanoojum —

5 Luchmenurs areddy stated in his keyfeut that the dealings between me and Parareddy commenced from the year Veya and between Ankapanaidoo and Parareddy from the year Paurdeva and that he is about 20 years old. He having been a Minor he caused a Vakalutnamah to be registered in the Zillah Court on 10th May 1838 in the name of his Mother in order to prefer a suit in the upper Court in No. 11 of 1838- Copy of which and the Vakalutnamah given to the pleader in this Court by his guardian Annaloor Chenchamah are herewith delivered- To the question I asked him in your presence, whether he did not get the Vakalutnamah registered in the Court? he stated that he does not recollect having done so, on comparing his present age with the year Paurdeva in which Luchmenarareddy stated

stated that dealings commenced between me and Parareddy, and the year Veya in which he stated that dealings commenced between Ankapanaidoo and Parareddy he was then between 4 or 5 years old. and he would be 14 or 15 years old in the year Manmadha in which year he stated that Ankapanaidoo spoke to his father about giving me (the money). This having been 5 years ago you must consider what truth there is in the circumstance which he now states to have occurred at that time, while he states that he does not recollect the circumstance of the Vakalutnamah which occurred about 2 years ago.

6 The above mentioned accounts which are said to be Private accounts are written on loose Cadjan Leaves and not on Paper stitched in to a Book. These accounts do not also bear the signature of any one. The account marked No. 1 is written on 4 Cadjan leaves, in the first leaf 3,000 Rupees are credited to

to Ankapanaidoo, from that to the 3d. leaf there are other items of Charges entered, in the last and fourth leaf two items are entered in my name. There appears no balance of cash in this account in part of the above said 3,000 Rupees on the day these two items are charged. nor does it appear that there have been any other items of credit and these two items of debit charged. there is neither a Monthly total nor are the charges entered according to the Months, there are many other differences which will be explained below. In the Kyfeut given by Lutchmenaroareddy he stated that the Poojah or Section of the Cadjan account of Receipts and charges which he last delivered is not the original rough Chitta account, and that it is a copy made from it. on seeing this Cadjan account which is stated to be

be an account of receipts and charges, the item of Charge for 500 Rupees said to be paid to me, appears to have been first written as 100 Rupees and altered afterwards to 500 Rupees, there are some other items included with this item and a total made of them, in this total 100 Rupees are only included and not 500 Rupees, to explain this difference it appears that some lines have been newly written. In this same manner there are differences in some other items. From this alone it is evident that the items of Charges in my name in the account No. 1. which is said to be an account of the dealings of Choondy Ankapanaidoo and in the account of receipts and charges are fabricated entries and not true. From some inconvenience this difference having occurred in the accounts it appears that he has stated, for the purpose of defending himself, that these accounts

were

were written in this manner in his father's time. It is easy to take away from such loose as Cadjans any items which may have been formerly written and to write other items on separate Cadjans and to put it up with the other Cadjans leaves. If those who execute justice were to inspect the conduct of any servant from his name being entered in such an account in which it is convenient to make such alterations it will be easy for any one to get his friends to write in an account the names of his enemies and persuade them to depose to that effect in order that suspicion may attach to him. In this case many persons can in various ways fabricate accounts. If such accounts are trusted any servant who may have conducted himself correctly in the circar business will not prosper, therefore these Cadjan accounts are not fit to be considered as documents. Formerly in this Villak four persons who called themselves

Head

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

Head Inhabitants having in the year 1822 Com-
plained against some of the principal
Servants that their names are entered in
their private accounts as bribes having been paid
to the servants, the Revenue Board in their
enquiry considered these accounts as fabrica-
ted and ought not to be admitted, and
were accordingly rejected. This is also
known to you. Moreover it has been
understood that Narrainreddy the
elder brother of Parareddy (and who
both were an undivided family) having
in the year 1829 complained against some
persons in a Suit No. 230 upon his Private
accounts, the Sudder Ameen Pundit and
the Zillah Judge not trusting his private
accounts dismissed the Suit and passed
decisions. There not being sufficient
time for submitting Copies of these
Decrees with this defense they
have

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

have not been delivered.

7 Letchmenarsareddy stated
in his Kyfeut that Antrapanaidoo came
only once to his Village in the year
Munmadha or in the year 1835 that he
spoke to his father Parareddy that he
would pay me 4,000 Rupees on account
of the Choondy Zemindary that he was
then near them writing accounts and
heard this conversation, and that from
the year Vejya (1826) he never came again.
Venkataramaniah who is said to be the
Goomastah of Parareddy, stated in his
deposition that antrapanaidoo came to
Parareddy in the year Vejeya (1833) which
is two years before Munmadha the
year mentioned by Letchmenarsareddy
that he was then near them writing
accounts, that some Weavers whose
names he does not know were at a
little distance, that Antrapanaidoo
then

then desired Parareddy to get the Choondy Zemindary made over to him and to pay money according to the Tanakah he had written, but he did not state that Lutchmenarreareddy was also there when that conversation occurred. Lutchmenarreareddy stated that both he and Vencataramaniah used to write the account, that one of them only never wrote them. There being a difference in the depositions given by Venkataramaniah and by Lutchmenarreareddy both in the years and in the circumstance of the alleged conversation of Anka panaidoo, it is for you to say which of the depositions are true, and if it is true that there was a Conversation upon such important Circumstances with Parareddy it is for you to consider what

what truth there is in Vencataramaniahs Statement that it occurred when Weavers Vrs were present. Moreover if as stated by Lutchmenarreareddy my name had been mentioned when the Conversation about 4,000 Rupees occurred Vencataramaniah would have deposed to that Conversation also. From this Circumstance you will observe that what Lutchmenarreareddy stated is not true and that some one persuaded him to give his deposition.

8 The business of Conferring the Zemindary on Ankapanaidoo rests with the Honorable Government and that of recommending him, with you and the Board, and it is not a thing which can be done by a Servant like myself, this Circumstance is known to you and all the rest. The above mentioned Lutchmenarreareddy and Covoor Vencataramaniah both deposed that Ankapanaidoo Spoke

spoke to Pararedy, but they did not say that Pararedy spoke to me on that subject, neither did Anka panaidoo cause such a message to be sent to me through Pararedy, neither Anka panaidoo nor Pararedy paid me any thing. Veravencata panaidoo whowas entitled to the Chondy Zemindary died on the 26th. November 1836 and the former collectors recommended that the Zemindary should be conferred on him. It will therfore appear that Veravencata pan Naidoo died 1½ year subsequent to Manmadha (1835) the year in which Lutchmenarayareddy stated that Anka panaidoo desired Pararedy to speak to me about getting the Zemindary conferred on him, and 3½ years if as stated by Venecataramaniah this had occurred in the year Vejeya. The Government having decided as formerly that Anka panaidoo was not entitled to the Zemindary and Veravencata panaidoo who was entitled to it being

living well, nothing had occurred to cause Venecata panaidoo to use endeavours to get the Zemindary in the years Vejeya and Manmadha (1833 and 1835) and you alone must consider what truth there is in the assertion of these two persons that at such a period Anka panaidoo spoke to Pararedy on the subject of the Zemindary.—

9 Of the 2 documents delivered by Letchmenarayareddy one bears the signature of Comara Anka panaidoo and this letter is dated Atteka Aushadum Bahoola 13th. and the other stated to have been written by Poondla Venecatanarsoo is dated 7th. Bahoola Bandra puddum of the year Doormooky. Letchmenarayareddy has stated that this Venkatanarasoo is the Vakeel of Anka panaidoo. nothing

is

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

is mentioned in that letter about any thing being paid to or received by me. The money which Letchmenarsareddy stated as having been charged twice in my name in the account is entered in the Cadjan leaves stated to be the account of Ankapanaidoo. the first item appears to be dated 6th Baboola Maurgaseve of the year Manmadha corresponding with December 1835. the second item is dated 6th Baboola Adheka Anshadum of the year Doormooky, corresponding with June 1836. In the deposition of Venkataramaniah the alleged Gomastah of Parareddy it is stated that Ankapanaidoo wrote

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

wrote a Tanaka to pay me the amount of the first item of Rupees 500 that the amount was accordingly delivered to the people belonging to Ankapanaidoo. that Pararedy accompanied them to Nellore and returned to his Village 2 or 3 days afterwards and caused him to write it in Ankapanaidoo's account. Letchmenarsareddy deposed quite contrary to this. Moreover nothing is mentioned in the two letters delivered by him about the Tanaka for 500 Rupees mentioned by Venkataramaniah. Letchmenarsareddy stated in his deposition that the said 500 Rupees were taken away by the people of Ankapanaidoo whom he does not know, but he did not say that his father Pararedy went with them. If it were true that there was a Tanaka for 500 Rupees as mentioned by Venkataramaniah, there is no reason why Letchmenarsareddy should not have delivered it in. If there was a tanaka it would have been regular to write in the Accounts that the charge is on

account

account of the Tanaka of such a date, and there is no reason why it should not have been so entered - but in the kyfeut given by Lutchmenarsareddy he considers the letter above mentioned dated Atheka Anshadum Bahoola 13th bearing the signature of Ankapanaidoo, to be the Tanaka for the sums charged previous to that date in my name - The first sum of 500 Rupees which is entered in the Account said to be that of Ankapanoidoo debited by Parareddy was charged eight Months previous to the date of the Tanaka and the second item of Rupees 946 was charged 18 days previous to the date of the Tanaka, but Lutchmenarsareddy gave a reason for charging the amount before the date of the Tanaka, but very contrary to this Cavoor Vencataramaniah the alleged Gomastah of Parareddy stated that when the 500 Rupees was debited in my name, Ankapanoidoo wrote a Tanaka, and that the charge was made

according

according to that Tanaka - The reason stated by Lutchmenarsareddy is that when Ankapanoidoo came in the year Nunmatha he having stated he would pay 4,000 Rupees, the charge was made on that authority before the receipt of the Tanaka - There are not any grounds for believing that the letters are written by the persons whose names they bear - My name is not written in the letter dated atheka anshadum Bahoola 13th which he delivered as the Tanaka - Moreover the said Lutchmenarsareddy stated that when I required, I used to take loans from his father that the loans were made partly in grain and partly in Money, that his father had a bond of mine running at interest - that as the interest was increasing, I desired that credit should be taken for the Bond from Ankapanaidoo's money — and that his father debited the amount in Ankapanoidoo's account on the authority of what Ankapanoidoo

had

had stated formerly, before receiving the Tanaka and wrote this circumstance to him and afterwards got a Voucher from him - In the paper which is called the Voucher nothing is mentioned about either 500 Rupees or 946 Rupees having been given - On seeing its contents it cannot be considered from it that any sum was charged previously - In the last deposition given by Letchemmanarsareddy he stated that he used to stay in the house and write accounts, but used not to go any where with his father, that he was not then engaged in business. It plainly appearing that Letchemmanarsareddy knows nothing of the circumstance which he had above stated as having been mentioned by me, it will appear that the circumstance he has stated were now fabricated by him and not what he truly knew -

All things

10. Although Pararedddy the father of Letchmmanarsareddy is a Ryot who has cultivation in the Village of Gunnagavarum which is one Kos distant from Nellore, and in other places, he is one of the many Ryots of this Zillah who Trade to Madras and other places. He used to export Indigo, Cotton &c. to Madras and used to bring from thence Jaffanapatam Palmiras which are required for building houses, and other articles and to sell them to the servants and other persons. He used also to give Hoondies to Gentlemen. Some months before his death he became bankrupt and was a good deal indebted to many persons. he afterwards became mad and died - I having some years before required Jaffanapatam Palmeeras, I purchased them from him 2 or 3 times for the purpose of a charitable Choultry and paid their value to him, but I had not much dealing

of

of any kind with him nor any great friend=
ship - nor did I owe him any thing - The
loose Cadjan account which has been shewn
to me and which is said to be the private
account between me and Pararedddy does not
appear to be a true account - On comparing
the items and dates entered therein with
each other it will decidedly appear that
it is a false account - It is entered in this
account that I contracted to furnish him
with grain and that some
measured out to him at Chintachelikay
I have no grain in Chintachelika,
nor did I cause any grain to be
measured to him - nor had I any such
dealings with him at any time -

11. In the Keyfeat given by Lutch
menarsareddy he stated that the second
item of Rupees 946/ which is charged in
the Cadjans said to be the account of
ankapanaidoo) is composed of Rupees 420
the principal amount of the Bond
executed

executed by me to his father Rupees 126 - on
account of Interest, total Rupees 546. and
the sum of 400 Rupees I owed Tota Vencas
=taramaunoojum, making altogether 946 -
Rupees, if what he has stated is true, the
said sum of Rupees 946 ought to have been
credited in the Cadjan account (No 2) which
he delivered as my account) on the 10th Soodha
athika aushaudum the same date on which
946 Rupees is stated to have been debited
in ankapanoidoo's account, and to enter
the charges as mentioned by him -
The amount said to have been so paid
to him by me and the amount
charged by him being entered in the
account, how is it that this item was
not so credited - Moreover it is stated in
the Account No 2 that a Balance of
Rupees 517 - 4 was due up to the month
of Kauvtika of the year Vijeya (to -
November 1833) under which there is
entered one item of 80 Rupees, one of 420

Rupees

Rupees on account of Bond, and Rupees 126 on account of interest these three items appear to have been newly written. If, as stated by Letchmenarsareddy, the 546 Rupees were in part of the sum of 946 Rupees debited in Ankapamoidoo's account, the amount ought to have been credited in my account on the 10th Soodhe of Atheka Aushaudum, the date on which it was debited in the said Ankapamoidoo's account. Instead of being credited in that manner it appears from the 11 days afterwards that is on the 6th Bahoodhe of Atheka Aushadum as if on account of Bond, and on account of Interest, it is not practicable to say that this was on that account. If the amount of these items were in payment of those debts, the amount due up to the date of the Bond ought to have been ascertained, and it ought to have been stated that the Bond was taken for that amount. But if the

the Bond was for a separate amount, it ought to have been added to the above amount and if, as stated by Letchmenarsareddy, money was received on that account, it ought to have been stated ~~that that~~ amount was received. This is the usual method observed in regular accounts in Trade, and in accounts of lending and receiving money. The circumstance of the Bond is not stated in the details of the Accounts. Letchmenarsareddy who has stated such particulars, has declared that he does not know on account of what items the Bond was executed, that it appears to be for the items entered in the account, that he does not know when I executed the Bond. that there is no one who knows that circumstance, that he did not see that Bond and that he does not recollect the rate of Interest. On seeing the items in this account, they appear to be items of Receipts and charges from the year Veya /1826/ and the Balance struck is Rs. 517.

If

If it is true that a Bond was executed for 420 Rupees, that the interest amounted to Rupees 126, and that a total of Rupees 546 was due the date of the Bond, at what rate and from what date the Interest ought to have been charged should have been entered, but this has not been done- if the Bond had been truly executed, the items in the said account up to the date of the Bond should appear as having been settled- and this also has not been done- The entry of the Bond not having been made in the place where it ought to have been entered, from its having been newly written as if there was a Bond and that the principal and interest thereof amounting to Rupees 546 was discharged and from Tota Rammanjaloo having declared that, the remaining sum of 400 Rupees which was said to have been transferred to him had not been transferred to him, it plainly appears by these private accounts which he has delivered

that

that this account, and the item of 946 Rupees which is entered in Ankapanoidoo's account, must be considered as having been fabricated- Nothing is mentioned in Vencataramaniah's deposition about the Bond- he stated that on settling the account between me and Pararedy, credit was taken for 546 Rupees in that account and for 400 Rupees on account of Tota Rammanjooloo- What he has stated not being true, was the reason that he was not able when questioned to state particulars-

12 In the famine which occurred in the year Nundana a chuttrum, besides that established by the Circar, was established for some days for feeding the Poors for which purpose Subscriptions were raised by some Gentlemen, the servants and others- the business of getting Rice &c. for the Poor was managed by me, at that time Tota Ramanjooloo having had extensive dealing in grain, I purchased 1200 Rupees worth of Rice thro' him and

paid

paid him the value thereof from the amount raised by Subscription and from my private cash and took a receipt from him and which has been delivered in to you - Venca-taramanjoodoo who has been called by me as a Witness stated in the depesetion given before you that as asserted by Lutchme-narsareddy and Vencataramaniah - he never made over to Parareddy any sum of money - that I paid him in ready money and admitted the receipt which he gave and which I have delivered in to you - It is entered in the account that 546 Rupees were received on account of the Bond and Interest the date mentioned is 6th Bahoola atteka aushadum of the year Doormocky - Letchmenarsareddy has admit-ted that his father died in the month of Maurgasarum of that year (Dec. 1836) from this it appears that he died 6 months after the 6th Bahoola Atteka aushadum which corresponds with the

June

June 1836 - Of the two Witnesses called by me Vota Venkata Ramanjoodoo had dealings with the said Parareddy and was acquainted with his circumstances - It appears by the deposition given by the 2d Witness Doggysetty Soobiah that he used to go to Parareddy to collect the debts due by him - These two persons have stated in their depositions that they heard Parareddy declare for 1½ year before his death that I did not owe him any money - Doogesetty Soobiah the 2d Witness called by me stated in his depo-sition that as he belonged to the — deceased Vobbareddy Bangereddy he asked Lutchmenarsareddy on the part of Bangereddy's relations for the money his father owed Bangereddy, that in the conversation he then had with Lutch-menarsareddy he (Lutchmenarsareddy) told him that same persons desired him to write my name in his accounts as if some one gave me money but that

his

his people did not agree that he should do so, and that with respect to the money he owed, he said that some money is coming to him on account of the amount due by Mr. Morat from which he Lutchmenarsareddy would pay what he owed — Lutchmenarsareddy being indebted to many persons, he has stated such words to satisfy his creditors whether the debts due to him by others were recoverable or not recoverable — By so stating in this manner, by the depositions of the two persons called by me who stated that Rararedddy declared that I did not owe him money by the receipts given by Tata Venkata Ramanjalu which I had delivered and according to which Tata Venkata Ramanjalu stated that he received money from me By the deposition given by him stating that he did not transfer to Rararedddy the payment of 400 Rupees — By credit not having been

given in the Cadjan Accounts which are said to be my accounts according to the disbursements charged in Anka pa= =naidoo's Accounts and by there being many differences in dates &c. between the account of Receipts and Disburse= =ments delivered in by him and the Account No 1 said to be that of Anka pa= =naidoo, you will perceive that the Statement of Lutchmenarsareddy that a disbursement in my name was entered in Ankapanaidoo's account and the statement of Cavaar Venkataramanaiah who came to confirm Lutchmenarsareddy's assertion are fabricated Statements — that they do not agree in their Statements; and that they falsely stated in that manner by the persuasion of my enemies as Lutchmenarsareddy is a young person and one who can be led away by the persuasion of any one and Venkataramaniah a person who

who subsists in a common manner by attending on some Europe people at Covaar you will perceive that you ought not to have any suspicion against me on the depositions given by them.-

13.- Lutchmenarsareddy stated, that altho it is not mentioned in the document which he asserts was written by Anka panaidoo to pay to such a person it is written therein to pay the rum and to pay 2½ after the business was effected- that by 1½ was meant 1500- and by 2½ 2500 in full of 4000 Rupees- If it were true that the first item of 500 Rupees as stated by him, and as is written in the Account was paid on the 6th Baboola Margasara of the year Manmada the sum of Rupees 500 previously paid — + — being deducted from 1500 Rupees which it was intended should be paid in the first instance in part of the 4000 Rs he would have written to pay 1. meaning 1000 but there would be no occasion to write 1½ moreover Lutchmenarsareddy stated in his depositions that

that 946 Rupees were debited in the account in my name without the knowledge of Anka panaidoo and that he afterwards wrote to Anka panaidoo about that circumstance and got this Letter as a document- nothing is mentioned in the above said letter N° 1 which is stated to have been written by Anka panaidoo to show that this circumstance was inwritten to him- If it were true that 946 Rupees were charged in my name in his Accounts Anka panaidoo ought necessarily to have stated in his letter that this circumstance was made known to him- It does not appear by the paper which is said to be his letter that Anka panaidoo knew this circumstance- From this it ought to be considered that the item of 946 Rupees and the letter said to have been written by Anka panaidoo are fabrications.-

14 In the Cadjan Accounts marked N° 1 said to be the private Account between Anka panaidoo

Fort St. George 24th December 1824.-

Ankapanaidoo and Parareddy 3000 Rupees are entered on the 10th Bahoola Margasara of the year Paurdheva corresponding with December 1825 as left with Parareddy on account of which charges were incurred.- From this account it appears that there was no Balance remaining of that sum at the time the first item was charged on my account; it therefore does not appear from the account from what source this charge was made.- Lutchmenarsareddy having been questioned about this he stated that Ankapanaidoo and his father settled accounts in the month of Poosham of the year Doormooky and took a writing for 2000 Rupees disbursed over and above the said 3000 Rupees and that the item of 500 Rupees first charged in my name is included in that sum of 2000 Rupees/ Tota Venaita Rammanjoolu the person who signed that Bond as a Witness,

and

Fort St. George 24th December 1824.-

and who was called by me as a Witness stated, that the item of 500 Rupees mentioned by Lutchmenarsareddy was not included in that account. From this it will be observed that the circumstance mentioned by Lutchmenarsareddy is not true.- In the Kyfeut first given by him he stated that the sums charged in Ankapanaidoo's account in my name were part of the said 3000 Rupees.- you subsequently saw that account and a question having been put to him that 6000 Rupees appear to have been disbursed by the end of the year Vijeya which was 2 or 3 years previous to the years Mummadhu and Doormooky he stated that Ankapanaidoo left 2 or 3000 Rupees with his uncle Narsareddy at Madras from which he used to receive some money.- that when Parareddy settled accounts with Ankapanaidoo, he sent

for

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

for the accounts which was at Madras
elsewhere there remained a Balance due to
him of 2000 Rupees for which he took a Bond.
If it were so, and there was a balance re-
maining of that account it ought to have
been credited to this account and the dis-
bursements on that account entered in it
but it has not been so entered. Lutchme-
narsareddy stated in one deposition that
the Bond for 2000 Rupees was taken in
the year Doornovoy - and in another depo-
sition he stated that with the exception
of in the year Nunnadhu Pararedd[illegible] and
Ankapanaidoo did never meet subsequently
which contradicts the above. The circum-
stance of the Bond for 2000 Rupees is not
entered in Ankapanaidoo's Account & as the
items in this account in my name, are fabri-
cations one does not agree with another, and it
appears that Lutchmenarsareddy in his
endeavours to maintain them, has stated
many

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

many contradictions, from this you will
observe that it is not a true account
It appears that Lutchmenarsareddy
at last delivered before you a letter one
which some items of account is written
With the exception of Lutchmeenarsareddy
no one else has stated this to be in the
hand writing of Pararedd[illegible]. It appears
that Lutchmenarsareddy heads written
this himself and stated as if Pararedd[illegible]
had wrate it. In this Account entered
is first made below which is written
"to Bangaurao 500 Rupees" but it is not
mentioned whose name that is and
there was no necessity for Pararedd[illegible] to
write in that manner.

15 With regard to this Zemindary
you took into consideration properly the
Reports written by the former Collectors,
the report written by you when you
were acting 1st Collector and the
Genealogical

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

Genealogical Tree of the Chaundy Zemindars and settled the Peishcush &c which ought to be fixed on the Zemindary and mirasi a report as you thought proper, under such circumstances there is no occasion for Ankapanaidoo to give many things in regard to my name being written in the Cadjan Leaves which are said to be the account between Parareddy and Ankapanaidoo and that Parareddy sent for the letter which is stated to have come from Ankapanaidoo, I have to observe that it is usual in the world for some persons to say that they will get business done and to make use of the names of some servants and to receive money deceitfully and therefore Parareddy might perhaps have deceived Ankapanaidoo in this manner or that you may get angry with me, my Enemies took advantage of my having been at three times

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

times purchased Palmiras from Parareddy and Ankapanaidoo may perhaps have had private dealings and there being such dealings and Letchmenarsareddy being a young man who does not know business the people belonging to him who are friends to the public servants who are my enemies might have caused my name to be written in the Cadjan account that it may appear in Ankapanaidoo's accounts, and with respects to that amount Letchmenarsareddy might have been persuaded that if some enquiry is made about it some expedient could be adopted for recovering it from Ankapanaidoo, and making Venkataramaniah who is said to be the Gomastah of Parareddy their friend, it will appear evident they caused them to give by-pents.

Considering

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

15 Considering that if I secured the situation of Head Sheristadar which you favored me and conducted myself properly that I would be yet promoted and to shew the labour I took to increase the Circar Revenue I accordingly to your orders adopted all such measures as could have been adopted, and caused a profit of about 1 Lac of Rupees in the cultivated Lands and in the Poollary.-

This will be evident from the Summary Jundy Reports from July 1245- wishing for your favor, and being in hopes of being promoted hereafter with the exception of the salary of my situation, I did not covet for any such ill acquired gains.- and acted correctly, but at last by my misfortune and through the intrigues of my enemies, I not only suffered injury in my rank and honor, but it has happened, such blames have been put on me in regard to my conduct but

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

but I did not covet such gains.-

16 From all the reasons above stated, I trust you will perceive that my name was fabricated and entered in the Cadjan leaves which are said to be Ankapanaidoo's private account and that false Hyfens were persuaded to be given- and that I am innocent.-

28th February 1840.- (Signed) Soow: Ramanoyarow
Suspended Hd Sheristadar

No 11 of 1838

Plaintiffs	Defendants
Chunchamah Matter and Guardian of Lutchmee-marsa reddy 9 yrs sons of Ramalear Pararedy-	1 Vurdareddy son of Dodla Venca-tapully reddy deceased.-
	2 Dodla Puttabe-ramreddy.-
	3 Venkatamarsa-reddy son of Potta Codum-daramreddy died.-

Vakalutnamah given by me the Plaintiff to Commandoary Streenu-vasachurlu Pleader in the Court of Adawlut

1915-1

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Adawlut of the Zillah of Nellore.-

I having according to Clause 1 Section 21 Regulation 11 of 1816 given you authority to prosecute the said defendants in this Court for 5,000 Rupees being the amount of Principal and Interest due on Vouchers, to plead to grant receipts and to receive from the Court the money that may become due to me in this suit; I shall admit whatever Plaint &c. you may file in my behalf in this case, or whatever acts you may do and consider them in the same manner as if done by myself. This Vakalutnamah is given by my consent.-

8th January 1838.- Marked by Chenchamah

Witnesses

(Signed) Comaundoory Rungacharloo

" Covaar Vencataramanah

This stamp is correct

(Signed) V. Vencatachellum Filed in Court this

Sheriff 8th January 1838

(True Copy)

(Signed) R. Grant

Judge

Vakalutnamah

1915-2

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

Vakalutnamah given by Aumaloor Chenchamah resident of Gungavaram in the Nellore Zillah, to Straputty Vencumah Pleader in the Court of Appeal for the Northern Division

As the Defendants Dodla Vurdarendy &ca in the suit brought by me - against them in the Court of Auda-lut of the Zillah of Nellore in No 11 of 1838 intend to make a summary appeal to your Court, I have given you authority according to Clause 1st Sect 21 Regulation 14 of 1806 to file on my behalf a counter petition and to Plead in regard to the summary appeal motion which the Defendants may file - I shall admit whatever Counter Petition &ca you may file or whatever you may do in this respect and consider them the same as if done

19153 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

done by myself- This Vakalutnamah is given by my consent.-

8th May 1838- Marked by Chenchanmah

Witness

(Signed) Sungavarum Ragavachaulu (Signed) Canamdoar

" Sungavarum Canamdoar Streenevasa.

Runguchaulu. charlas the authorized Planter of Nimalvarchevs chamah.-

(True Copy)

(Signed) R. Grant

Judge

Regd before me this 10th day of May 1838 at 4 O'clock P.M.

(True Copy)

(Signed) Geo. A. Skelton

Regr

To the Principal Collector of the Zillah of Nellore.

The Arzee of Soondracherry Ramanoojarow Suspended Dr. Sheristadar.-

According to the yaduste of the 24th instant which you have favoured me with I have as far as it has occurred to me made out my defence in regard to the investigation in the case of Annalear Letchmenarasedy and transmit it herewith- you are a master to protect me.-

28th February 1840- (Signed) S. Ramanoojah Row

Susp. D. Sheristadar

(True Translation)

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse

Pr. Coll.

Compr. J.R.

19154 Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Case 3. No. 1

No. 2

A

Porooza or Journal of Etamookala Parareddy for the year Velumbee.-

10th Increasing Moon. Disbursement- For the

Vysakhum 4th Shayepett channel bu-

May 1838 sineſs given in charge

to Tettoty Paupiah and

sent to Eskapully for

Ramanoojarow Rupees 100

(A true Extract)

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse

Pr. Coll.

Summa Church account of Etamookalacoa Parareddy on paper, for the year Velumbee consisting of 53 Sheets.-

10th Increasing Moon Amount brought from the

Vysakhum 4th May Shayepett Collections when

1838 Gopoliah was coming 100 Rupees.-

Disbursement- Amount

sent to Ramanoojah down

on account of Shayepett

channel busineſs- 100 Rupees.-

(A true Extract)

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse

Pr. Coll.

Extract

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Extract from the Cash Chitta of the year Velumbu of the Curnums of Shayerpett named Vellatoor & Goorovarauze. & Vellatoor Lutchmemarow.

Receipts from the 2nd to the 10th Increasing moon of Vysakhum year Velumbee.—

	Pagodas	
Amount paid twice by Yedla Pedda Nursareddy	Pgs. 10	
Deduct amount of Mulet on trespassing cattle	"	5½/16
Remainder	9	10½/16
Amount received thro' Cheemata Vencata nursoo on account of the Fine Paddy sold to Auroovala Roodrapa Naidoo	10	
" received from Dauma Chinpeny	2	
" from Sullapanany Iyana	"	9/16
Sonnney Paetiah	"	13/16
Paid by Dauma Vencatanursoo for Ghee for the Woorsoo for a annual Ceremony	1	
Cheemata Vencatanursoo.	1	
Dauma Nauganah.	1	
Dava Bottoony Sooliah	1	
	26	13½/16
Balance on hand	2	15/16 22/64
Carry Over	29	14/16 54/64

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

	Pagodas	
Brought over	29	14/16 54/64

Disbursements.—

Sent to Cavaly under charge of Inakatand Venkatramoodoo

65 Company's Rupees		16½
34 Newly Coined Rupees		8½
2 Half Rupees		"½
	25	
Dº to Woodiagherry by the Chuckler for Ghee and Sheep for the Woorsoo	4	
	29.	
Balance of Cash	"	14/16 54/64

(Atrue Extract)

(Signed) T. V. Monhouse

Pr. Collr.—

Case 3. No. 2.—

Translation of declaration of Vellety Pulpa Naidoo aged 35 years an inhabitant of Nalatalpoor in the Talook of Choondy before the Principal Collector of Nellore dated 24th February 1840.

By Principal Collector.— 2.1. It appears from an entry in the Porooza or Journal of Etamookala Parareddy that on the 10th Increasing moon of Vysakhum of the year Velumbee a sum of 100 Rupees was given in charge to you to be paid to Ramanjarow on account of the Shayeespett Channel business, state if that circumstance

circumstance is true and what you know about it.?

A. Vamookala Parareddy being sick I went to see him and return- after I came and had remained there one or two days Parareddy gave into my hands a sum of 100 Rupees and told me that it was to be paid to Ramanoojarow. I must take it. pay it to him. and return- I took it and paid it to Ramanoojarow at Eskapully and returned to my Village.

2. 2. Did any one accompany you when you took the 100 Rupees to Eskapully.?

A. My own people who were with me accompanied me.

2. 3. Did you ask Vamookala Parareddy the reason of paying this 100 Rupees to Ramanoojarow or do you know the reason.?

A. I did not ask him but he told me it was on account of the Nayerpett Channel business.

By Ramanjas (Jpow) 2. 4. How many days did you remain at Cawly after Parareddy gave the money into

into your charge.?

A. I did not remain at Cavely after the money was paid- I went the same day-

2. 5 How many days did you remain at Eskapully.?

A. I set out from Cavely and arrived at Eskapully the same Evening. I took my meal at noon of the next day and returned to Cavaly the same day- from thence I went the next day to my Village-

2. 6. How many days is it since you came to Nellore.?

A. About 20 days ago-

2. 7 Who manages the business of making advances and the other affairs of Rungama the Mother of Mottarauze who has been made Zemindar of Chondy.?

A. If she requires grain for her household expenses I supply it-

2. 8 On what day and at what time was it that you paid the money to me at Eskapully and who were there at that time.?

A. I arrived from Cavely at about

about sunset, and early the next morning I went to the house where Ramanoojah Row put up, and told him that Pararedy had sent the money. He told me to deliver it to a Bramin who was there and to go. I paid it to him and went away.—

2.9. In what place.?

A. In the Brahmin's house at which he was staying at Escapully.

2.10. Did any others see you pay the money besides that Brahmin.?

A. I recollect only that the Brahmin was there. I do not recollect that any one else was there.—

By Principal Collr. 2.11. Do you know who the Brahmin was.?

A.— I do not know who he was.

By Ramanoojarow 2.12. Do you recollect the day on which the money was paid.?

A. I dont recollect.—

2.13. What mark had the Brahmin who took the money, and what was his age.?

A. It was early in the morning and he had not put his mark, and therefore I

I do not know what mark he used to have I cannot positively state his age.—

Ramanoojarow says that he has no further questions to put.—

(Signed) Atloty Poopia Naidoo

Taken before me this 24th day of February 1840

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Pr. Collr.

(A true translation)
(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Pr. Collr.

Case 3 No. 3.

Translation of the Deposition given by Ambatty Venkataramoodoo aged 46 years Inhabitant of Boocheereddypollem before the Head Assistant Collector on the 28th Feburary 1840.—

By Ramanoojarow 2.1. Do you know that I was at Eskapully in Vysakum mausum.?

A. I known.—

2.2. Where were you when I was at Eskapully in Vysakum mausum of last year.?

A. With you (Ramanoojarow).—

2.2. What business were you employed on.?

A. Before you awoke I used to get up and after your getting up I used to come with you

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

with the brass Pot of water. after you came out I used to give the instrument used for cleaning teeth and after you sat down in the front room I used to remain at the outer door or gate (talavakeles).

4. 2. From the time of my rising till I used to go to bathe were you waiting on me.2

A I was.

5 2. After I went to bathe where did you go and wait.2

A. After you went to bathe I used to remain there and get clothes ready and prepare the Palanqueen against your having finished eating rice.

6 2. From the time I arrived at Eskapully last year till the day I returned were you always with me as you have above stated.2

A. Yes I was.

7 2 Do you know Atloty Paupiah?

A. Yes I know him.

8 2 Did Atloty Paupiah while I was at Eskapully last year ever come on any morning and speak to me.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

A. No.

9 2 When I was at Eskapully last year Do you know who the brahmin was who was always with me.

A. I know.

10 2 What was his name.2

A. Dumpoor Soobiah.

11 2 When at Esakapully at what hour used I bathe every day.2

A. Within the Saum (first Saum).

12 2 Used you to be with me from the morning till the time I went to Cutcherry.2

A. I used to be.

13 2 Are you able to state positively that Atloty Paupiah while I was at Esakapully never come to me nor spoke to me.2

A. I can state positively.

By the Head Asst. Coll.

14 2 How many years have you been in Ramanoojarow's service.2

A. Five years have expired.

15 2 How many days were you at Eskapully last year.2

A. About a Month.

16 2 During that month were you attending every day and every morning.2

A. I was attending every morning & never missing once.—

17 Q. It is now nearly two years since how is it you are able to recollect that you were attending every Morning for a Month & without once missing?

A. As I am attending always and being the Head bearer am always in attendance I recollect.

18 Q. When used you to go for rice when at Eskapully?

A. In the morning after carrying Ramanoojarow to Cutcherry I used to eat rice In the evening after he had gone to rice I used to go and eat rice return quickly and prepared the Sleeping place.

19 Q. Besides Duempoor Sobiah was there no other brahmin with Ramanoojarow at that time?

A. No.

20 Q. Where did you see Attoly Paupiah?

A. I have seen him in Nellore.

21 Q. How often have you seen him?

Many

A. Many times as he was coming and going to Cutcherry and here and there.

22 Q. Did you see him at Eskapully?

A. I did not see him at Eskapully.

23 Q. On no occasion?

A. I did not see him last year.

24 Q. After Ramanoojarow had come and gone in again were used you to remain?

A. At the outer Door or gate.

25 Q. Did you never leave the Door?

A. I used always to remain at the outer Door and always used to attend till Ramanoojarow had eat rice and came out.

Ramanoojarow says he has no more questions.

By Head Asst Coll.r

26 Q. Did the other bearers never attend in the house?

A. The other bearers used to remain at the place where we used to eat rice. eat rice and come to carry the Palam queen. they did not attend always.

27 Q. Used you to eat rice with the other bearers or separately?

A. We all used to eat rice to-gether.

28 Q. You have stated above that

your

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

you used without fail to attend every morning at the outer Door till Ramanoojarow went to Cutcherry that after he had eaten rice and you had left him at Cutcherry. you used to go and eat rice- and in your answer to the 27th Question you say you and the other bearers used to eat rice together and in the answeer to the 26th Question you say that the other bearers used to eat rice and come in time to carry the Palanqueen when you and the other bearers eat rice together how could you be constantly attending every morning at the gate.?

A. The rice of myself and the others was cooked in one chatty. they used to eat rice before Ramanoojarow went to cutcherry and leave my share there after I had left Ramanjarow at Cutcherry I used to return and eat rice but I and the other bearers did not eat rice together—

Mark of Ambatty Venatasw

do- Given before me this 28th February 1840-

(Signed) A. Purvis
Head Asst. Coll.

(A true translation)
(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse
Pr. Coll.

Comp. L.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 3 No 4.

Translation of a deposition given by akaraj Veeraragavapah, aged 22 years and inhabitant of Rungraikoola pettah, before the Head Assistant Collector 28th February 1840-

By Ramanoja Row

2-1. Do you know Attaty Paupiah?

A. I know him.

2-2. Is there much acquaintance between you and him?

A. Yes.

2-3. Have you seen him lately?

A I saw him at Runga Naikpett— about 12 or 13 days ago, when he came to see the Vootsavum-

2-4 Did any conversation take place between you and Paupiah regarding me?

A. Conversation did take place.

2-5 State what it was.

A While Paupiah and myself were speaking of certain circumstances, Ramanooja Row's name was mentioned in the course of conversation. Paupiah said

I had

Fort St.t George 24.th December 1840

I had before come once to Nellore and that some of the people in the Collectors Cut-cherry told me that some how or other Ramanoyarows name must be got into E. Parareddy's accounts. That then some thing had been done, now they are sayin that I must give Evidence, if I do not given Evidence my busines would be much damaged. If I do, it would be speaking unjustly. It appears as if I must submit without the justice & injustice / if the case being enquired into / on this account he said he had not got leave to go to his Village.

2.6. When and where did the abovementioned conversation between you and Paupeah take place and was any one there besides you?

A. About 12 or 13 days after sun set in the Mantapum opposite the Pagoda large door. I and Paupeah sat together and many people were there who had come on account of the Tooties but

Fort St.t George 24.th December 1840

but I do not recollect their names.

2.7. Did you and Paupeah talk in a low tone of voice or so that any one might hear?

A. We spake in a low tone of voice.

By the Head Asst.t to Coll.r

2.8. In whose service are you at present?

A. I am in the service of a Pleader in the Court, Narrainshastroolo.

2.9. How long have you been in his service?

A. About two months.

2.10. Before that in whose service were you?

A. For four months I was the fourth Goomastah appointed by Govern-ment under the Ongole Moonsiff. but the water of the place not agreeing with me, I resigned my situation, came to Nellore and have been since a Volunteer at the Zillah Court.

2.11. When did you come from Ongole?

A. I do not recollect the day, but I-

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

I recollect I came in the year 1836.

2-12 Were you a Volunteer in the Court or with the Pleaders?

A- Not with the Pleaders, I was a Volunteer in the Court.

2 13- Do you know Cundalla Casavacharry?

A- Yes.

2-14 Have you ever been employed as his Goomastah?

A- Yes- my elder brother sees Goomastah business near him.

2 15- What is your Elder Brother's name?

A- Venaatapaty.

2 16 How is it you are so well acquainted with attoty Paupiah?

A- For about 8 or 10 years when Paupiah has come to Nellore if anything had to be written regarding his private affairs he used to get it done by me- this is the reason there is acquaintance.

2 17- You have written in the answer to the 5th Question that attoty Paupiah

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Paupiah told you, some people in the Collector's Cutcherry had told- Did he mention the names of any of those people?

A- He mentioned no names.

2 18- Did Attoty Paupiah tell you that he had been told that he (attoty Paupiah) must get Ramanoja-row's name into Etamookala Para-reddy's Accounts?

A- From what Paupiah said I received the impression that he had been told he must do it.

2 19- Did Paupiah say he had made an entry in Pararedd'y's Accounts?

A- Paupiah said some how or other it had been done, but did not state particulars.

2 20- When Paupiah told you this, what did you say to him?

A- I told Paupiah that any how it would be good to pursue a just (Course) not to submit to an unjust one.

2- 21- Who did you tell of the conversation that passed between you

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

you and Paupiah?

A. Itold the above words to the Fouzdary Record Keeper in the Court, Nuclapully Vencatanursoo.

22. Q. How is it that you a Volunteer in the Court consented to serve as a Pleader's Goomastah?

A. If always a Volunteer it would be difficult to get a livelihood. Therefore, till the favor of the Gentlemen fell upon me, consented to be a Pleader's Goomastah.

23. Q. Have you any other name but Akaranze Veeraragavapah?

A. I have no other name but people who do not know my house name call me Veeraragavapah who lives near the Betragoontawar's house or Akaranze Veeraragavappah.

24. Q. Is your house near Betragoontawars?

A. yes.

25. Q. Is there friendship or enmity between you and Condala Casavachary?

By Ramanoja Pous.

A. Enmity.

26. Q. Why is there Enmity?

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

A. Upon a dispute arising between me and my Elder brother, Casavachary has joined with my brother and is throwing difficulties in the way of my getting a proper share.

2. Q. Are you and your elder brother Vencatapaty divided or undivided?

A. Divided since about 4 Months before that we were undivided.

/Signed/ Akaranze Veeraragavapah

Given before me this 28th day of February 1840.

/Signed/ A. Purvis.

Head Asstt Coll.

/A. True Translation./

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse.

Princ. Coll.

Case 3. No. 5.

Second Examination of Ackaranze Veeraragavapah before the Head Assistant Collector 29th February 1840.

By the Head Asstt Coll.

12. Q. You say in answer to the 3d Question that you saw Attaty Paupiah 12 or 13 Days ago, when was the last time you saw him before that?

A. I saw him 5 or 6 days before that time.

2 Q. In what place?

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

A. In Nellore, but I cannot state the place. I recollect it was near the butchery.

3 Q. You have stated in answer to the 16th Question that you used to write any thing for Paupiah regarding his private affairs. when did you last do any business near Paupeah.?

A. Four or five months ago he came here, then I recollect I did business for him.

4 Q. Do you recollect what it was?

A. It would be writing business.

5 Q. Cannot you say what writing business?

A. I cannot state what writing business, whether a letter or account or what I cannot recollect.

6 Q. Before four or five months when and what business did you do for atty Paupiah?

A. I do not recollect.

Ramanoja Row says that he has no questions.

/Signed/ Ackaranja Veeraraga[illegible]

given before me this 29th day of February 1840.

/Signed/ A. Purves.

/True Translation/ Head Asst to Coll.

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse.

Pro Collr

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 3. No 6.

Second Examination of Ambatty Venkatramoodoo, before the Head Assistant Collector 29th February 1840.

By Head Asst Collector. 1 Q. Who did the water bringing business near Ramanoyarow at Ekapully?

A. One named Bootchia. I dont recollect his house name. / The witness again stated / a bramin Paty Bootchiah.

By Ramanoja Row 2 Q. Was this Paty Bootchiah employed as a water bramin or was he like D. Soobiah always attending?

A. He was not always in attendance, he was employed in bringing water.

3 Q. Yesterday when you were asked whether there is any bramin near me besides Dumpoor Soobiah you said no. what did you intend by that?

A. I thought I was asked whether any other bramin was always in attendance. I said that there was no body else constantly in attendance besides.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

besides Soobiah. I said there was no body besides the water brawin there is a Cooking brawin /auchariar/

mark of Vencatramoodoo.

Given before me this 29th February 1840

/Signed/ A. Purvis.

Head Asst. to Coll.

/A true Translation/

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Coll.

Case 3 No 7.

Translate of Deposition given by Dumpoor Soobiah aged 40 years and Inhabitant of Toornmagoontah, before the Head Assistant Collector dated 2nd March 1840.

By Ramanoja Row from 25th April to 29th May 1838.

2 1. Where were you when I was at Eskapully in Vysaka Masam of last year.

A. I was at Eskapully.

2 2. Who were you with in Eskapully

A. With Ramanoja Row Pantoolu

3 2. Where you with me from the day I arrived at Eskapully till the day I left?

yes

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

A. Yes I was with you.

4 2. While I was at Eskapully were you every day from the sunrise till I went to Cutcherry attending near me?

A. I used to write the Comity Chits for Ramanoja row and his private accounts and used to attend near him.

5 2. Do you know Atoty Paupiah?

A. I know him.

6 2. When I was at Eskapully did Atoty Paupiah ever on any morning come to the House, in which I put up. and speak to me?

A. No.

7 2. Besides you was there any other Brawin attending near me on those days from sun rise till the time of going to Cutcherry?

A. I was only in attendance, there was no body else.

8 2. When I was at Eskapully did Atoty Paupiah give you any money?

A. I never saw him and he did not give to me.

The

9-2 The booking braman and water braman with me when employed on their business were they inside or with me?

A- The booking braman was within and the water braman was employed boiling water - they never come near you.

10-2. When I was at Eskapully was the Head Bearer Veneatramoodoo waiting Every day from sun rise till the time of my going to the Cutcherry at the outer Door

A- Always he was every day attending.

By Head Inft. Bollts

11-2. Have you ever been in Government employ?

A- Yes.

12-2. From how many years and in what situation?

A- I was employed in certain Vuntoos in the Cranamellore Talook as a Peishcar for 8 years.

13-2. How did you lose that business?

A- The Ryots of the Village of Kertee and having disagreement with

with me made a Complaint to Mr. Parker to the effect that I had made an incorrect Estimate - he made enquiry and dismissed me -

14-2. When were you so dismissed?

A. About 3 years ago I recollect -

15-2. From that time how have you gained your livelihood and where have you been?

A. I was an Ommedwar in Nellore for a part of the time wandering about here and there but not getting any thing to subsist upon I went to my Village commenced cultivation and I am living by it -

16-2. How many days have you attended near Ramanja Row?

A. For 20 years - I have attended near Ramanjarow -

17-2. How do you know that Atty Paupiah never came to Ramanja Row on any morning -

A. As I was always attending from sun rise till the time of his going to Cutcherry I know -

How

182. How many days were you at Eskapully?

A. I went at the end of Chaitra Mausum and remained till Vysakha baboolum Irecollect about a month.

192. In this month were you every day from mooning till the time of going to Cutchery attending without missing one day?

A. I was always attending every day from sun rise till Ramanja Row went to Cutchery and after his return from Cutchery till he went to sleep.

202. It is now nearly two years ago how is it you are able to recollect that you always attended every morning without failing once when Ramanja Row was at Eskapully?

A. He is the person I attend near and therefore I recollect.

212. What time used you to rise every morning?

A. In the morning while two Garries of the night were remaining I used to arise go to the Goonta

Goonta, return and write the house accounts and after my return Ramanoja Row used to get up.

222. Besides this occasion when at Eskapully where have you always attended on Ramanoja Row without missing one day.

A. Having gone to my Village and staid there 8 or 10 days I used to return and remain (with Ramanja Row) 12 — 4 or 5 Months. but getting Leave at my Village making arrangements there I used to be with Ramanja Row.

232. How many days have you as above mentioned attended every morning till the time of going to Cutchery without failing once on Ramanjarow besides when at Eskapully?

A. From the time of coming from Eskapully till the time of the commission I used to attend near Ramanoja Row every day going now and then to my Village for three or four days.

242. How have you attended near

near Ramanjarow since the commission?-

A- A month or two months I have been at my Village, 15 or 20 days in Ramanojarow's house (so it has been going on)-

252- Did you give evidence before the Commission?-

A- Yes- I gave evidence-

262- In whose favour?-

A- In favour of Ramanja Row-

272- Before Ramanja Row going to Eskapully did you attend near Ramanoja Row in the same way as you did at Eskapully?-

A- I used to be here for 2 or 3 months, for some days I used to go to my Village and for some days to the place where my relations were and return-

282- Where were you when the peon came to call you?-

A- I had gone to Woothoor-

292- When did you return from Woothoor and why did you go there?-

A- I returned the day before yesterday. The man to whom I owe a balance wrote for me & I went-

When

302- When did you leave Nellore?-

A- On the day the Principal Collector left Nellore, I was employed collecting various articles of house hold consumption till the evening and then went to my Village-

By Ramanja Row- 312- You have stated above, you have been attending on me for 20 years and also that you were 8 years employed in Enamanamallore Talook what is this?-

A- My Ancestors were attending near him (Ramanoja Row) In the same way am I- The 8 years I was in the Peishear situation are included in the 20- I was employed 8 years-

322- You have stated above that from the time of leaving Eskapully last year till the Commission you were generally attending on me- By the Committee do you mean till I was placed in confinement?-

A- Till the day of putting in Custody-

After-

332- After I came from Godoor this year till the day I was placed in confinement did you sleep in my house of a night or not?-

A- I used to sleep-

334- You have stated in the Answer to question 24, that you used to be with me 15 or 20 days or were you not for any greater number of days?-

A- I was here some days and there some days- I cannot say 15 20 days or a month precisely-

/Signed/ Dumpoo Soobiah.

Given before me-

/Signed/ A. Purvis.

Head Assistant Collector-

/A true Translation/

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector-

Case 3. No. 8-

Letter from Uttoly Paupiah to Etamookal

Pararedy Dated from Nellore Sunday the 7th Decreasing Moon of Palgoonums-

As I have written and sent a letter the day before yesterday you will not have

have received it and understood the contents- The day before yesterday the Toorpoollem people not only represented clamorously during the Settlement but refused to take Puttahs re- presented very much to the Gentleman, and not having listened to what the Gentleman said namely that he would personally enquire into the Puttahs- All the Papers relating to that chan- ged have come to the Head man- As the bu- siness cannot be effected unless as much as two are expended in that case- I write this that you may know it- I shall act up to what you write in this respect- what is more- you must continue to write to me about any thing particu- lar.-

/A true Translation/

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse

Princ. Collector-

From

Case 3 No 9-

From Uttoly Paupiah to Eld-
mookala Parasreddy dated from Nellore the 7th
Increasing Moon of Chatrum-

I have received your letter sent
by post, I understood the contents- I have accord-
ingly taken care about the channel, as he has said
that as they are now in the trouble of the settlement
it is not practicable to enquire into that bu-
siness, until the settlement is over- After the
settlement is done it will be enquired into- As
the Settlement of these Talooks will be over
in ten days, they will arrive at Ellore from hence
when it is done- As the Choundy papers have
not still gone up, we shall have to remain
here till they go- which will be within a week
Araveyla Lobanaidoo came here four
days ago and complained to the Court a gainst
Achena and the Ryots of the Village
who

who cultivated the land stating that Achenah
rented out to him the Village of Bheemavaram and
for ten years from the year Jaya, & that when
he intended to cultivate the land this year he
prevented him from carrying on the cultivation &
that he thereby sustained a loss of 100 Rupees on
account of Madapaloo Varu receivable by him from
it- Therefore write this for your information- You
must continue to write to me for any particulars-

/A True Translation/

/Signed/ T.V. Stonhouse-
Principal Collector-

Case 3 No 10-

Letter from Abbas Ally Khan Daphtedar of
Woodeyaghery to Etamookala Parasreddy dated 15th of
(the Month not legible) July 1247-

Arzee has been received
and the contents understood- The Ryots as
soon

soon as the produce is thrashed ought to have brought it with the Circar Coroo share, and put it in Store in the Saveedee, and after the circumstance was brought to my notice it should have been done as appeared to me fit- On the contrary if the Ryots take away the Coroo as well as the Ryots share of the grain, to their houses from the thrash-ing floor as soon as it is thrashed, what sort of Ryots are they & what sort of Master am I- What do you mean by writing to me to send orders to the Ryots- This kind of conduct does not exist any where throughout Vencatagherry and Calastry-

You have mentioned about the Channel Case Abdool Raheem is not here, but has gone on account of money- When he comes I will send him- You have written to say that I must send Raheem Sahib together with a

a sum of 350 Rupees about this Channel busines. when there you represented to me that 100 or 150 Ru-pees would do, and now you mention that a sum of 350 Rupees is required- I am much astonished; you have lately taken away my Takeeds of the nature of Documents about the channel busines- You have not yet sent them- I require them necessarily, you must send all those papers to me- You have occasion for money but nothing else- What will happen if the affairs of my Taghere are to be thus spoilt- I have therefore writ-ten this for your information-

/A true translate/

/Signed/ T.V. Stonhouse
Prin.l Collector-

Cadd 3 No 11.

To The Principal Collector of Nellore-

The defence of Soondragherry Ramanja Row suspended Head Heristader-

It being stated in the

1- private

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

private accounts of Etamookala Parareddy inha-
-bitant of Cawraly which had been sent for, two
months ago, that 100 Rupees were sent to me by
Attote Paupiah on account of the Sayapettah chaunel
on the 10th of the increasing moon of the month of
Vysakha of the year Velumbee, the account was
shewn to me on the 23rd February last - In the
depositions taken by you on the 24th February in
regard to this subject from Attotee Paupiah
it is stated, that the said Etamookala Para-
-reddy having been sick he (Attoty Paupiah)
went to Cawraly to see him and that Pararedd
gave him 100 Rupees and desired him to
pay the money to me on account of the
Sayapettah Channel - that he left Cawraly and
arrived at Ekapully and on the morning
of the following day came to
the Bramin's house where - I put
up

Comp. J.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

up and mentioned the circumstance to me
and that I having desired him to give
the money to a Bramin whom he does
not know, but who was near me, he
gave the money to that Bramin -
The witnesses who were called on my
part in this case were examined -
according to your orders - and I was
directed by the Memorandum dated
the 1st instant to give my answer in
regard to the circumstance above-
-mentioned. -

In regard to this I
2
respectfully beg to state as follows. It
is true that I was at Ekapully with
the Cutcherry during some days in
the month of Vysaka of the year Ve-
-lumbee, but the truth of the point to -
stated by Paupiah Viz that he came
to my house, that he spoke to me,
and that by my desire he gave the
money which he stated he had -
brought

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

brought to the Bramin who was near me should be proved by the servants who were with me, as it cannot be known to others- Those who were at Eskapilly at that time were a water Bramin and an Aucharee who cooked my Victuals- these persons always attend on those duties- besides them there was another named Dampoo- =roo Soobiah he used to look after my private affairs, and as he always remained with me while I was at the house in the mornings I have called him and I Vencataramdoo my Head Bearer, who always attend- =ed at the door way of the House- where I resided from morning till I went to the Cutcherry, as my witnesses. In the depositions given by those two persons they stated decidedly that the said Autotee Pauptiah never came to

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

to my house in a morning while I was at Eskapilly- Of these two the Bramin Dumpooree Soobiah stated that the said Pauptiah never gave any money into his hands- From the depositions given by these two persons it will be seen that the said Pauptiah never came to my house while I was at Eskapilly and that he did not give me any money as he stated- and from the reasons stated below it will be seen that the said Pauptiah had stated circum- =stances which are not true, by the persuasion of my Enemies-

You got the Head Moon-

3 =shee to read to you the record in the case of the Sayepetta Channel, and caused a final order to be written on the subject without any interference on my part nothing was done by me and no assist- =ance was afforded to any one by me.

Though you may have

4. issued same orders justly, yet in some such cases those persons who are my enemies-

enemies, and those servants who have given false depositions against me, used to persuade some of their friends who have such private accounts to enter my name in them, and to depose in accordance thereto - in order that I may be injured. This circumstance is known to all per= =sons - The said Paupiah has at present some particular business in the affairs of the Choondy Jemindary - The above said Etamookala Parareddy died about one year ago and as all his accounts &c. and all the persons who belonged to =m him are now subject to Paupiah and as the assistance of the present prin= =cipal servant is necessary to him there was a report that depending on the friendship which he maintained with them they intended to plot against me thro' the means of Paupiah - but as I had not committed any irregularity in any case. I consequently did not consider any thing of that report, or =

looking

looking at the accounts shewn to me as those belonging to Parareddy (Sobierne) they are loose Cadjans and loose papers, and it being easy to enter names in them, there can be no doubt for asser= =ting that the entering my name in those accounts is a fabrication - Though the accounts of Parareddy had been sent for by the orders of the commission= =er, yet the circumstance that those accounts were to be sent for was not known to my enemies, and I trust you will perceive that this plot was so =n contrived, that in the event of my name being in the account so brought it might be considered as if my name was accidentally discovered and there= =by to create a great suspicion in =r your mind - Moreover Acharauze Veeraragavapah the person who was =n known to write and do the private business of authoty Paupiah when he came to Nellore, and who was called

by

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

by me as a witness, stated in his depo=
=sition that the said Paupiah mentioned
to him previous to his (Paupiah) having
given his deposition, that when he formerly
came to Nellore, some principal persons
kept persuading him (Paupiah) to get
my name entered in the accounts of
the deceased Etamookala Parareddy,
that at that time it passed off some
how or other, but that they were now
constraining him to give his evidence,
and that if he did not do so his bu=
=siness would be spoiled, and how could
he speak unjustly— Many persons
belonging to the Cutcherry are acquaint=
=ed with the circumstance of the said
Paupiah having been constrained in
many ways to give evidence against
me, but they are now afraid to give
true evidence.

5. It is very surprising to think that those who pay any thing to any person and get their business done

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

done would write in their private ac=
=counts in detail, that on such an
account such a sum was sent to such
a place for such a person
through such a person— of the items
entered in Parareddy's private account
this alone is detailed so much at
length, and therefore, if you were to
take this circumstance into consider=
=ation, you will perceive that as stated
by Veeraragavapah, my enemies
gained over the said Paupiah and
caused it to be written in that manner in
the accounts of Parareddy, and got
Paupiah to state circumstances which
are false—

6— Paupiah stated in his deposition that as this money was given into his hands on account of Parareddy, he brought it on his account and gave it to me, but he did not state that he had spoken to me about giving me this money in

in this manner - If it is true that Pauliah did so, then it must be that Parareddy had spoken to me previously about it, but there is no proof that Parareddy had at any time spoken to me - It will appear to you on a consideration of the subject from what Pauliah himself has stated Vizt. that in such circumstances, one spoke that money was sent by another - & that another Bramin was desired to receive the money from the person who brought it, that this circumstance is not at all true - A complaint having been brought before the Joint Magistrate in the year 1829 against the said Pauliah and some others who joined him, for having received some money from some persons residents of Paunoor Talook in Calastry, in the names of some servants, that Gentleman enquired into the case and committed him for trial before the criminal

criminal Judge - The Judge investigated into the case and having been of Opinion that the crime was proved, he was sentenced to be imprisoned and to pay a fine and to further imprisonment if the fine was not paid. Copy of the sentence passed by the Court will be submitted with this - after perusing this you will yourself consider how far credit can be given to the circumstances mentioned by Pauliah -

Pauliah stated that Etamookala Parareddy having been sick he went to see him - Parareddy was sick from many months previous to that, and Cauvaly the place of his residence is 4 Amadahs distant from Nellore - If it were true that the money was given to me as stated by Pauliah, and is entered in the accounts, Parareddy should have spoken to me previously in regard to that circumstance, but Parareddy did not come to Nellore owing to his

* This has not been furnished

N.B. Vide Copy of Collr's Letter from Nellore to Parareddy.

his sickness, nor had I been to Cauvaly after the Circumstance regarding this Channel had occurred, you made the settlement of the Cauvaly Talook at Allow Euen then Parareddy did nat Come to Allow on account of his sickness - If the Statement of Shist of that Village for that year is referred to, the Circumstance of his nat having come will be known - Parareddy never Spoke to me either on the Subject of the Sayepetta Channel or on any other Subject My conduct was nat such as to encourage any one to speak to me in this manner, neither was their much acquaintance between Parareddy and myself - While nothing passed between us, it Should be Considered how far Paupiahs Statement, that Parareddy had sent him with money is true.

8. On referring to the records in regard to what had formerly occurred

occurred about this Channel it appears that there was a Channel of supply running thro' the fields of Toorpoopollom Pansoobaula Villages of the Calegherry talook belonging to Government which supplied the tank of Woodeagherry, Sayepet Lutchmepoorum with rain water and with water from the Woopotair river, that the renter of the Villages belonging to Woodeagherry having Commenced to repair the Channel contrary to allowance, the Inhabitants of Toorpoopoomool belonging to the Circar wrote a Cowle to you on the 2nd June 1837 stating that they prevented them from making the repair, and that you had written an order to the Tahsildar of that Talook to enquire into the case - that the Tahsildar made an enquiry and his last report was sent in December 1837. that it is stated in the report that the Woodeagherry people should make the repairs and that that argee was referred to -

the

the Sheristadar's Department, that the settlement of the Talooks having Com=
=menced subsequently, the people of Toorpoo=
=pallam wrote some Arzees against the
Report of the Tahsildar and that in their last
Arzee written in March 1838 they requested that you
would personally inspect the Channel and decide
upon it, that you had accordingly kept
by the Record with the intention of seeing
the spot when you went in that direction.
and then making a decision, that in
the mean time you went to Salem
for a few months, and after your return
the Woodeagherry Sagheredar having
written an Arzee to you in December 1838
stating that the repairs of the Chan=
=nel should be made soon, otherwise
that he would suffer a loss, you perused
the Arzee and sent for all the papers
which were previously received on that
subject, together with the former record
from all the departments, and got the
Head Moonshee to read them to you

(and

and wrote out a decision in English
stating that the Woodeagherry people can make
the repairs, and according to the translation
of this, an order was written to the
Tahsildar and that a copy of the order
was sent to the Sagheeedar, but it does
nat appear that I had made any
Enquiry into the case, or that I had
given my opinion to you or that I had
any conversation regarding it - If you were to
look into the records of the proceedings which
took place in this case you will know it -
From the great fear I
had that my character would be injured
if I did any thing irregular in the high
situation which you were pleased to bestow
on me, I conducted myself regularly
according to the orders you gave me,
without having any complaisance
towards any one - some of those who are
my enemies and who envy me wish=
=ing for my ruin and that I may
suffer much trouble brought an
accusation

19203 Fort St. George 24th December 1840

accusation against me, but on enquiry I was found guiltless. Instead of letting me alone even after that, it is their intention that I should not even remain in Employment, and for the purpose of bringing some blame on me (in whose nature it is not to have any transactions in trifling affairs, and who served during 32 years without a fault and gained the confidence of the Gentlemen they gained over attaly Paupiah, and through him the people of the Deceased Pararedy and in the same manner as they had before fabricated some circumstances they caused a trifling amount to be charged in the accounts in my name (who know nothing) in a way not usual any where in the world, as if it was sent for such a purpose, to such a person, at such a place & thro' such a person - this I trust you will perceive did not actually occur and that thro' intrigue Paupiah was made to state in that manner, and that I am guiltless.

March 9th 1840.-

(Signed) S. Ramanoojarow

Suspd. H. Sheriff

(A true translation)

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse,

Princl. Collector.

19204 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 4 No. 4.

Deposition of Cuppavarauze Venkataroydoo an Inhabitant of Suldunky in the Cavaly Talook before the Principal Collector dated 21st March 1839.

12. You have presented a Petition stating that you have some circumstances to represent to me, what are these circumstances?

A. As I did not get any employment though attending the Cutcherry as a Volunteer for the last 2 years, Seendaraghurry Ramanjarow Sheristadar sent for me when your honor was on circuit and holding Cutcherry at Indoocoorpett and told me that Hooghelly Ramarow would tell me something, and that if I take care about it and come by the time he arrived at Nellore Gentlemen would favor me with a situation. I relied upon his word and executed a Bond to Bezzawadah

Pararedy

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Pararedy an Inhabitant of Wootoocoot and who lives in Davaredy Veerareddy's house at Moodevurty and brought a sum of 100 Rupees, and both I and Hoogghelly Ramarow having met at Nellore carried the Rupees to the Sheristadar's house, that is to say, I went in to the upstair and laid before the Sheristadar Ramayah row the parcel of those Rupees tied up in a red Handkerchief. Afterwards Ramanjarow and Ramarow spoke some words in English which language I dont know. Then Ramarow told me that the Sheristadar had told him that the Situation of a Irayeem Goomastah in the Salamunkee Salook is vacant, and that he would get me that situation, since then I am waiting upon them. While it was so, the Situation of the Irayeem Goomastah of the Salamunkee Salook has been filled up. I represented this circumstance forcibly to the Sheristadar but he told me that he would represent

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

represent to the Gentlemen and in Eight days have my business settled favorably, but as he did not do so, I after the Sheristadar's return to Nellore again asked him either to return me my rupees or to procure me a Situation, he used some improper language to me, and said thee, go away. Then I came to the place where I had put up and told some one that I would present a Petition to you, that he had spoken in this manner to me. Inconsequence of this, they made this day some consultation or other and paid me a Sum of Rupees 98 out of my money and two Rupees is still due. In last year when your honor went to Salem, Boray Rungarow came to Suldunky and other Villages to collect the balance, the Collection of which had been postponed by the Gentleman and subjected Davarapully Calareddy the Head Caupoo and Cajavarayer Seshadrow

Seabarow to every kind of restraint, made a Subscription of 30 Rupees from the Poor Ryots of that Village, received the same, returned to Cavaly and received some Money at Inoosoonoor, also where some postponed balance was outstanding – It is said that he took a Sum of 15 Rupees. This is his case – If your honor suddenly send for the Caupos, Curnums and the Shroff of Sulluriky, I shall prove their circumstance – If it is delayed and if the Matter is known, it cannot be proved because the Mayoondar of that Talook stands in the relationship of fatherinlaw to Rungarow –

2 Q. Did any other person except Hoogghelly Ramarow accompany you when you went to pay the sum of 100 Rupees to Ramanjarow – ?

A. No one accompanied us. When I and Ramarow went Seerrauze Narrainappah was sitting with Ramarow and Ramarow having winked at him, the said Narrainappah got up and went away –

3 Q. Did you execute a Bond to Byzpawadah Pararedy and borrow of him a sum of 100 Rupees. ?

A. Yes. I executed a Bond and borrowed 100 Rupees. In that Bond I have stated that I borrowed the Money as I required it for service, and that I would discharge the Money by instalments after getting a Situation.

4 Q. In whose profession is that Bond at present. ?

A. That Bond is among Byzpawadah Pararedy's Cadjan Accounts kept in the house of the said Veerareddy and I executed the Bond in the Name of my elder brother.

5. Q. Who paid you the said sum this day and where – ?

A. This morning Hoogghelly Ramarow's peon Janakeeramoodoo a short and dark peon took me saying the Sheristadar wanted

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

wanted me. By the time I went to the Sheristadars house, he was sitting and performing the religious Ceremony of Oupasanum, The Rupees were placed before him and he said to me - Here are your Rupees, take them away. Be off and go quickly to your Village. If I get my Situation again, I will get you employment. If you remain here and make an outcry I am now performing oupasanum you will die suddenly. I did not then count the Rupees, and when I had come away and counted the Rupees, there were only 98 Rupees. I have another circumstance to state besides this which is as follows - because I had said that I would call Ramayarows younger Sister Ruganah as a witness to my having paid him the Money and have her brought before the Gentleman he

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

he was afraid and returned me the Rupees.

/ Signed / Cupsavarayze Vencatrow

Deposed before me this 21st March 1839.

/ Signed / J. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

/ A true translation /

/ Signed / J. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Case 4 No. 2

Deposition of Davareddy Veerareddy Inhabitant of Moodevurty in Salamunchy Talook before the Principal Collector dated 23d March 1839.

Q. Did Cupsavarayze Vencatrow execute a Bond either in your name or in that of Beyyawadah Davareddy and receive Money; state all the particulars?

A. About one Month ago or upwards of a Month ago the said Cupsavarayze Vencatraydoo and his elder brother Soobaraydoo both

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

both executed a Bond either in my name, or in that of Pararedddy, I don't perfectly recollect in whose name the Bond was drawn out. I merely told Pararedddy to give a sum of 100 Rupees Bond when Vencatroydoo and Soobaroydoo were both present and I went to the fields Pararedddy accordingly paid the Money. When Vencatroydoo asked for the Rupees, he said he would pay them to the Sheristadar and obtain a Situation and pay at the rate of 4 Pagodas a Month in discharge of what I owed them.

2 2. Why has Pararedddy not come.?

A. He did not come because he is sick.

2 3. When Vencatroydoo asked you for the Rupees, did he tell you that the Sheristadar told him that he would get him a Situation if the Money is paid.?

Yes

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

A. Yes. When Vencatroydoo asked me for the Rupees, he told me that the Sheristadar had told him that he would get a Situation if the Money was paid.?

2 4. Who heard Cufsavarauze Vencatroydoo tell you that the Sheristadar Ramanjarow agreed to get him a Situation if a sum of 100 Rupees was paid to him.?

A. Moondlapoody Nursareddy and Anuntarauze Shashapah were present at that time they heard those words.

Mark of Veerareddy.

Deposed before me this 23d March 1839.

/ Signed / J. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

/ A true translation /
/ Signed / J. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Case 4 No. 3.

Vayada Puttrum or Bond payable by instalments executed by Cufsavarauze Soobaroydoo

Soobaroydoo to Bezzewada Parareddy on the 10th decreasing moon of Inaughum Year Veelumbee corresponding with the 9th February 1839.

As we have this day borrowed of you a sum of 100 Rupees equivalent to 25 Pagodas on account of Circar employment the instalments fixed for the payment of the said sum with interest at the rate p.r Mensem of 3 quarters of a Pagoda and a fanam for 100 Pagodas are as follows.

By two months commencing from this date a sum of 4 Pagodas and afterwards at the rate of 4 Pagodas p.r Month after paying the principal and interest of the Bond I will take back my instalment Bond. this is executed with our consent in Soobarayadoo's own hand writing.

Witnesses /Signed/ Soobaroydoo
(Signed) Anuntarauze Sachapah
Moondlapody Nurrareddy

Payment

10th Increasing Moon Chitrum. Year Vekaree corresponding with the 24th March 1839- 80 Rupees

/A true translation/
/Signed/ J. J. Stonhouse
Pt Collector

Case 4 No. 4

Cupparauze Soobarow's Account.

Paid for

10th decreasing Moon of Inaughum year Veelumbee corresponding with 9th February 1839.

Situation for Venkatarayadoo Madras Rupees 100- or Pagodas 25 for which they executed an instalment Bond to us with interest at 3.- quarter Pagodas and 1. fanam per 0/0 per Mensem.

Amount

10th Increasing Moon Chaytrum. year paid into Sashakeraree corresponding with the 24th March 1839. at Nellore Rupees 80. equivalent to 20 Pagodas.

/A true translation/
/Signed/ J. J. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 4, No. 5

Deposition of Inoondalapoody Nursa-reddy Inhabitant of Inoodwurty in Salamunchy Salook before the Principal Collector of Nellore dated the 23d March 1839.

2. 1. Do you know the circumstance of the two persons named Bezzawadah Parareddy and Davareddy Veerareddy having lent a Sum of 100 Rupees to Cuparavaruzu Venkatarayadoo. state all the particulars of that circumstance.

A. About one month and twenty days ago Cuparavaruzu Venkatarayadoo came to Inoodavurty and asked the said Parareddy and Veerareddy for a sum of 100 Rupees, saying that he wanted it to procure a Situation. a Bond was taken from Venkatarayadoo in favor of Parareddy and the Sum of 100 Rupees paid, as I was desired to attest the Bonds as a witness I affixed my Signature.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

2 2. Did Parareddy tell Veerareddy for whom the said Rupees were taken by Venkatrayadoo?

A. He brought the Rupees saying that they were wanted for some principal servant in the Cutcherry.

2 3. Listen to the Deposition given by Davareddy Veerareddy before me which will be read to you, in which it is stated that you and one Anuntaravuzu Sashupah heard Casavaravuzu Venkatrayadoo when he came to him tell him that the Sheristadar promised to get him a Situation if he paid a Sum of 100 Rupees. Did you so hear or not?

A. I did not hear it said that it was for the Sheristadar but heard it mentioned that it was for a great man.

Who

24 Who did you think was the great man?

A. I thought that by the great man was meant the Sheristadar, the name was not mentioned.

/ Signed / Nursaraddy

Deposed before me this 23d March 1840

/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

/ A true translation /

/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Case 4 No 6.

Deposition of Anumteranze Sashuppah Inhabitant of Moodeenurty Talamurcky Taluk before the Principal Collector Dated 23d March 1839.

2-1- Do you know the circumstances of the two persons named Bezzawada Parareddy and Davareddy Veerareddy having lent a Sum of 100 Rupees to Casaveranze Venecatarayadoo, state the particulars of that circumstance

9th February 1839

A I know - on the 10th Decreasing moon of Maughum Cuppavaranze Venecatrayadoo and his elder brother Soobarayadoo came to the house of Bezzawada Parareddy and Veerareddy and Vencatrayadoo's elder brother Soobarayadoo told them both that the Sheristadar Ramanjarow promised to get Vencatrayadoo a situation that if 100 Rupees were paid he would get employment and that he would pay at the rate of 4 Pagodas a Month afterwards, and asked them to give the Money - They said take it accordingly and having brought 100 Rupees from inside of the House and placed them before Soobarayadoo and Vencatarayadoo Parareddy asked them to execute a Document and they gave a Cadjan bond agreeing to pay the sum of 100 Rupees with interest - The Bond was executed in

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

in favor of Bezzawadah Parareddy by Soobaroyadoo - As Moondlamoody Nursareddy and myself were present there Parareddy got the Bond attested by us and delivered it to Veerareddy -

2 2. To whom did Soobaroyadoo say those 100 Rupees were to be paid to obtain a Situation.

A Soobaroyadoo told Parareddy and Veerareddy that if the said sum of 100 Rupees were paid to the Sheristadar Ramanjarow, his younger Brother Vencatarayadoo would get a Situation and took away the Rupees. -

/ Signed / Anun Tarauze Saskapah

Deposed before me this 23rd March 1840 -

/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

/ A true translation /
/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Deposition

Fort St. George 24th December 1840 -

Case 4 No 7

Deposition of Cutsavarauze Soobarow aged 32 Years and Inhabitant of Juldunky before the Principal Collector dated 25th March 1840 -

By Principal Collector

12 Do you know any thing of your brother Cutsavarauze having paid a Sum of Money to Soondaraghery Ramanjarow when he was Head Sheristadar to obtain for him a Situation in public Service

A In the Month of Maughum (February) last year Vencatarayadoo came from Nellore to our Village Juldunky & asked me for a Sum of 100 Rupees saying that Ramanjarow had told him that he would get him a Situation if that Sum were paid to him - I told Vencatarayadoo that I had then no Rupees but he was importunate saying that unless I had the Money given him he would not remain in

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

in this country- Then I and Venca-
taroyadoo came to Bezzawada a
Parareddy at Moodewurty and I
executed a Bond to Parareddy in
my Name and Caused 100 Rupees
to be paid to Vencataroyadoo- In
the bond I gave to Parareddy it
was written that it was to be
discharged from his pay after he
obtained Service- Then taking the
Rupees I and Vencataroyadoo came
to Nellore and having left him
there, I went to our Village Juldunky
Eight Days afterwards Vencataroyadoo
wrote a letter to me from Nellore
stating that he had had the Money
paid to Ramanjarow

2 Q. Have you got the
abovementioned letter written to you
by Vencataraw?

A. As it was a documen-
tary letter which ought not to be
kept, I tore it up-

3 Q. Did any person attest the

Fort St. George 24th December 1840-

the Bond you executed to Bezzawada
Parareddy?

A. I recollect that Moodla-
moody Nursareddy and Anuntaraze
Sashapah attested the Bond.

4 Q. Can you identify the
Bond if you see it?

A. I can identify-

5 Q. Upon what was it as
executed?

A. Upon Cadjan-

6 Q. Look at the Cadjan Bond
now shewn to you- Is it the one
executed by you to Bezzawada
Parareddy?

A. It is the same-

7 Q. Do you know any thing
of any portion of the bond having
been discharged?

A. My brother Vencata
raw told me that he had received
back 98 Rupees from Ramanjarow
and keeping 18 Rupees for his
own

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

own escpenses and had repaid 80 Rupees to Bezzawada Parareddy and he /Parareddy/ also told me that 80 Rupees had been paid four Months subsequently I paid the remaining 20 Rupees to Bezzawada Parareddy.

By Ramanja Row.

8 Q. When you and your brother Veneatarow went to Moodevurty to borrow Money, whom did you ask?

A. We asked Bezzawada Parareddy and Davareddy Veerareddy his fatherinlaw who lives with him as an undivided family.

9 Q. When you both went to the abovementioned Capoo's house, which of you first asked the Capoo and which Capoo, what did you ask and what did they tell you, and who gave the Money? state those particulars.

A. As it is a matter of a year back I do not recollect which of us first asked or whom we

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

we said that they had promised to get a Situation for Veneatarayadoo, that if a Sum of 100 Rupees were given we would discharge it from the a resourses of his Service and asked them to give it us, and they gave it accordingly. Both, that is to say, Parareddy and Veereareddy were Sitting together when the Money was paid, Parareddy brought the Money and paid it.

10 Q. You have stated that both were present when the Money was paid, was the Bond executed before or after the payment of the Money?

A. Whether it was before or after I cannot recollect.

11 Q. You have stated that Moondlapoody Nursareddy and Sashappah attested the Bond, when did they come to that place? Shashapah

A. Shashappah is their Goomastah and always remains their whether Nursareddy or come before I took the Money and executed the Bond or after, I cannot recollect.

12 Q. How you and Vencata Row went to the House of the said Caupoos Pararaddy & Veeraraddy, what time was it, what were those caupoos doing was their Goomastah Sashapah there by the time you went, and in on what place were the Rupees paid and the execution of the Bond took place?

A. I recollect the Money was paid and the Bond executed in the Lavadee in the front of the house. as The other particulars I do not recollect.

13 Q. Are the said Pararaddy Veeraraddy

Veeraraddy and Bezzawaddah Pararaddy now alive?

A. Veeraraddy has died but Pararaddy is alive but ill Veeraraddy died about 8 or 9 months ago.

14 Q. How long after Vencatarow told you in Juldunky that he required 100 Rupees, did you go to Moodeenurty and borrow that Money?

A. About 8 or 10 days after we came to Moodeenurty and borrowed the Money.

15 Q. After coming to Moodeenurty and borrowing this Money, how long did you remain there.

A. We remained one or two days.

16 Q. Did you speak with the Caupoos about lending the Money or did Vencatarow

19227 Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Vencataraw speak with them.2

A. I spoke and also Vencataraya doo.

By Principal Collector 17.2. In what coins were the 100 Rupees borrowed by you from those caufroos.2

A. They were all Rupees.

/Signed/ Cufsavarauze Soobalow

Taken before me this 25th day of March 1840.

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector

/A true translation/

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector

19228 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 4. No. 8.

Second Examination of Cufsavarauze Soobalow, on the 27th March 1840.

By Ramanjarauw 1.2. Did your brother Cufsavarauze Vencataraw, tell you when I had told him the money should be paid?

A. There was no reason to ask him the particular time, and I did not ask.

2.2. You have stated that Vencataraw wrote a letter to you that he had paid me the money, how many days after did he tell you he had received back 98 Rupees.2

A. He told me he had received it one month after.

By Principal Collector. 3.2. In the answer to the 2nd question, is it that the period of one month after was to the receiving the money or to telling you that he had received it.2

A. I recollect that when I came to Pellore in the month of Chaitrum, he told me that he had received

received it a month after.

By Ramanjaraw. 4.2. Do you know how many days after your brother received back the money he gave a deposition containing the Complaint /against me/?

A I dont know.

5.2. Besides those 100 Rupees did you borrow any money from Bezzawada Bararedy and Veerareddy -?

A There have been from a long time dealings between us -

6.2. Did you borrow any money from them in the year Velumbe; either before or after the time of borrowing these 100 Rupees. ?

A About that time I did not, but since I took money from them for my shist. I was in the habit also previously of taking money to purchase Cattle - -

7.2 Was it the practice to enter in the accounts or documents the particular purpose for which it

it was borrowed at all times that you borrowed money from them -?

A I recollect that if it related to any one particular account the reason was mentioned, but if on two or three accounts, it was stated that I had need of it -

8.2 In what service are you ? in what service is your Brother?

A I am not in the - - public service, but do the Pedda Capoos duties in Juldunky. Carry on Cultivation - subsit thereby. my Brother is a mazoom Goomastah -

/signed/ Cassavarauze Soobarau.

Taken before me this 27th March 1840.

/signed/ J. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector.

/A true translation./

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse -

Principal Collector

Case 4 No. 9.

Second Deposition of Cassavarauze - - Vencatarau, aged 28 Years. before the - -

Principal

Principal Collector, dated 27th March 1840.

By Ramayyasaw

1. 2. It is stated in your first deposition that I spoke to yaw at Indoocoorpett, What day and time was that and who were present?

A I dont recollect the day, but it was the Month of Pooshyum of last year When the Gentleman Came an Circuit, your Nephew Hoogheelly Ramiah (Ramsaw) yaw and myself were there. I did not see who may have been inside.

2 2 How long afterwards did yaw go to Moordenurty & borrow the money?

A I remained 4 or 5 days at Indoocoorpett and thereabouts, after which I went to Juldunky the Village where I reside, and after 8. or 9 days having been unable to succeed anywhere I went to Moordenurty together with my brother and asked Bezzawada Pararedy and Davereddy Veerareddy, who live together as an undivided family, and they gave 100 Rupees—

When

3. 2. When you went to Beggawada Pararedy and Davereddy Veerareddy's house who also were there?

A Pararedy and Veerareddy were there, and also sashapah the Goomastah who writes the accounts in their house, moreover a Canjoo named Imaundapoody Muruareddy Came there, before we went or after I dont recollect which.

4 2 As soon as you went whom did yaw ask for the money, and what Conversation passed.—?

A We asked Pararedy and Veerareddy for the money—They asked us for some security for the payment of it, after executing a Bond in my Brother's name to pay it by instalments, either of 4 Pagodas or 3 Pagodas a month is written in the Bond, after I got service, they gave the money—

5 2 Was the money paid after the bond had been executed or before?

A I recollect that the money was

was given after the bond had been
Executed.

6 2 At what time of the day
did this take place?

A About 10 Guddees in the
morning (or 10 o'Clock)

7 2 How long did you remain
in their house?

A I recollect about 4 or 5 Guddees

8 2 When you and Soobrow left
their house were Dararedy, Veerareddy,
Sashapah and Moondlapoody nurvaredy
all there?

A I recollect that all four
persons were there.

9 2 How many days did you remain
at Moodevurty and where did you go
from thence?

A We remained one or two days
before we got the money, and as soon
as the money was given we went to
take our meals at Vagoor, From Vagoor
we went the same day to Nellore.

10 2 After Coming to Nellore
where did you go?

A

I went no where afterwards
but remained at Nellore. I went to your
nephew Hooghelly Ramiah, and told
him I had brought the money. He said
Come to my house after sunset with
the money - we will both take it,
and speak with Ramanjum Puntulooo
and after paying it you may state
Your Circumstances and Come away.

By Principal Collector. 11. 2. Did your Brother remain
at Nellore or not after Coming from
Moodevurty to Nellore?

A My brother Came to Nellore.
and proceeded to Juldunky the Village
where we reside.

By Ramanjarow 12 2 When did your brother
go to Juldunky after Coming to Nellore,
and when did you see Ramrow?

A I do not perfectly recollect
whether my brother went after taking
his meals the next day or early in the
morning - I saw Ramrow five Ghuddies
after sunset.

By Principal Collector. 13. 2 Was that the first time
You

you saw him after bringing the Rupees to Nellore—?

A That was the first time of seeing after the Rupees were brought—

14.2 Your answer to the 10th question will be read to you— you there state that Ramrow told you to come after sunset, while by your answers to the 12th and 13th questions it appears that when you saw Ramrow it was already four or five Ghuddies after sunset and that this was the first time of your seeing him after you had brought the Rupees— how is this—?

A When I saw him that night he told me not to bring the money in the day time but to bring it after sunset the next day— accordingly the next night I carried the money and paid it—.

By Ramanjarow. 15.2 At what time the next night was the money brought and paid in what place, who were there, what

what week and what day was it—?

A As upwards of one year has elapsed. I cannot recollect the day or the week.. Between 9 & 10 o'clock at night I went inside of your house and as you were sitting facing the East on a Mat in the upstair, your sister Rungamah was standing on the south of you— I recollect that Surrauze Narrai napah was at a distance on the south of you— at that time we brought the Rupees and paid them to you. Afterwards your brotherinlaw Hooggelly Ramrow spoke some words in English and you told me, you would procure a situation for me in a few days, take leave and go— I then took leave of Ramrow also, and went to the place where I was putting up.

16.2. You have mentioned the upstair, where is it—?

A On passing the principal door into the house, it is the thatched upstair to which you go by a flight of

you saw him after bringing the Rupees to Nellore—?

A That was the first time of seeing after the Rupees were brought—

14 2 Your answer to the 10th question will be read to you— you there state that Ramrow told you to come after sunset, while by your answers to the 12th and 13th questions it appears that when you saw Ramrow it was already four or five Ghuddies after sunset and that this was the first time of your seeing him after you had brought the Rupees— how is this—?

A When I saw him that night he told me not to bring the money in the day time but to bring it after sunset the next day— accordingly the next night I carried the money and paid it—.

By Ramanjarow. 15 2 At what time the next night was the money brought and paid, in what place, who were there, what

what week and what day was it—?

A As upwards of one year has elapsed. I cannot recollect the day or the week.. Between 9 & 10 o'Clock at night I went inside of your house and as you were sitting facing the East on a Mat in the upstair, your sister Rungamah was standing on the south of you— I recollect that Surrayya Narrai napah was at a distance on the south of you— at that time we brought the Rupees and paid them to you. Afterwards your brotherinlaw Hooggelly Ramrow spoke some words in English and you told me, you would procure a situation for me in a few days, take leave and go— I then took leave of Ramrow also, and went to the place where I was putting up.

16 2. You have mentioned the upstair, where is it—?

A On passing the principal door into the house, it is the thatched upstair to which you go by a flight of

of wooden steps.

17 2 You have stated that you Came to the thatched upstair where I sat — from the principal door of the house, if you had so seen that place, can you give a plan of it — ?

A I cannot properly draw a plan.

By Principal Collector. 18 2. Had you ever been to Ramanja's — row's house or to the upstair before that. — ?

A I used to go frequently to the house and also several times with — Ramrow to the upstair on the occasion of a marriage in the house or at any other time. —

By Ramanjarow. 19 2. Is the upstair you speak of the upstair where mats and Carpets are spread for Cutchery — ?

A On the occasion of the — marriage, Carpets and mats were spread there — at other times I dont recollect whether they are spread there or not. —

By Principal Collector 20 2. In what Coins were the 100 Rupees

Rupees given to you by Pararedy and Veerareddy — ?

A All Company's Rupees. and no smaller Coins.

By Ramanjarow 21 2 You have stated that — after remaining two days at Moodevurty you executed a Bond and took the Money. did you not speak with Pararedy and Veerareddy about borrowing the Money the day you arrived at that Village ? —

A I think my elder brother asked about giving the money the same day — —

22 2 What took place the next day ?

A On the next day they, — Pararedy and Veerareddy, spoke with each other and said they would give the Rupees tomarrow, and that we might fully talk over the matter when the money was paid — He then went to the place — where we had put up. —

23 2 Do you Know the situation of the place in my house where I make

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Auposanam, and how many doors must be passed / to get there/?

A I know after passing two doors there is a place like a room on the south, and in that you sit and make auposanum.

24 Q Before your present service how did you subsist yourself?

A There is property which was acquired by my father, By it, by Village Curnum Meerassy, by other landed property by Cultivation, and by taking sayer/ posts used to subsist.

By Principal Collector. 25 Q Has any portion of the Bond executed to Parareddy been repaid?

A As the Rupees had been returned to me I at the same time discharged 80 Rupees keeping some Rupees for my Batta.

26 Q State the Particulars of how the 80 Rupees was paid back on account of Parareddy's bond?

A Parareddy's brotherinlaw Veerareddy, Came to Nellore and asked me to

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

to discharge the money saying that he understood I had received it back, and keeping his Goomastah Anuntarauze Sashapah went away. I reserved 18 Rupees on account of articles I had already received from the Banian and the remaining 80 Rupees I paid in charge of the Goomastah and endorsed the payment on the Bond.

By Ramanjarow. 27 Q How many days before you paid the 80 Rupees to Sashapah had you received, as you say, the 98 Rupees?

A I recollect I received the 98 Rupees four days before.

/Signed/ Cafsavarauze Venkatarow

Taken before me this 27th March 1840.

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector.

/A true translation/
/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector
Seconds

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 4. No. 10.

Second Deposition of Anuntarauze Sasha=
=pah aged 43 years and Inhabitant of
Moodeeurty before the Principal Collector
Dated 27th March 1840.

By Ramanjarow 1 Q. When Cufsavarauze Vencataroydoo and Soobaroyadoo came in the month of Magham in last year to Moodevurty to borrow Money how many days did they remain.?

A. As it is a busineſs of a year back, I donot recollect how many days they remained.

2 Q. On the day the Bond was executed, did Vencataroyadoo and Sooba=
=royadoo come to Veerareddy's house before you come there, or had yo gone and were there previously /to their Coming/.?

A. I had gone first and was there.

3. Q. When did moondlapoody Nursareddy Come.?

A. Myself, Parareddy, Veerareddy Soobaroyadoo and Vencatroyadoo were all

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

all sitting on the Pial of the house when moondlapoody Nursareddy came.

4 Q. How long had you been sitting there when he came.?

A. About one Ghuddy=/24 minutes/.

5 Q. Had the bond by that time been execated.?

A. Soobaroyadoo was then writing the Bond

6. Q. It is understood that Sooba=
=royadoo and Vencataroyadoo had come two days previously to that. Had they already spoken about what they came to speak of with Veerareddy and Parareddy.?

A. They spoke at the time they wrote the Bond, but I was not present at any previous Conversation.

7 Q. When Soobaroyadoo and Vencataroyadoo took loan from Daveerooy, Veerareddy & Parareddy, used it to be written in the accounts that it was for a particular purpose.

A. The particular purpose for

for which the loan is made is entered in the accounts as for instance, for the trade in young bulls, for Cows, for a marriage, for a contract of grain, &c.

8 2. Was it Vencataroyadoo, or Soobaroyadoo who spoke at that time, and was it to Parareddy or Veerareddy?

A. It was Soobaroyadoo who spoke to Veerareddy. Parareddy was sitting there.

9 2. After speaking together, was the Bond executed after the money was paid or before it was paid?

A The Bond was first executed and kept and then the money was paid.

10. 2. Who paid the money?

A. Veerareddy was sitting there and Parareddy brought the money from inside of the house and paid it.

11. 2. When Soobaroyadoo and Vencataroyadoo

Vencataroyadoo took away the money were you Parareddy Veerareddy and Nursareddy all there?

A I was sitting writing accounts and I recollect that they were sitting on the Pial.

12 2. What time of the day did this take place?

A. In the Morning before taking meals.

/Signed/ Anantarauze Sashapah.

Taken before me this 27th day of March 1840.

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

/A true translation/

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Case 4 No. 11.

Second Deposition of Moondlapoody Nursareddy aged 40 or 45 years and inhabitant of Moodevurty before the Principal Collector dated 27th March 1840.

By Ramanjaroo 1 2. You have stated in your first deposition that Cufsavarauze Soobaroyadoo and

and Vencataroyadoo borrowed Money from Bezzawada Parareddy and Dava=reddy Veerareddy, on the day on which the money was lent was it before or after you went to Veerareddy's house that Soobaroyadoo and Vencataroyadoo Came there and what were they doing there at that time.Q

A. They had come there before I went there. They had written a bond and kept it there, and were sitting there- as I was acquainted with Soobaroyadoo as to whence he had come, when he told me that he wanted a loan of 100 Rupees and had come to ask Parareddy and Veerareddy and take it.

2. Q. When Soobaroyadoo and Veneta=royadoo were going away after receiving the money were you there or had you previously gone away.Q

A. They took the money and saying that they must go to Nellore went away and after some Conversation with Veera=reddy I went away.

Do

3. Q. Do you know how many days Soobaroyadoo and Vencataroyadoo were at Moodevurty before the Bond was executed.Q

A. I dont know. I saw them at that time.

By Principal Collector

4. Q. When you went to Veerareddy's house, and saw there Soobaroyadoo and Vencataroyadoo, had you been sent for or did you go of your own accord.Q

A. I went because I had business to speak with Veerareddy about.

/Signed/ Moondlapoody Nursareddy.

Taken before me this 27th day of March 1840.

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector.

/A true translation/

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Case 4. No. 12.

Deposition of Mullavarapoo Audeemoorty aged 38 years and inhabitant of Nellore witness called on the part of Ramanjarow before the Principal Collector dated 28th March 1840.

Do

By Ramanjarow 1 2 Do you know Hoogghelly Ramrow and Cufsavarauze Vencatarow.2

A I know.

2 2 Did you obtain a loan for Hoogghelly Ramrow from any one about one year ago.2

A. I did. In the month of magham of last year Ramrow said that he required to send a Hoondee on madras for 200 Rupees to his elder brother Seeniah who is Hoogghelly Appiah's son, that there existed friendship between Davareddy Lingareddy of Moodevurty and myself and that I got the money given there, he would repay the principal with interest. I told him that as Lingareddy had died, it would not be posible to get the money from the others at the time I was speaking with Ramrow, Cufsavarauze Vencatarow was there, He [Vencatarow] told me and Ramrow that he was acquainted with Davereddy Veerareddy and that if the Principal and

and interest would be paid, he would get a sum of 100 Rupees given afterwards — I told Ramrow to execute a Bond for — 100 Rupees and to get the money and that he should speak some where else for the remaining 100 Rupees, and that it — did not appear to me that there were any others who would give a loan Ram- -row asked Vencataroyadoo as to in whose name this Bond was to be executed and Vencataroyadoo said that they — would not lend it, if the Bond was in his [Ramrow's] name that he — would by some means or other obtain from them the money and give the Bond in his name, and that he must keep favar on him for doing him this assist- -ance. afterwards Vencataroyadoo told me that he [Ramrow] had obtained the — money and had executed a Bond to Vencataroyadoo. Ramrow also told me that he had obtained the money in — this way. He [Ramrow] told me that

money

money would come soon, that as much interest would accrue he would return the money and get back the Bond. On the 2d Increasing moon of Chaitrum of the year Vekaree I was at Mopoor on Sayer business, and on the 4th or 5th Increasing Moon I dont recollect which, after I returned to Nellore, Venkataroyadoo who was in the habit of Coming to my house on his way to the Cutcherry after taking meals at the Choultry outside of the Town, told me that Hooggheelly Ramrow paid him 98 Rupees on account of the money which I had spoken about and obtained for him /Ramrow/ and that he had written the payment at the foot of the Bond, that he /Ramrow/ had desired him to remit the interest, but that although it amounted to a small sum, the other party had lent the money upon interest, he at least would be obliged to pay interest, and that

that I would speak to Ramrow and get the Interest as also two Rupees which was short of the principal sum paid. I then sent a person for Ramrow to my house, and told him that his paying two Rupees short and not paying interest was improper, and that he must immediately pay it to Vencatarow and take his Bond. The interest on being calculated amounted to upwards of a Rupee. Ramrow at the same time brought one Rupee without the odd fractions on account of the interest, and two Rupees on account of the principal. Ramrow paid those three Rupees to Vencatarow and asked him to return the bond in which the payment of 98 Rupees was entered. Venkataroyadoo said that the Bond was at the place where he had put up, that he would give a receipt and that he would bring the Bond afterwards, that is to say that Evening or the next day and gave it. Then Venkataroyadoo gave a receipt in his own hand

hand writing to Ramrow as if he had received one hundred Rupees. Ramarow told me to attest it and although I told him that as it was a receipt there was no necessity for attesting witnesses, yet Ramrow told me that as the Bond which was paid was with Vencatarow, and that as it was a receipt executed for it, I should attest it. I therefore attested it as a witness.

Ramanjarow files the receipt marked A.

3. 2. Did any words again pass between you and Casavarauze Vencatarow besides the circumstances you have above stated.?

A. Five or six days after the above mentioned receipt was given, Vencatarayadoo came to me and said that he had the next day returned to Ramrow the bond on which the payment of 198 Rupees had been entered and on asking for

for the receipt he had not returned it. Vencatarow pressed me some how or other to get the receipt given to him. and asked what necessity was there for him to get back the receipt. He said that if I would have the receipt given to him He would get a situation by this in some other way. I told Ramrow to return the receipt, and that it was not proper to keep the receipt after the Bond was returned. He said the receipt could not be given and that it must remain with him /Ramrow/ I mentioned this to Vencatarayadoo, who said what harm would it be to him. /Vencatarow/ if the receipt were not given, and that when the accasion for it Offers, he could any how get out of it, This is what I know.

4. 2. Besides the circumstances above stated, did Cufsavarauze Vencatarayadoo tell

tell you any other circumstances relating to the Complaint he made against me.—

A I do not recollect.—

Ramanjarow states that he has no further questions to ask.—

By Principal Collector— 5 Q Did you only attest the aforesaid receipt given by Cafsavarauze Venatrow to Ramrow or did any one else also attest it.—

A If it is shewn to me I will state, but otherwise I cannot recollect.—

6 Q Do not you recollect whether any other persons were present at the time the receipt was written.—

A I have no recollection that many persons were present.—

7 Q Can you identify the receipt if it is shewn to you.—

A I can identify it.—

The receipt is shewn to the witness.—

Is

8 Q. Is the receipt now shewn to you the one which was then written.—

A It is the one Vencatarow then gave.—

9 Q It appears that in the aforesaid receipt there is the mark of one Putsamully Paupiah as an attesting witness. Who is he.—

A He used to be occasionally employed by sayer renters, at the time of the receipt having been written he was not in service, He attends me, about four months ago he went to Madras and died.—

10 Q Was he present when the receipt was written.—

A He was.—

11 Q At what place was the said receipt written.—

A Vencatrow wrote it sitting on a bench in my Eastern house.—

12 Q On what date in the Month of Vaghum did Ramrow ask you to procure

procure for him a loan of 200 Rupees.—

A I recollect it was the second — increasing moon of Maughum.—

13 2 Did you get a Hoondee — for Ramrow.—

A He told me he wanted it for a Hoondee, but I did not get him.—

14 2 How far is it from your house to the Choultry where Venkataro- -yadoo put up.—

A Less than a quarter ghuddy as far as from the Cutcherry to surveyar- -Ross' house.—

15 2 If it was so near why did not Casavarauze Venkatarow instead — of saying he would bring the bond that evening or the next day and giving a receipt, go at once to the place where he was putting up and bring the bond.—

A As it was then nearly Midday and hot, and as he had taken his

his meals and came on his way to the Cutcherry, and as the going back- -wards and forwards in the sun was troublesome, and as the Bond with the payment of 98 Rupees was with him, Venkatarayadoo wrote a receipt Considering that he could give back the bond to Ramarow and take his own receipt back.—

By Ramayarow 16 2. you have stated that you returned from Mopaar to Nellore on the 4th or 5th Increasing moon of Chaitrum, did Venkataroyadoo give the receipt on the same day you returned to this Village, what date was entered in the receipt.—

19th to 20th March 1839.

A Venkataroyadoo said that Hoogghelly Ramarow has paid 98 Rupees three days previously or on the 2d Increasing moon, and had been Credited in the Band in order to Correspond with it the same date was entered in the receipt given by Venkatrow.—

17th March 1839.

By Principal Collector. 17. 2. On what day did you come to Nellore.—

On.

A On the 4th or 5th Increasing moon of Chaitrum Ide not recollect which- I have stated so already-

By Ramanjarow 18 D. Do you hear any thing of Ramarow having borrowed the remaining sum of 100 Rupees from yerragerla Condareddy and sent a hoondee to Madras for 200 Rupees, or did you hear?—

A I do not properly know the circumstance of his /Ramarow's/ having borrowed money of yerragerla candareddy- I heard from Ra=marow himself the circumstance of his having sent a Hoondee.—

By Principal Collector. /signed/ Mullavarapoo audeemoorty-

19. 2. Do you know whether the Bond for 100 Rupees executed by Ramarow to Cusavarauze Ven=catarow was written upon paper or cadjan, and what was the date of it.—

A I never saw the Bond, but upon asking whether it was upon stamp or plain paper, Ra=marow told me it was upon plain paper.—

/signed/ M. Audeemoorty-

Taken before me this 28th March 1840.

/signed/ T. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector

/ A true translation /

/signed/ T. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector.

Case 4. No. 13.

Third Deposition of Casavarauze Vencatarow dated 28th March 1840. before the Principal Collector.—

By Ramanjarow. 1. D. Did you give a receipt to— Hooggully Ramrow, stating that you have received the money?—

A you paid me 98 Rupees. after=wards you understood that I complained to the Gentleman that I did not receive the remain=ing two Rupees. and you sent one Aucharloo who lives in your house and whose name I dont know, to call me to your house- I said that I would not come to your house thinking that you would do me some harm or other, one or two days afterwards you sent your Son-in-law Ramrow, saying that it was understood that I had Complained that the Rupees they had paid had not been paid, that he (Ramrow) should pay the— money which was short and take a receipt, that some how or other he was to satisfy— me and get me to go to the Village where

I

I reside, that it was through him Ramrow that Vencatarow had brought and paid the money; Ramrow asked me to receive the balance due and give a receipt, I asked him if the receipt should be in his name or in Ramanjarow, He said it was all the same and as he was present he asked me to give the receipt in his name, and I gave a receipt to Ramrow.—

2. D. In what place was the receipt written.

A. It was written on the front door Pial of Mullavarapoo Audeemoortee's ho

3 D. Was Mallavarapoo Audeemoo there at the time?—

A I do not recollect that he was present.—

4 D Was any one else present—?

A There was a man who came with Ramrow with ink bottle and pen— I dont recollect any others being present— I did not see any one— Whether there was any one inside or not.—

Was

By the Pl. Coll.r 5 D. Was the receipt attested by any one—?—

A. No one attested the receipt.—

By Ramanja Row 6 D. Who wrote the receipt.?—

A. I wrote it myself.—

7 D. What were the Contents?—

A I dont recollect.—

By Princ.l Collector. 8. D. The receipt marked A is now shewn to you— Look at the body of the receipt and the signature— Is it your hand writing and your signature.?—

A This is not the receipt I wrote and gave, some of the letters seem to have been made to resemble my hand writing— It is not my hand wring, nor is it my signature.—

9 D Besides the payment of the 98 Rupees how many Rupees did Ramarow pay you when you gave the receipt.?—

A. Of the remaining two Rupees Ramrow paid me one Rupees, and after Ramrow sent the other Rupee by his man I sent the receipt.—

Did

10 D. Did Ramrow never execute a Bond to you for money borrowed for him.?—

A. Ramrow told me to speak with Yerragarla Candareddy about lending him 200 Rupees, I told him I was not a Sowcar, and could not do it — afterwards being told to speak with Yerragarla Condareddy & Cotumreddy Soobareddy, I spoke with them, They said that if they were asked by Ramrow they would tell — This is all. I did not procure a loan from Ramrow.—

11 D When did this take place — in what month and year — ?—

A In the month of Palgoonum of the year Havalumbee, Hooggholly, Ramrow first asked me, Five or six months afterwards I went to Wootoocoor on a certain business — and told those Capoos incidentally, and they told me to go away saying, Cannot Ramrow send for and ask us, what was it to me.—

12 D. How many days after the 98 Rupees

Rupees were paid were the remaining two Rupees paid by Ramrow, and you gave the receipt.?—

A. About 5 or 6 days after.—

13. D. If the 100 Rupees as you have deposed was paid as a bribe why should you give a receipt on it's being repaid to — you.—

A Ramanjarow thought I intended to complain that I had not received the money, and Ramrow having asked me to give a receipt for the money paid by his father — inlaw and himself, and I gave a receipt.—

14 D. How did it happen that you wrote the receipt at Malavarapoo Audemoorty's house?—

A I went to drink water at Audemoorty's house and was sitting there, and while there Ramrow came.—

15 D. What time of the day was that.?—

A Between 12 & one O'Clock in the day.

16. D. Was Audeemoorty then in the

the house ?—

A I did not see him.—

17 D. At what time was the receipt written ?—

A Between 12 & one O'Block when sitting at the front door.—

18 D. Was Ramrow present when the receipt was written ?—

A He was.—

19 D. Was the receipt given to Ramrow as soon as the receipt was written ?—

A. The receipt was not given to Ramrow after the remaining Rupee had been sent by his man I sent the receipt.—

20 D. The 2d question and answer in Mullavarapoo Audeemoorty's deposition will be read to listen to it and State what you have to say. ?—

A I never spoke with Audeemoorty. On the day I wrote the receipt Audeemoorty was not at all there and I saw nothing of him. He is a friend of Ramanjarow and frequents his house and I think he has on that account given this

this evidence in his favor.

21 D. Did Ramrow never execute a Bond in your favor.—

A He never executed a bond to me.—

/ Signed / Casavarauze Vencatarow.—

Taken before me this 28th March 1840.—

/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse.

Prin.l Collector.

Case 4 No 14.

Deposition of Surrauze narrainapah—— aged 40 years & inhabitant of Juckapully goodoor, witness called on the part of Ramanjarow before the Principal Collector dated 1st April 1840.

By Ramanjarow. D. 1. Do you Know Cassavarauze Vencataraydoo.—

A I Know him.—

D. 2 Did you ever see him come to my house ?—

A I never saw him come to your house.—

D. 3. Cassavarauze Vencatraydoo—— has Stated that one night about a year ago,

He

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

He and Hoogghully Ramrow came into the upstair of my house, that you were then sitting with me, & that Ramrow having winked his eye you went away, Did this occur at any time.?

A. It never occurred, so I never saw Vencataroydoo either come alone, or with Ramrow to your house Oomyedwars used generally publicly to frequent the entrance of your house I did not see him come along with them even to the door of your house.—

D. 4 Was it usual for Oomayed=wars to present petitions to the Gentleman for service, or did they expect to get service by my means?—

A. Although it is notorious that they present Petitions to the Gentleman and that the Gentleman, writes them in a list, and favor them with Situations according to the different grades, and although moonshees and Sherustadars used

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

used to have the Volunteers driven away from thier gates by Peons, telling them to present petitions to the Gentleman yet all Volunteer for Parbutties and minor appoint=ments attend at the doors of all moot=suddies This is all Volunteers did not come only to the gate of your house.—

D 5. Where do I hold Dee=wankhana.?

A. The place where you hold Deewankhana is the first large hall in the upstair.—

D.6 In order to go to it must you go up wooden steps as soon as you pass the principal entrance into the house?—

A yes, you must go up wooden steps.

/ Signed / Narrainapah.

Taken before me this 1st April 1840—

/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector.

Translate.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 4 No. 15.

Translate of the receipt field by S. Ramanjarow

Receipt which Cassavarauze Vencatrow caused to be written to Hoogyahully Ramrow —

17th March 1839. on the 2nd Increasing moon of Chaitrum year Vekaree

As you have caused to be paid the sum of 100 Rupees which you have borrowed through me, together with interest it has been received.

This receipt is caused to be written with my free will. —

/ Signed / Vencataraw.

Witnesses.

Mallavarapoo Audeemoorty.

Mark of Putsavully Paupiah.

/ A true Translation. /

Signed / T. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Case 4 No. 16

To T. V. Stonhouse Esqr. Principal Collector of the Killah of Nellore.

The defence of Soondragherry Rassaunoojarow Suspended Head Sheristadar.

1. The Yadast which you were pleased to cause to be written on the 6th of this month and the copies of the depositions sent with it have been received. It will be evident from what I shall state below, that the circumstances therein mentioned Vizt. that Cassavarauze Veneatarasdoo gave me 100 Rupees for the purpose of procuring an employment and received it back - is an accusation unjustly brought against me.

2. I only saw the features of the said Casavarauze Veneatarow when he gave his deposition before you in my presence, on the 27th Ultimo, but before that I did not know that he was of that name or saw him. This person never came to me as an Omeydwaur nor as now stated did he ever come of himself or with any other person, and speak to me.

I

I did not converse with him, nor receive Rupees from him under a promise of giving him an employment, and afterwards return the money. I am not a person who has an eye on such bad business. The power of bestowing situations is in you, and not with me. It is known to all, that Ameydavars present argies to you for employment that you enquire into their circumstances and keep a list of them and when any situation become vacant you appoint persons who are fit for such situations.

3. It is stated in the deposition which this Veneataroidoo first gave before you about a year ago that is on the 21st March 1839, that when the Cutcherry was at Indookoorpetta I sent for him and told him that if he did what Hoogapally Ramarow may tell him and come to Nellore the Gentleman would favor him with a situation, that he afterwards borrowed 100 Rupees from Bejjavaudoo

Bejjavaudoo Bavareddy, and executed a Bond in the name of his elder brother Soobaroidoo, that it is stated in the Bond that the money was borrowed as it was required on account of an employment and that it would be paid by instalments after he was employed, that he brought the money to Nellore and came to my house with it, accompanied by Ramarow, that as one Surrauze Narrainapah was then sitting with me, Ramarow winked to him when he got up and went away, that the Rupees he brought were given to me, that some days afterwards when he came to Nellore he asked either to be employed, or that the Rupees should be returned and that I sent for him and gave him 98 Rupees. From this deposition it appears that the said Veneataroidoo executed a Bond in

in the name of his elder brother and so borrowed 100 Rupees. In the deposition given by him the second time on the 27th March 1840 before you, in my so presence, it is stated that he spoke to me at Indookoorpetta that he remained in those parts afterwards for 4 or 5 days and then went to Juldunky his place of residence and remained there 8 or 9 days. that he afterwards went with his elder brother Soobrow to Moodso werty, remained there 2 or 3 days, and so asked Bayyavanda Parareddy and so Davereddy Virareddy and executed a Bond promising to pay 3 or 4 Pagodas so month, and brought 100 Rupees. In the Deposition given by his elder Brother so Soobarow, it is stated that in the so month of Mangum of last year his so younger brother, the said Venkatar roidoo, came to Juldunky the place of

of his residence and told him, that I promised to get him an employment if he gave me 100 Rupees that he and Venkataroidoo went to Moodwerty and that he executed a Bond in his own name to Bejjavanda Parareddy and caused 100 Rupees to be delivered to so Venkataroidoo, that it is written in the Bond that the amount will be paid by instalments from the wages of his employment, that he and his younger brother came to Nellore with the money and that he afterwards went to his Village. that 8 days afterwards his so younger brother Venkataroidoo wrote a letter to him stating that he gave so those Rupees to me, that that letter being a document he tore it as he considered that it ought not to be kept and that Venkataroidoo informed him that one month afterwards he received back 98 Rupees from me and

paid

paid 80 Rupees in liquidation of the Bond.

4. Of the two persons named Bejjavauda Parareddy and Davareddy Lingareddy who are said to have lent the money one named Bejjavauda Parareddy it appears having been absent from Sickness, a deposition was not taken from him and it appears that Davareddy Veerareddy alone gave a deposition on the 23d March 1839 and died shortly afterwards. It is stated in the deposition then given by Veerareddy, that both Venkataroidoo and his elder brother Soobaroidoo executed a Bond either in his name or in that of Parareddy that he told Parareddy to give 100 Rupees on account of the Bond when Venkataroidoo and Soobaroidoo were together and went to the fields, that Venkataroidoo said the Rupees were to be given to me for the purpose of his procuring

procuring an employment and that Moolamoody Narsareddy and Annantarauze Sashapah were then there and heard him say those words. On seeing the depositions formerly given on the 23d March 1839 by Annantarauze Sashapah and Moollamoody Narsareddy the persons above mentioned and who signed the Bond, it is stated in Sashapah's deposition that Casavarauze Venkataroidoo and his elder brother Soobaroidoo both came to Bejjavauda Parareddy and Veerareddy, that Soobaroidoo asked for 100 Rupees for the purpose of being given to me to procure his brother Venkataroidoo an employment, and that they gave 100 Rupees and took a Bond. In the deposition given by him the second time on the 27th March 1840, before you in my presence it is stated that the Bond was first executed and

the

the money paid afterwards- in the depo-
-sition of the 2nd Witness. Moollamoody
Narraneddy, it is stated that Venkatas
roidoo alone came to Parareddy —
and Vereareddy, that he having asked
for 100 Rupees for the purpose of —
procuring an employment a Bond
was taken and the amount paid, that
he signed the Bond as a Witness, that
he heard Venkataroidoo say that as
the money was required for a Head
Servant of the Cutcherry, but did not
hear him mention my name. In
the deposition given by him then —
second time before you in my presence
on the 27th March 1840, he stated —
that Venkataraidoo and his elder —
brother Soobaroidoo both came together
and received the Rupees. There are a
great contradictions in the depositions
of the two Witnesses and in that —
of Davareddy Vereareddy one of the
two

two persons who sent the money on —
the same point and there is also
a great difference in what they —
stated in their first, and in their
second depositions. These three persons
have stated in three different ways.
Viz.th Vereareddy, who is said to —
have given the Rupees, deposed
that both Venkataroidoo and Soobaroidoo
executed the Bond, that he desired
Parareddy to give the money in account
of the Bond and went to the fields
while the said two persons were there
the witness Sashapah stated that
both the Capoos Parareddy and —
Vereareddy were together and paid
the money. The second witness
stated in his first deposition, that
Venkataroidoo alone came to ask —
for the money, that a Bond was taken
from him and the Rupees given to
him - in his 2nd deposition, he stated
that

that both Veneatarasidoo and Soobaraidoo came together and that when the Bond was taken and the money paid. Paras-reddy and Verareddy also were there. Sashapa stated that Narsareddy came when the Bond was being written, while Narsareddy stated that he came after the Bond had been written - if you take into consideration these and many other differences in their Statements it will be evident to you that they having fabricated and stated unfounded circumstances from the persuasion of some enemies it has been the cause of these differences in their Statements.

5. On seeing the Bond which is written on a loose Cadjan for the 100 Rupees stated to have been borrowed, it is stated therein that 100 Rupees were taken on account of Circar business that 4 Pagodas of the amount would be paid in 2 Months with interest at 3/4 per Cent per Mensem, and afterwards at

at 4 Pagodas p.r Month in this manner the payment by instalments of the principal and interest is written therein, but as stated by them in their depositions, it is not mentioned in the bond that the money was taken on account of an employment or that it would be paid from the wages of the employment. From this alone you must consider what truth is in their words.

6. It is usual in the world for those who give, and those who receive bribes to speak of such circumstances secretly without any other person knowing it, but it is asserted that with regard to giving me a bribe in that manner for procuring an employment, they spoke about it so that some other persons should know it, and it is asserted that it is so written in the Bond.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Bond that the circumstance should be known, and Soobrow has stated that he tore the letter which was said to have been written to him by his younger brother, mentioning that the Rupees were paid to me, as it ought not to be seen by any others it being a document. It would therefore have been understood by you, what possible credit ought to be given to the circumstance stated by Venkatatrow Vizt that he had mentioned to the persons who lent the money, and to the witnesses that he paid a bribe to procure employment and with regard to that circumstance being stated to have been written in the Bond, it having been falsified by the contents of the Bond alone, you will have perceived that the other circumstances have also been fabricated in the same manner.

7 Durmayya Narrainapah who was

Comp.d T.R.

was stated to have been with me when Hoogahully Ramarow brought Venkatroidoo with him in order to give me the Rupees, stated in his deposition that he never saw Vencatroydoo come to my house either alone or together with Ram Row.

8. I recollect that your Cutcherry arrived at Indoor Poorpettah either on the 17th or 18th March 1839 remained there Six days up to the 22nd and went from thence to Nellore, and after remaining there 5 or 6 days, went to Canoopartipaudoo and thence to Surrapully 8 or 10 Villages according to this, 10 or 12 days would have elapsed from the time the Cutcherry arrived at Indoor Poorpettah to its leaving Nellore, but according to the statement of Veneatroydoo in regard to this, it would appear that he was 4 or 5 days at Indoor Poorpettah and those parts. 8 or 9 days at Gullunkry and 2 or 3 days at Moodeverty, making a

total

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

total of 17 days during which time he was in those Villages, and allowing 2 or 3 days for travelling on the road to Tuldunky and thence to Moodeverty and to Nellore, 20 days would have elapsed, and it will appear that at this time I together with your Cutcherry was not at Nellore, and you will consider what truth there is in the Statement of this Vencatroyadoo, he had given me 100 Rupees when I was at Nellore.

9 Mullawarapoo ~~Andeemooty~~ stated in his deposition that ~~Hooga~~ Hully Ramarow told him in the Month of Margeum of last year that he required 200 Rupees to send a Hoordy to Madras and that as Davareddy Lingareddy of Moodeverty was his friend H. Ramarow ~~he~~ asked him to get him the loan of the Money from Dr Lingareddy and

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

and that he would repay it with interest, that he said that he could not do it as Lingareddy was then dead. that when he spoke those words the said Casavarapoo Venkataroyadoo was present and said that he and Davareddy Veerareddy are acquainted, that if interest was allowed he would get the loan of 100 Rupees, but that if the bond is executed by H. Ramarow they would not give the money and that some deception must be practised and he would execute a Bond and bring 100 Rupees, that on this Ramarow executed a bond to Vencatroyadoo and got the Rupees, that on the 4th or 5th of the increasing moon of Chaitroon of the year Vekauree when he came from Mopoor to Nellore, Vencataroyadoo told him that of the 100 Rupees which were given to Ramarow he paid back 98 Rupees and entered the

the sum as paid under the Bond and asked him to speak to Ramarow and get him the interest and the Balance of the principal sum being 2 Rupees, that he afterwards sent for Ramarow and caus=ed him to pay to Vencataroyadoo 1 Rupee on account of interest excluding the fractional part of the amount of the interest and two Rupees on account of the principal, total 3 Rupees, which he said he caused Ramarow to pay to Vencataroyadoo at the same time. that Vencataroyadoo then said that the Bond in which 98 Rupees is entered as having been discharged, was at the House where he put up and pro=mised to bring it either in the evening or the next morning and gave a re=ceipt in his own hand writing to Ramarow for the amount discharged including what was then paid. that he

he signed the receipt as a witness and another person put his mark to it. that Ven=cataroyadoo came to him 5 or 6 days after he gave the receipt and told him that he returned to Ramarow on the following day, the Bond which he Ramarow had executed, that on his (Vencataroyadoo's) asking Ramarow to return his receipt, he did not give it and told him (Aun=dunooty) that if he caused the receipt to be returned to him by any means, he would get an employment by some other means and also stated some other circumstances after the deposition was given Vencatroyadoo having been questioned about the receipt given by him to Ramarow, he ad=mitted that he had given a receipt in his own hand writing near Audemootee's house and also admitted some part of what

Fort St. George 24th December 1820.

what Audeemoorty had stated, as regarded the time &c. but afterwards doubting what injury may happen to him for having done so, he, it appears stated that this receipt is not in his hand writing. He has acknowledged that he received the money which was paid to him and that he had given a receipt in his own hand writing, and Audemoorty has stated decidedly that this receipt is in his Venkataroyadoo's handwriting. It does not therefore appear of any consequence what he may have stated in regard to this.

10. This is a case in which Venkataroyadoo sent money to Ramarow and received it again, and I do not therefore consider it necessary for me to write at length regarding it. Ramarow does not live with me as undivided family and I have no concern

Fort St. George 24th December 1820.

concern with his property or his debts. On your taking the above circumstances into consideration you will perceive that it being the intention of some of my enemies to bring my situation into jeopardy by bringing by any means some crimes against me by causing false complaints to be made, they have fabricated a false accusation as if I had taken a bribe in this case by promising to get Venkataroyadoo employed & employed and giving him hopes of being employed caused him to prefer this Complaint.

11. As Venkataroyadoo has admitted in his deposition that he attempted to procure an employment in the public Service by giving a bribe, I enquired into his circumstances from which it appears that he had hitherto realized the

layer

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Sayer duties and without paying his rents, has left a balance outstanding against him, that after he was employed about one year ago there was an investigation against him in the Police Department for having troubled the Pyots much, for which he was fined. That his Elder brother Soollarow, who lives with him as an undivided family, is a Cummum, the Head Caupoo of the Village of Jelduriky and that he having committed some irregularities he was removed from being Heads Caupoo. The abovementioned Davareddy Veerareddy and Mootoomoody Narasareddy were formerly Head Caupoos and Moonsiffs of Moodevarty, from which situation they

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

they were removed, and Singareddy appointed in their stead, as it appeared from the enquiry you made that he had a right to that situation and they considered that it was by my means that he was appointed Moonsiff and Head Caupoo and conceived enmity against me. It has been not only known that they presented Arjees against me on this subject, but you will perceive that they conceived a hope that if they deposed against me in this manner they would be restored to that situation and which is the cause of their having fabricated and stated unfounded circumstances

in

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

in the case of the complaint of Veerataroyadoo and of having caused Lashapah the Goomasta of Veerareddy to depose in the same manner. If you take all the points of this case into full consideration, I trust you will perceive that this is a false complaint, and was brought through hatred against me.

13th April 1840.

/ Signed / S Ramanooja Row
Supt. Head Shroistadar

/ A True translation /

/ Signed / T V Stonhouse
Principal Collr

No. 1.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

Letter from Ellooty Paupiah to Etamookala Para-reddy dated the afternoon of Tuesday 15th Increasing moon of Ausweejunn from Nellore.

I received your letter this morning and understood the contents. A Deloyet came for you and for Trimul Condareddy to obtain stamp receipts for the settlement of the Choundydebts. The Deloyet came the day before yesterday. The day before yesterday he would arrive at Brammanakraka and yesterday at noon at Cavaly. Our Peroomallos &c. set out from hence on the noon of the day before yesterday, and thinking that they would arrive by the time the Deloyets would arrive yesterday noon, and that all circumstances could be known from them I did not write a separate letter. If it had been a matter of any great consequence I would have beforehand have written to inform you of it. Besides this, it having been

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

been understood that you must yourself come and give a receipt and that it could not be done through another person, and that it is necessary that you should come because there is no means of avoiding your coming and as every thing can be known from Peroomallo I did not write. after the receipt of your letter I went to Ramanooja Row and represented to him in different ways that Paraseddy was sick and could not come, & that I would get a Vakalutnamah & file it. that if this could not be done and leave is given for eight days. he (Paraseddy) would come. He (Ramanooja Row) said that as the money was not in the first instance given through a Vakeel, it was not possible to take a receipt now through a Vakeel, that altho it

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

it were now mentioned to the Gentleman he would not give permission, that he must therefore necessarily come for one day, and may return the same day after giving a receipt, & that I should write a letter to you directing you to come in a Palanqueen. As you know already how it is in the matter of your coming I have not written more. The business of your giving a receipt is strongly impressed on the Gentleman's mind. you must come for a half day, although you are at present too unwell to come, although the delay of half a day take place, you must necessarily come, & it cannot be done if you do not come. You must bring a horse with you. & when you come. When the Vuntaroowar come, you must take care that they bring the Rupees with them.

(A true Translation)
(Signed) J.D. Stonhouse
Rent Collector

From

Fort St. George 24th December 1840-

No. 2-

From Uttoly Panjiah to Etamookala Para=
=reddy dated 14th of this increasing moon-

I have received your letter and understood all its contents- The Accounts have been settled in the Cutcherry, that is if there is im=
=mediate payment 43,000 Rupees will be paid and if not so paid, it is to be paid in future=
with interest- These balance Accounts & all other=
papers relating to that Talook will be sent to the Board in two or three days- The man who is doing the business says that the Collector will write that it should be paid now- We shall also have leave the day after tomorrow- There will be a delay of 20 days before the Circuit people come We shall therefore set out the day after tomorrow- Kristh=
=nareddy & Lyapanaidoo are here, An order has been

issued

Fort St. George 24th December 1840-

issued to the Amildar including the anticipated payments made by the Ryots in the Talook with the other debts, considering that they also lent the money as we all did, & telling him to collect=
the money- For this purpose both of them are here intending to send for some Ryots of the Talook and have petitions presented- That business only cannot be effected- No objection is made about what we stated regarding the balance Accounts of Kristnareddy- As for other circumstances we will come the day after tomorrow, & as you will know when we communicate personally with you I have not written more-

In regard to other circumstances I have written a letter in the presence of Puntooloo & sent it, from which all circumstances will be known- If he will accomplish our business for us according to our request as far as lies in his power, therefore you must take care

* Sheristadar

of

Fort St. George 24th December 1810-

of that matter & send- Leave has not been granted to us on account of the thing which is come from you, but we have no business here- If therefore you take care soon & send it by Wednesday night or Thursday morning, I shall come to the Village- For that purpose I am obliged to remain but have no other business whatever- You must do as you think proper & write a letter soon about it- Besides this Boodamagounta Chen= =nunnauze has not brought the letter written by you to Sobarow- An order has been issued to the Amildar about the Palmira trees of Veneatadry Reddy- As Veneatadry Reddy came here on that day I told him that circumstance- He said he had spoken to the Amildar but the Amildar has not yet sent an answer & if he writes that they may be granted, permission will be given

Fort St. George 24th December 1810-

given-

(A true translation)

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Print. Coll.

No. 3-

Arzdaust from Goolam Pusoonoor Lutchmenurson to his Master Abbas ally Khan / Sagheerdar of Woodiagherry / No Late-

I arrived at Allore on the night of the 3rd day after I obtained leave in Huzrut's presence- In the case of the Abbeepooram people having cut the bank of the Pundapoor tank, the record which has been hitherto before the Collector and the record of the Head of Police having been referred to the Head= Sheristadar Loondaragherry Ramanoja Row he has them with him- Goolam Rahamatoollah has pre= pared an Arzee on two full sheets of Duyem paper, mentioning that the North side bank of the Pundapand tank was strengthened that is to say was extended and the Centre of the bank raised, that he had complained of the same to Caumaraze Singiah at the time,

that

7 Sagheerdar of Anamasamoo= drumpett-

that Caumaraujza Singiah decided that no more water than was usual ought to be received that in July 1245 the Colingulah was shut and more water taken to the tanks, that the extremity of the western bank was in consequence washed away but that he did not cut it that he was a poor Fakeer, that the Woodiagherry Sagheerdar always acted unjustly towards him, and also always bears enmity towards him that as the Sagheerdar was hitherto preferring unfounded complaints against him, the then Collectors Mr. Smalley and others, knowing that his complaints were unfounded were not only doing justice to him (Ramatoollah) that your honor Mr. Stonhouse also dismissed some complaints preferred against him by the Sagheerdar and rendered him justice. That the Sagheerdar has now had false complaints preferred against him

him, and that he (the Sagheerdar) being a rich man, the Tahsildars have written in his favour, that if your honor be pleased to see in person the bank of that tank and the other places, it will be known that the complaint now made against him is false. that justice should be rendered to him, & so forth and has sent his Vakeels Ramoo Chenooraumoodoo and Angole Adeena, Goolam Rahamatoollah has sent 600 Rupees to his Vakeels, to be paid to the Sheristadar in order to avoid this Complaint for damages going against him, & are going about to have the money paid to the Sheristadar & the case settled in his favour. I have spoken to Ramanoja Row. I do not know what they represented to him or what they promised to pay but he said to me what are these Complaints. It will be proper if a compromise is made and the Collector is

is of opinion to settle the matter amicably & that an amicable settlement must be made, to which I replied who has authority to make a compromise- If our business is settled in our favour, my Master will deal with you properly, & did he not give you a horse immediately you asked- He said he did not want the Horse, & it would be proper if paid in Cash- I should not write here what his expectations is- The Tahsildars have written properly- They (the two Vakeels) have money in their hand and are using every endeavour to get the business settled in their favour, although it was not so done by the Tahsildar, your servant cannot write the circumstances of this place- I have however told him that he must not spoil our business by receiving money from the opposite party & that I would write an Arzee to my Master & make him deal properly with him & got him to stop for the present

present- I have represented the circumstances of this place & will act as you direct- Excuse all faults in this Arzdaushto-

(A true translation)

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse-

Princ. Collector-

No 4

Letter from Pasoonoor Sutchumenuroo to Moulavee Makadee- no date-

After (taking leave) of you, I came to Nellore by Caleghery & you might have understood all circumstances by the Arzee I am addressing to the Circar (his Master) and they will be known by the letter of the Collector to the Huzzut our Master- The great person with whom I was directed to communicate I have spoken to, & have also delivered to him the thing you directed- I have mentioned in the Arzee I wrote to Huzzut the circumstance he mentioned & desired me to write- It will be proper if an answer is written to me suited to the occasion- If the business for which you are to go to Madras can be done, you will yourself understand everything if you come this

thes road keep favour upon me—

/ A true Translation /

/ Signed / J. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector.

No. 5

Dustuck bearing the Seal of Abbas Ally Khan Sagheerdar of Woodiagherry to Nuckalapully Nursingarow dated 1st Suffer fusly 1248 corresponding with the 16th April 1839—

As I want to send now five hundred Rupees to Soondaraghery Ramanoja Row, I have written a letter to Syed Ally Hossain* who will deliver five hundred Rupees into your charge—You will therefore take two Peons with you, proceed quickly to Nellore, pay the 500 Rs to Ramanoja Row & come with—hasten to me you will understand that this circumstance is to be kept secret—

*Sagheerdar's son

No. 6.

Dastuck bearing the Seal of Abbas Ally Khan Sagheerdar of Woodiagherry to Adoor Chitturnbarum Mazoomdar of Tadakaloor dated 20th Shewal of fusly 1248 corresponding with the 7th January 1839

of

Compd. T. R.

Of the two horses which have been sent to Tadakaloor for forage, the large Chesnut mare is required to be sent as a Nuzzur to Soondaraghery Ramanjee Row, Head Sheristadar at Nellore,—I have despatched some late Khileets &c as Nuzzur for him and also sent Syed Ghumber Sepoy with them you must send that mare with them to Nellore in his charge.—

The Seal of Abbas Ally Khan.

/ A true translation /

/ Signed / J. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector.

B

List of the Packet sent to the Board of Revenue containing a Report with its accompaniments on the charges of bribery against Soondaraghery Ramanja Row the Suspended Head Sheristadar of the zillah of Nellore—

Case 2. No. 1. Account of choondy Caumeenayany Bungaroo Coomara ankapa Naidoo dated 10th of the decreasing moon of Margaserum in the year Pardhewa—

" 2 Do. of Soondaraghery Ramanja Row—

of

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

of Nellore for the year Vyaya.

3 Translates of the Items in certain Cadjans selected from the private Cadjan account produced by Aumooloor Luchemenurseareddy.

" 4 Translate of a letter marked A from Poondla Vencatanarsoo to Aumooloor Pararedy dated monday 13th decreasing moon in the month of Adekka Aushadurm.

" 5 Do of Do marked B from Do to Do dated 7th increasing moon Bhadrapadurm year Dhoormookhy.—

" 6 Translate of the Memorandum on the back of a Native letter marked C.

" 7 Translate of a declaration of Aumooloor Luchemenursa Reddy dated 5th December 1839.

" 8 Do of Do of Covoor Vencataramaniah dated 28th January 1840.

" 9 Do of the Second Do of Aumooloor Luchemenurseareddy dated 1st February 1840.

" 10 Do of the third Do of Do dated 12th Do.

" 11 Do of the Deposition of Cautumreddy Vencatareddy dated 10th Do.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No 12 Translate of the fourth Declaration of Aumooloor Lutchemenursareddy dated 20th Do.

" 13 Do of the Deposition of Pota Vencata Ramayum dated 20th Do.

" 14 Do of the Second Do of Do dated 21st Do.

" 15 Do of the Deposition of Doggesetty Soobiah dated 22d Do.

" 16 Do of a fifth Deposition of Aumooloor Lutchemenursareddy dated 22d Do.

" 17 Do of the Defence of S Ramanoojarow dated 28th February 1840.—

" 18 Telugu List of the Original papers and copies in Telugu which accompany the Report.

Case 3. No 1. Translates of entries in Cutamookala Pararedy's chitta and Journal, also of the cash chitta of the Curnums of Shageepett.

" 2 Do of the declaration of Uttooty Pauperiah dated 24th February 1840.—

" 3 Do of the Deposition of Ambaty Vencataramoodoo dated 28th Do.—

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

" 4 Translate of the Dº of Aukarauze Veera-
raghavaiah dated 28th February 1840-

"5. Dº of second Dº of Dº dated 29th Dº

"6. Dº second Dº of ambaty Venkatramoodoo
dated 29th Dº-

"7. Dº of the Deposition of Dumpoor
Loobbiah dated 2d March 1840-

"8. Dº of the original letter marked A
from Uttoly Paupiah to Catamookoola
Parareddy--

"9 Dº of Dº marked B from Dº to Dº.

"10 Dº of Dº marked C from abbas ally khan
to Catamookoola Parareddy--

"11 Defence of S Ramanja Row dated
9th March 1840-

"12 Telugu list of the Originals and
Copies in Telugu which accompany the
Report--

Case 4. Nº 1- Translate of a Deposition of
Casavarauze Venkatroydoo dated 21st
March 1840.

" 2 Dº of Dº of Dauvereddy Veerareddy
dated

Fort St. George 24th December 1840-

dated 23d March-

3. Translate of Vayeda Puttum or Bond payable
by instalment executed by Casavarauze
Loobroydoo to Bagavada Parareddy-

"4. Dº of Casavarauze Loobroydoo's account-

"5 Dº of the Deposition of Moondalapoody
Narsareddy dated 23d March 1840-

"6 Dº of Dº of Anantarauze Sachapa dated
23d Dº

"7 Dº of Dº of Casavarauze Loobaroom dated
25th Dº

"8. Dº of the Second Dº of Dº dated 27th Dº

"9. Dº of the Second Dº of Casavarauze Venka-
trow dated 27th Dº.

"10. Dº of the Second Dº of Anantarauze
Sachapah dated 27th Dº.

"11 Dº of the Second Dº of Moondlapoody
Narasareddy dated 27th Dº.

"12. Dº of the Deposition of Mullavarapoo
Audeemoorty dated 28th Dº-

"13. Dº of the 3d Dº of Casavarauze Venka-
trow dated 28th Dº

19307

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 14. Translate of the Deposition of Surrauze Narrain Aprah dated 1st april 1840.

" 15 Do. of a receipt filed by S Ramanja Row

" 16 Do. of the Defence of S Ramanjarow.

" 17 Telugu list of the Originals and Copies in Telugu which accompany the Report.

Appendix

No. 1. Translate of a letter from Vittoly Paupiah to Catamookala Parareddy.

" 2 Do. of Do. from Do. to Do.

" 3 Do. of an Arzudaust from Pusnoor Lutchemenurso to his Master Abbas ally Khan / Jagheerdar of Woodiagherry /

" 4. Do. of a letter from Pasoonoor Lutchemenurso to Moulavee Makadee.—

" 5. Do. of a Dustuck bearing the Seal of Abbas ally Khan Jagheerdar of Woodiagherry to Nuckalapully Nurainga Row.

Translate

19308

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

No. 6 Translate of Do. bearing Do. of Do. to Adoor Chetumbreuve, Amaldar of Jadakaloor

" 7 Packet containing the abovementioned 6 Originals.

A Report of the Principal Collector.

B List of Packet.

Nellore, Pl. Coll.rs Office, 19th June 1840 } / Signed / T.D. Monhaute Pl. Collr

Ordered

19309 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

22-24

Order on the two foregoing letters

Order to be brought forward at a future meeting

Read

19310 Fort St George 24th. December 1840.

Read the following letter.

25

To the Secretary to the Board of Revenue Fort St George

from the Pr. Coll. of Nellore

Sir,

The amount sanctioned as the standard for the Sundernared Charges of the Sub Division Cutcherry under date the 18th November 1834 having been found insufficient for the purpose, I have the honor of submitting herewith the correspondence on that subject with the Sub Collector as noted in the margin for the information of the Board, and to request that the sum of Rupees 157-4-6. proposed by the Sub Collector as the amount of the annual charge for Sundernared in the Sub Division, may be sanctioned from fasly 1250-

Memo. to the Sub Coll. dated 26th Augt 1839 & from do 15th Decr 1839 with a statement

Nellore Pr. Coll's Cutcherry 11th December 1840

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse Pr. Coll.

A

Memorandum -

The Principal Collector begs to inform the Sub Collector that he has directed the payment of the Sundernaried Charges of the Sub Division Cutcherry for the months of May and June, but he cannot altogether coincide in the reasons given for the increased expenditure detailed

detailed in the Telgoo Memorandum from the Sub Division Sheristadar dated the 11th June last - It appears to the Principal Collector obvious that the mere taking of the Petitions from one Department into another cannot occasion an actual increase of business although the standard Sandereared now in force for the Sub Division Cutcherry was founded on the expenditure taken from accounts furnished from the Sub Division Cutcherry it appears to the Principal Collector to be too limited in some of its items particularly Course Cloths for Duffers, Wax and thread - and he would be glad if the Sub Collector would look into the accounts and furnish him with a fresh Estimate of the average expenditure of his Cutcherry to be adopted as the future standard -

Nellore Cutcherry 26th August 1839. } p.e Coll.r } (Signed) J. V. Stonhouse p.e Coll.r

Memorandum.

The Sub Collector has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Principal Collectors Memorandum No 32 under date the 26th August last and to inform him

him that in compliance with the instructions therein contained he has examined the accounts connected with the Sandereared Charges in his Cutcherry and begs now to forward a Statement shewing the amount formerly sanctioned the average expenditure of the last two years and a proposed Estimate of Charges to be adopted as the future standard - As the Sayer did not come under Amanie till July 1247 the average has been framed upon the Accounts of Fushes 1247 and 1248 and a slight increase upon that amount has been made in the Estimate of which Rupees 4-8-7 are caused by an increase in the Bazar rates and Rupees 6-7-9 by an addition to the quantity of some items required the consumption of which must necessarily fluctuate - The total amount of the proposed estimate is Rupees 157-4-6 exceeding the amount understood to have been formerly sanctioned by Rupees 37-2-9 an increase in the present Current prices above those at which the sanctioned Charges were calculated has led to an excess of Rupees 14-14-7 and the remaining sum of Rupees 22-6-2 is required on account of the increase in the quantity of the different articles to be purchased -

Considering the increase of business from the greater number of Revenue accounts received at the Hoozoor Cutcherry as well as from the placing of the Sayer under Amanie Management since the period when the former Sandereared Charges were sanctioned the increase in the proposed Estimate would appear small and as the Sub Collector is satisfied that the strictest attention is paid to the expenditure under this head, he trusts the Principal Collector will approve of the present estimate being adopted as the future Standard of the Sandereared Charges in this Cutcherry -

Nellore District Ongole Sub Coll.r Office 15th December 1839. - - - - - } (Signed) A. S. Mathieson Sub Coll.r

Statement -

49313

Fort St George

No 1.

Statement shewing the average rate of Sunderwarè for fusties 1247 & 1248 and the amount proposed as future standard of Expenditure under that head—

No	Items—	Sunderwarè Charges formerly sanctioned as shewn in the Tehvee Memorandum from the Principal Collectors Office Dated 22d October 1838. Quantity	Price per Viss Vtm	Total Value—	Average Expenditure of Fusties 1247 & 1248— Quantity	Price per Viss Vtm	Total Value—	Proposed Estimate of Sunderwarè charges to be adopted as future standard— Quantity	Price per Viss Vtm	Total Value
			CRs as ps	CRs as ps	V. Seers	CRs as ps	CRs as ps		CRs as ps	CRs as ps
1	Lamp Oil	265 Visses	— 3 5	56 9 5	278 — 4 3/8	— 3 9/4	66 6 7.	300 Visses	— 4 —	75 — —
2	Coarse Cloth for Duftar	21 Pieces	— 12 —	15 12 a	30 Pieces	— 15 5	28 15 —	30 Pieces	1 — —	30 — —
3	Black Sealing Wax	2 Seers	— 4 —	— 8 —	12 7/8 Seers	— a 3 6/2	2 13 6.	12 Seers	— 4 —	3 — —
4	Red Sealing Wax	5 Ds	1 — —	5 — —	4 — Ds	1 — —	4 — —	5 Ds	1 — —	5 — —
5	Red Ink Cotton	15 Pieces	— 2 8	2 8 —	11 1/4 Pieces	— 2 8	1 14 a	12 Pieces	— 2 8	2 — —
6	Thread	6 3/16 Skeins	— 2 —	— 12 4	13 3/8 Skeins	— 2 2/2	1 14 7.	16 Skeins	— 2 —	2 — —
7	Lead for ruling	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — 6	— — —	— — —	— — 6.
8	Country Ink	— — —	— — —	36 — —	— — —	— — —	36 — —	— — —	— — —	36 — —
9	Paste	— — —	— — —	3 — —	— — —	— — —	3 — —	— — —	— — —	3 — —
10	Gum	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	1 4 —	— — —	— — —	1 4 —
	Total—	— — —	— — —	120 1 9	— — —	— — —	146 4 2	— — —	— — —	157 4 6

Nellore District Ongole. — — — —
Sub Collectors' Office 15th December 1839

Signed / A. L. Mathieson Sub Collector

Ordered

24th December 1840—

Charges in the Sub Collectors Cutcherry of Nellore the future standard of Expenditure under that Head—

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Ordered that the following address be submitted together with the foregoing letter —

25 . 26

To the Chief Secretary to Government

To the Chief Secy to Government

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request that you will lay before the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the accompanying letter from the Principal Collector of Nellore, and under the explanation therein given, to recommend that the revised Estimate submitted by him of Sunderwards Charges for the Sub Collectors Cutcherry amounting to Rupees 157-4-6. per annum, may be sanctioned from the commencement of the Current Fusly 1250 —

11th in Cons 24 Dec 1840

Revenue Board office
Fort St George
24th December 184 - - -

(Signed) B.B. Smollett
Secretary

Read

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Read again the following letter from the Collector of Bellary reporting the outturn of the Extra Sources of Revenue, in his District for Fusly 1249

11th Inf Cons 28th Septr 1840

27

Proceedings Relative to the settlement of the Extra sources of Revenue in the District of Bellary for Fusly 1249 —

Sayer Para 1 The accounts exhibit an Increase in the Demand under the Head of Sayer to the amount of — 34,827 — 1 — . Of this, Rupees 23,886 were derived from the excess of the amount for which the duties on Betel and Tobacco were rented in the year under review over the Collections under Dumaunie in Fusly 1248 — The remaining increase of Rupees 10,941 — 5 — is the result of an increase of 15,336 on the Collections on Imports from Mysore Chiefly and a Decrease of 4,395 on the Collections on home produce. —

1248 — 37,150
1249 — 61,036

2 Of the Balance of 8787 outstanding

outstanding at the close of the Fusly 8,663-9-6 had been recovered up to the 31st August last, and the remainder, due by the Renters of the Betel and Tobacco Farm was stated to be in process of liquidation.—

3.— The Gross Collections including arrears and Extra amounted to 3,13,871—10— and exceeded the Gross Collections of the year preceding by 40,498—2—. Owing to the abolition of 95 out of 194 Chowkies there was a Decrease of 19,318-10-4 in the charges. The Increase in the net Revenue therefore was raised to 59,816—12—4, the net Revenue of Fusly 1248 being 2,27,491-15-2 and that of the Fusly under review Rupees 2,87,308-11-6.—

4 This result is the more satisfactory as it occurred after the reduction of nearly half the Chowkies formerly maintained which it was —

expected would have occasioned a Considerable decrease of revenue. The new arrangement of Chowkies received the sanction of Government on the 10th December 1839 of 194 Chowkies 95 have been abolished and 650 Villages only instead of 2505 included within their limits. The exclusion of so large a portion of the district from the interference of Custom House Servants, can hardly have failed to operate as a great relief to the inhabetants, though the goodness of the season and the high rents obtained for the Betel and Tobacco Farm prevented a falling off in the Revenue.—

In Cons. 23 Dec. 1839

Abkarry Demand
1248-233466-4-
1249-229835-4-

5. The Settlement of the Abkarry Revenue in the year under review fell short of that of the year preceding by Rupees 3631- In the gross Collections, however, there was an increase of no less than 20897-14- owing to

to the large portion of the rents of Fusly 1248 which remained outstanding at its close. The Net Revenue amounted to 233367-7-" and exceeded the Net Revenue of Fusly 1248 by Rupees 21734-6-3. The Balance of Rupees 19391-3-" outstanding at the end of the Fusly had been collected up to the 31st August with the exception only of Rupees 151-1-" stated to be under adjustment.--

Small Farms and Licenses Demand
1248. 17331-14-"
1249. 17069-14-"

6 Under the Head of Small Farms and Licenses there was a decrease of 262 in the Demand, but an increase of 1137-13-" in the Current, and of 1562 in the gross Collections and Net Revenue both of which as there were no charges, amounted to the same sum 18535-7-".

Of the Current Balance of 577-2-"- which appears in the Statement, the sum of Rupees 409-5-11 had been recovered up to the end of August and as the

the remainder was being Collected.--

Moturpha Demand
1248-2.53704-9-"
1249-2.56.185-14-"
Increase 2481-5--

7 Of the Increase, Rupees 2481-5-" appearing in the Demand of Moturpha, one third is stated to have occurred from an improvement of the Revenue from Veesabuddy or Tax on the Profits of Trade and 2/3rds" from Baghy Veesabuddy or the Tax on Artizans &c. It is satisfactory to observe a greater increase Viz. 10708-10-" in the Current Collections and 17292-9-" in the Gross Collections. Owing to the discontinuance of Commission, there were no charges and the Net Revenue, therefore, was still further enhanced to the extent of 1378--10 the amount of the Charges of Fusly 1248 the Net Revenue of Fusly 1248 being Rupees 246917-15-2 and the Net Revenue of Fusly 1249 Rs. 264863-9--

8 Of the Balance Rupees 1997-8-" outstanding at the end of Fusly 1249 the sum of Rupees 1103-12-10 had been subsequently realized up to the 31st August.--

Stamps

9 The value of the Stamps sold in the Fusly under review fell short of the extent

extent of the sales in the year preceding by Rupees 255-2-" but owing to a decrease of 288-"-5 in the Charges, there was an increase of 32-14-5 in the Net Revenue which Amounted to 24076-2-2.—

10 The total Demand, an account of all the Branches of Extra Revenue Amounted to Rupees 843609-3-" exceeding the total Demand of Fusly 1248 by 33160-4-". The Current Collections Amounted to 812506-6-" leaving a Balance of 30902-13-" which with the exception of a small sum had been Collected up to the 31st" August. The gross Collections amounted to 855956-9-" or Rupees 79,975-9-" more than the Gross Collections of Fusly 1248 and as there was at the same time a decrease of 21,821-1-10 in the charges the increase in the Net Revenue was 101796-10-10 the Net Revenue of Fusly 1248 being 726354-9-10 and of the year under review 828151-4-8-

11 The arrears due at the commencement of the Fusly under review on account of preceding years, amounted to

53825-13-"

53825-13-" of which 12712-2-" being recovered in the course of the Fusly there remained a Balance of 11113-11-" at its close under the following Heads-

Sayer	10396-6-"
Dhary	457-14-"
Motupha	259-7-"

The Sayer Balance is due by the parties who in Fusly 1242 rented Land Customs on the whole of the Mysore Frontier in the Districts of Bellary, Cuddapah, Salem and North Arcot. They have engaged to pay a certain portion of their total arrear within a given time and in the interim Government have directed that the remaining Balance be retained in account. Of the Dhary Balance Rupees 638 had been Collected up to the 31st" August and the remainder as well as the Motupha Balance is reported to be in train of liquidation—

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing Extract from the Board's Proceedings with the annexed Comparative Statement of the Collections Charges and Net Revenue be submitted to Government and a transcript of the same be forwarded to the Collector of Bellary for his information and guidance—

Bellary

Amount ——

Charge ——

Old Account ——

Total

Monat April 1929 — Dezember 1830

Allerley — April 1929

Abrechnung über Einnahme und Ausgabe

	Einnahme	Ausgabe
Cassa	1.382 3 "	1946 15 " 364 10 "
Pflaume	16,992 3 "	18,333 7 " 1342 2 "
Pflaume	" " " " " "	" " "
Pflaume	16,992 3 "	18,533 7 " 1342 2 "
Diamant	2,303,704 9 "	2,361,183 11 " 2,481 3 "
Salamee m. Ale 11 " July	10,224 13 "	1997 8 " " " 8217 3 "
Cement Collection	2,434,192 12 "	2,54,188 6 " 10,708 10 "
Cassa	193 8 "	371 7 " 373 15 "
Pflaume	3895 12 "	19103 12 " 6208 "
Pflaume	2,4,378 "	2,64,863 9 " 1792 9 "
Schwager	1378 " 10 "	" " " 1378 " 10
Alt Pflaume	2,46,192 13 2	2,64,863 9 " 1867 9 10
Diamant	2,381 2 "	2,33,363 9 " 2,37 2 "
Salamee m. Ale 11 " July	1731 14 "	1706 11 " " " 262 "
Cement Collection	1946 15 "	327 2 " " " 1419 13 "
Cassa	15 384 15 "	16,342 12 " 1137 13 "
Pflaume	26 1 "	13 12 " 19 11 "
Pflaume	1382 3 "	1946 13 " 364 10 "
Pflaume	16,992 3 "	18,333 7 " 1342 2 "
Pflaume	" " " " " "	" " "
Diamant	16,992 3 "	18,333 7 " 1342 2 "
Salamee m. Ale 11 " July	2,303,704 9 "	2,361,183 11 " 2,481 3 "
Cement Collection	10,224 13 "	1997 8 " " " 8217 3 "
Cassa	2,434,192 12 "	2,54,188 6 " 10,708 10 "
Pflaume	193 8 "	371 7 " 373 15 "
Pflaume	3895 12 "	19103 12 " 6208 "
Pflaume	2,4,378 "	2,64,863 9 " 1792 9 "
Schwager	1378 " 10 "	" " " 1378 " 10
Alt Pflaume	2,46,192 13 2	2,64,863 9 " 1867 9 10
Diamant	2,381 2 "	2,33,363 9 " 2,37 2 "
Salamee m. Ale 11 " July	1731 14 "	1706 11 " " " 262 "
Cement Collection	1946 15 "	327 2 " " " 1419 13 "
Cassa	15 384 15 "	16,342 12 " 1137 13 "
Pflaume	26 1 "	13 12 " 19 11 "
Pflaume	1382 3 "	1946 13 " 364 10 "
Pflaume	16,992 3 "	18,333 7 " 1342 2 "
Pflaume	" " " " " "	" " "
Diamant	16,992 3 "	18,533

Comment

Balance in the Hands of Sally

Comment Collection

Balance

Amount Received

Total

25.373	10	"	25.318	8	"	"	"	"	235	2	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
25.373	10	"	25.318	8	"	"	"	"	235	2	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
25.373	10	"	25.318	8	"	"	"	"	235	2	"
1530	6	3	1242	5	10	"	"	"	288	"	3
24.043	3	9	24.076	2	2	32	14	3	"	"	"
8.102.48	15	"	8.43.409	3	"	33	160	4	"	"	"
43.291	1	"	30.902	13	"	"	"	"	12388	4	"
7.669.71	14	"	8.12.806	6	"	43.348	8	"	"	"	1
328	11	"	938	1	"	409	6	"	"	"	1
8.694	7	"	42.712	2	"	34.017	11	"	"	"	1
7.759.81	"	"	8.33.935	9	"	79.973	9	"	"	"	"
496.26	6	7	7.805	4	4	"	"	"	21.821	1	10
726.354	9	10	8.281.51	4	8	101.796	10	10	"	"	4

Received

1932

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

28

Proceedings thereon.

Read again letter from the Acting Collector of Cuddapah dated 31st October and entered in Consultation 26th Ultimo.

The Board of Revenue are not aware of any objection to the Portions of Aayacut Bunjee land in the Gopagoodipilly Village exhibited in the Statement forwarded by Mr. Lavie being assigned in remuneration to the Reddy in the absence of any Reddy Enam in that Village. The Acting Collector will take the necessary steps for that purpose accordingly.

Read again letter from the acting Collector of Cuddapah dated 20th October and entered in Consultation 9th Ultimo.

Ordered that the following address be submitted together with the above-mentioned letter and the previous Correspondence on the subject.

29

To the Chief Secretary to Government.

To the Chief Secretary to Government.

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request that you will lay before the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the accompanying Papers, and obtain sanction for the payment to Lutch-

To the Collr. of Cuddapah 17th Sept. 1840 From Do. 20th Oct. in Cons. 9th Nov.

=mana

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

=mana Row of the sum of Rupees 251-8-6 being the amount of Collections from certain Enam land during the time it was under assumption by the Officers of Government.

The facts of the case are stated in Mr. Lavie's Endorsement on Petition No. 293 of 1840. It appears that on the death of one Appoo Row in Fusly 1243 the Enam land in question, which had come into his possession by gift from Chenchamah the Widow of the Enamdar entered in the Survey accounts, was taken under the management of the Government Officers in consequence of the absence of his heir, Kistnah Row, his brother, and that the income as it accrued was placed in deposite; that neither the land nor the money in deposite was delivered to Kistnah Row when he subsequently claimed them, but that this Person having executed a deed of gift to his nephew Lutchmana Row, the land was given over to the said Lutchamana Row by order of the Sub Collector in

1932 5

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

No. 1004 of 1837
" 411 of 1838
" 293 of 1840

in Fusly 1244 Lutchmana Rawer in his Petitions submitted herewith applies for payment of the amount of Collections made by Government which the acting Collector would decline making over to him, because he thinks his title is liable to question on the part of one Vencata Row, to whom Chenchummah gave the land, before she presented it to Appoo Row. As Vencata Row, however, is stated to have declined the gift, and to have returned the document conferring it, the Board conceive that the subsequent gift to Appoo Row was valid and that the Collections from the Enam which have been carried from the Head of Deposite to the Credit of Government should be paid to Lutchmana Row to whom the land seems to have passed in a legal manner.

3 The delay in submitting this reference was occasioned by the non receipt of the original Petitions of Lutchemana Row from Cuddapah till the 14th Instant.

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
24th December 1840

/Signed/ P. B. Smollett
Secretary
Redd

Comp. S.R.

1932 6

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Read again letter from the Collector of Chingleput dated 27th ultimo and entered in Consultation 7th Instant.

Ordered that the following letter be sent in consequence.

30

To the Register to the Court of Sudr Udalut.

Sir,

To the Regr to the Court of Sudr Udalut — Para 1.

With reference to the orders of Government noted in the margin, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to transmit to the Judges of the Sudr Udalut for the information of the Zillah Court of Chingleput, an account furnished by the Collector of that District, shewing the state of the revenues for Fusly 1249 of the Estates

28th in Cons 30th July 1839
17th in Cons 20th Dec. 1839

Enclosure No 3 in a letter from the Coll. of Chingleput dated 27th Nov. in Cons 7th Dec. 1840.

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Estates placed under this charge

by that Court -

2. The above Account

has been compared with the Ac

Accounts furnished by the Co

Collector to this Office and is cer

-tified to be correct -

Revenue Board Office
Fort St George
24th December 1840 —

(Signed) P. B. Smollett
Secretary

I hereby certify that the above has been compared with the Accounts furnished to this Office by the Collector of Chingleput and has been found to be correct -

(Signed) P. B. S.

Compd J.R.

Read

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Read the following letter.

31

From the Collr. of Chingleput.

Reporting on the present state and condition of a Choultry and Tank constructed at Coonnatoor by one Oodiacurren Lalah and recommending a grant of Rs. 1,000 for the support thereof -

To

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue -
Fort St. George -

Sir,

Para 1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter under date the 10th September, giving cover to a Petition presented by one Sagunnauth Prasad, relative to a Choultry and Tank constructed for charitable purposes at Coonnatoor on the road leading by that Village from Madras to Bangalore, and to report for the information of the Board of Revenue, that the Choultry alluded to was constructed by the Petitioner's late father Oodiacurren Lalah in 1832 and consists of two wings, one of which has been completed in the most substantial manner, whilst the other is as yet unfinished; but to complete which the required materials are now being collected by the Petitioner - The tank in front of the Choultry is of considerable size but the stone steps have not as yet been constructed -

2- The Choultry is one of great utility to native Travellers who resort to

to it in numbers from the assistance afforded to them by the Proprietor, whose expenses for the servants of the chaultry and other contingencies amount to Rupees 252—"—" per annum. The total outlay hitherto incurred by the proprietors in the construction of the Tank and chaultry amount, as near as can be ascertained, to Rupees 11,000.

3. The Petitioner's late father purchased from the Inhabitants of Coonnatoor 6 cs — 5/4 as of Punjey land assessed at Rupees 19—6—1 3/4 per annum, which he appropriated to the erection of the chaultry, the excavation of the Tank, and formation of a Garden for the benefit of the chaultry. The Petitioner requests that this land should be exempted from assessment, and that an additional grant of — 9 cs — 6 1/2 as of land bearing an assessment of Rupees 79—6—9 and situated on the southside of the chaultry should

should also be conferred on him as an endowment for the future maintenance of the institution. The inhabitants of Coonnatoor have at the same time expressed their willingness to part with those lands on behalf of the chaultry.

4. Under these circumstances I am inclined to recommend a compliance with the request of the Petitioner, on the stipulation that the grant shall be continued only so long as the chaultry is properly and sufficiently maintained.

Chingleput District,
Collector's Circuit Cutcherry,
Unjeikerry, 11th Decr. 1840.

/Signed/ A. Freese
Collector

Order thereon
(Read again in Cons. 11 Jany)
Forward at a future meeting.

Ordered to be brought

Read the following letter

To.
The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George.

Sir,

From the Pt. Collr. of North Arcot

With reference to the Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue bearing

bearing date the 12th Ultimo, I have the honor to submit for inspection, Copy of the Decree therein required—

North Arcot,

Principal Coll.rs Circuit Cutcherry, Pulicat, 12th December 1840—

Signed/ G.M. Ogilvie.
Principal Collector.

A.

Abstract translation of a Decree passed by J. D. Newbolt, Esqr. Register to the Zillah Court at Chittore, under date the 11th July 1816.

Suit No. 1426 of 1815—

Plaintiff—

Rasedally Khan of Arcot, Son of the late Ackeramuddy Khan, by Court Vakeel P. Annajee Row—

Defendants.

Abdul-Guffoor of Shaik Intra Bazar at Arcot, and Venkatasawmy Naick a shop keeper of the same place—

Plaintiff sues the Defendants for the recovery of certain rents due by the 1st Defendant, as renter, and the 2nd Defendant, as his security, on account of the rents of his Garden at Wunniveddy in the Cauvery paukum Talook, Comprizing Nunjah and Punjah lands to the extent of 16 ¼ Cawnies—

In his answer, the 1st Defendant denies the validity of the Plaintiff's claim, by stating that he had already paid all the rents due to him, and that the Plaintiff brought this suit falsely, it being known to him previously that an action was about to be brought against himself by the Defendant for the recovery of certain sums defrayed by him in digging a new well, and hedging the garden, as also for certain losses sustained by him, all of which the Plaintiff was according to the agreement executed by his Father, who granted the rent to the Defendant, bound to repay—

The 2nd Defendant disputes in his answer the justness of an action against himself, before the Plaintiff had adopted the necessary measures for the recovery of his dues from the Renter—

It is clearly proved to the Court that the 1st Defendant rented the Garden in question from the Plaintiff's father,

father, and that the 2nd Defendant became his security.—

The 1st Defendant adds in his answer that an agreement was forcibly taken from him, but it has been plainly shewn by evidence that, he Voluntarily executed a muchilka in favor of the Plaintiffs Father—

It has also been proved that the 1st Defendant did not dig a new well as asserted by him in his answer, but that he only repaired an old well—

With to regard to the Hedge, it has been proved that the 1st Defendant did make the hedge, but the Court are of opinion that he is not entitled to a compensation for it as he was bound to make the hedge according to the stipulations entered into by him in his Muchilka above adverted to—

Altho' the Plaintiff has consented by an agreement, to allow a

remission to the 1st Defendant of such sums as may be awarded by assessors, yet as the assessors have not as yet determined upon the sums to be remitted, the 1st Defendant can only have recourse to a suit against the Plaintiff for the recovery of any losses he may have sustained—

It appears that the loss said to have been sustained by the 1st Defendant by the prevention of irregation to the Garden in question, did not arise from any act on the part of the Plaintiffs, but from circumstances over which he had no controul—

It also appears by the evidence adduced, that the agreement adverted to above, was voluntarily executed by the 1st Defendant and not forcibly taken by the Plaintiffs—

The Defendant filed in the Court a Receipt for 10 Pagodas paid by him to the Plaintiffs in part payment of

of the Rent, and the Court believe this to be a genuine document.—

If the Defendant had paid the whole of the rents to the Plaintiff as asserted by him, he might have no doubt obtained receipts for them similar to that referred to above. The Court, therefore, decree that the sum of 10 Pagodas above adverted to, be deducted from the amount claimed by the Plaintiffs, and that the residue be paid with interest by the 1st Defendant to the Plaintiff as per account subjoined to the decree.

The Court further decree that in the event of the Plaintiff not being able to recover the amount from the 1st Defendant, the 2nd Defendant do pay the same; and that the Court charges be paid by the Defendants—

/True Abstract Translation/

/Signed/ P. Baseboo Pillay

Appeal Translator.

(33 - 34)

Order thereon. Ordered to be brought forward (Read again in Cause 28th Jany) at a future day.—

To

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George.

Sir,

(35)

From the Pr. Collr. in the N. Dn. of Arcot } Dated

Reporting upon the accompanying Petition No. 897 of 1840. presented by Tessya Moodeliar.

Petition & Enclosure returned.

I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of the 26th ultimo, with annexed Copy of a Communication from the Chief Secretary, with the Petition from Tessya Moodeliar inclosed, and directing me to report what has been done in the case of the Petitioner.

In the year 1822 I find an order from Mr. Cotton to the Tahsildar of 2 Sholinghur directing him to make enquiry into Tessya Moodeliar's right to the Meras of Billagoondum, and if he finds his claim proved, to put him in possession; upon this the opposite party presented a petition to the Collector denying Tessya Moodeliar's

Modeliar's right to t he Mera, and after that t he matter appears to have been taken before t he Civil Court - but t he Court passed no order, as t he suit, I am informed, was depending when Regulation VII of 1831 was promulgated and accordingly it was struck off the File.-

3 The claims of the Petitioner however were reported upon at length in Mr. Roberts' letter to the Board of Revenue dated t he 20th May 1834, Mr. Roberts giving his opinion "that the most satisfactory mode of settling the dispute would be by reference to a Punchayet, and that he had demanded of t he parties t heir willingness or objection to t he measure, when Sopiya Modeliar and the Ramanuars gave individually a written assent, the Brahmins (other Muttadars) refusing".

Subsequently

4 Subsequently I find, t his difficulty was got over, - t he Brahmins assenting to t he Punjayet and Mr. Roberts again directed t hem to t he Tahsildar of Sholinghur by a Tahseed dated 1st September 1834 to have the claim decided by Punjayet - The whole party, t he Brahmins included, giving t heir written Consent on t he 18th October 1834 -

5 An endorsement was sent to me by the Board of Revenue on Petition No 137 of 1836 (presented by Sopiya Modeliar, adverting to his former addresses and complaining of the inattention of the Principal Collector to his case) desiring me to State by endorsement what steps had been taken for the purpose of adjusting the claims of the Petitioner, which t he Board observed had been reported upon at length by Mr. Roberts. To this I made no return because

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

because I could not discover where the principal individual Concerned (Sopspa Modeliar) was to be found. My orders were repeated on several occasions to learn if the Punyayet had assembled according to the assent of all the parties, and the Tahsildar's reply invariably was that he, Sopspa Modeliar could not be found, that he was moving about from one place to another, that he was supposed to be at Madras presenting petitions to the Government, and apparently discontented with the agreement he had entered into to abide by the award of the Punyayet.

To this time he has not made his appearance, the Punyayet is now ready to decide his Case, the parties are only awaiting for him and whenever he returns, they are prepared to go into the enquiry.—

Sopspa.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

Sopspa Modeliar in his Petition to Government carefully avoids alluding to the Punyayet, he is aware of that this mode of settling his case has been agreed upon by himself and the others concerned, and he is dissatisfied, I imagine with the arrangement, but he should be ordered to abide by it, he having given his written Consent, as before stated on the 18th October 1834, the original document to that effect, being in the Tahsildar's Cutcherry at Sholinghur.

North Arcot, — — —
Dt. Collr's Ct. Cutcherry,
Publicat, 12th December 1840.

Signed G. W. Agilvie
Princ. Collector.

Ordered that the following letter be submitted together with the foregoing letter.—

So.

(35 - 36)

To The Chief Secy to Government Fort St. George

To The Chief Secy to Government Pub. Cons. 26th Nov. 1840

To

The Chief Secretary to
Government
Fort St. George.

Sir

Para 1. In reply to your letter of the 7th November, transmitting an original Petition No. 697 of 1840. herewith returned, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request you will lay before the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the accompanying letter from the Principal Collector of North arcot reporting upon the Steps taken to adjust the Petitioner's Claims.

Pub. Cons. 24th Dec. 1840

2 From this Communication it will be seen that the delay in the Settlement of Sossia Moodeliar's Case has been entirely owing to his own act in Neglecting to attend in Person before the Constituted authorities of the district in order that the Cause may be decided by Punchayet - all Parties having given their written Consent to abide by the award that tribunal may pronounce -

Revenue Board's Office,
Fort St. George,
24th December 1840.

Signed P. B. Smallett
Secretary.

Read

Read the following letter

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

(37)

From the Pr. Coll. in the Pr. Div. of Arcot

Sir

Para 1. Adverting to the Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 29th April 1839, in which the Right Honorable the Governor in Council was pleased for the present to accede so far to the recommendation of the Board of Revenue as to permit Soonkoo Chengleroy Chitty, Cottah Chinnapah Chitty, and Venkatroy Chetty Securities to Chengalapah and Tummanah Renters of the Sayer Frontier Chowkies in Fusly 1242 to pay the sum of Rupees 3000 Three thousand in three annual Instalments, I have the honor to report that two of the sureties, Soonkoo Chengleroy Chetty and Cottah Chinnapah Chetty have fulfilled their engagement for the past year, but that Venkatroy Chetty

Recommending that Venkatroy Chetty one of the securities of Tummanah and Chengalapah late Frontier Sayer Renters of Fusly 1242 may be continued in Suit if he objects any longer to become a party with the other sureties to pay 3,000. Rs. by three annual instalments.

Chitty, the other surety, declines becomming a party to the arrangement, considering himself no longer liable, as surety for the defaulters.—

2— In the Petition No. 55 of 1839 transmitted to me in the Boards' letter of the 4th February 1839, the Petitioners Soonkoo Chengleroy Chitty and Cottah Chennapah Chitty engage for themselves and the other surety, Vencatroy Chitty and although the name of the latter is not attached to the Petition, his obligation is equally the same with theirs, being one of the defaulter's Securities.—

3 There were originally as the Board know, four Securities, Goorabasapah, Soonkoo Chengleroy Chitty, Cottah Chinnapah Chitty and Vencatroy Chitty.—

4 Goorabasapah was incarcerated for two years and the other three fled the country and could

could no where be discovered, until two of them of their own accord made the proposal in their Petition No. 55 of 1839 which was acceded to. Vencatroy Chitty has only been discovered within the last month and because he did not Petition the Board, as a party to the arrangement, he does not consider himself bound to abide by it.—

5 The Petitioners took occasion in their Petition to observe on the absence of the other surety Vencatroy Chitty, and pray the Board to order him to pay his share of the instalment. The Government in their Minute of the 29th April 1839, see the justness of this and hold him equally liable for the due fulfilment of the instalment.—

6— There can be no doubt of his liability as he is one of the defaulters

defaulters securities, and the plea he sets up of not having signed the Petition which the other two Sureties presented to the Board, cannot of course, in any manner relieve him from his share of responsibility — It has been proved, and by his own confession, that he has had the command of money, and that too very lately — He acknowledges to have received more than 500 Rupees recovered from Suits filed in Court, and from individuals owing him money, notes a rupee of which has he made over to Government —

I have discovered that he has still money owing to him and that he will obtain it, and considering that he is in every way liable with the other Sureties, I strongly recommend that he may be immediately confined in Jail, if he objects —

any

any longer to become a party with the others for the punctual fulfilment of their engagement. —

North Arcot — — — — — — }
Principal Coll.rs Circuit Cutcherry, } (Signed) G. M. Ogilvie
Pulicat 16th December, 1840. — } Principal Collector.

Ordered to be brought forward at a future day. —

(Read again in Cons.n 11th January)

37 - 38

Read the following letter —

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue —
Fort St. George —

From the P.l Coll.r in the S.th D.n of Arcot —

39

Sir,

Amaniendar named Sooreyanarrain Buttacloo having preferred a claim to the sum of Rupees 16 — 3 — a/ being the amount of the teervah of 10 1/2 of Tunjie Land which was brought to Summah in Fusly 1249 under the orders of the Board, I have the honor with reference to the whole Correspondence on the subject, as entered in the margin, to request instructions — The applicant it appears

23d January 1840.

To B.d 7th Nov.r 1839.
From D.o 28th Jan.y 1840
To D.o 17th June —
From D.o 20th July —
To D.o 6 August —
From D.o 7th D.o —

At the end of the 2d Para of this Summd it is stated "the loom tax is to be remitted for ever" and from the want of Connection this sentence has to that preceding it, it bears some appearance of interpolation.—

Mr Kindersley in his report to the Board of the 31st May 1832 recommended Compensation being granted to the Pagoda of Terbavanum, as well as to other Suvamaniendars in lieu of their right to the moturpha Collection resumed by Government, and the grounds of Mr Kindersley's recommendation were that the Collections had been previously made for the support of certain charitable institutions— upon further examination, this does not appear to be the case in the present instance as the exemption or otherwise does not affect the Pagoda of Terbavanum; for loom Tax collections were never made on account

appears grounds his claim upon the last division of the Board and if it is favorably entertained, I request that the necessary Sanction of Government may be obtained for refunding the amount in question Rupees 16 3 —

Trenomalee
South Arcot,
Pr Coll. Circuit Cutcherry
3 December 1840

/Signed/ W. Ashton
Principal Collector

39 . 40

Order thereon
(read again in Cons. 11th January)

Ordered to be brought forward at a future meting.—

Read the following letter—

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

41.

From the Asst. Coll. of Tanjore

Reporting on certain petitions claiming exemption from moturpha on the plea of their possessing a Duffer Roka granted by the late Amarsing Rajah.

Sir

I have the honor to report on the Petitions noted in the margin.—

Petitioners claim exemption from moturpha on the plea of their possessing a Duffer Roka granted by the late Amarsing Rajah. Copy and translation of which are annexed hereto.—

At

account of it previously— The compensation sanctioned by Government under date the 14th march 1838 has therefore not been made and Petitioners have been called on to pay this Tax to the Government like all other weavers in the District—

The duffer Roka possessed by Petitioners was evidently granted to them to encourage their settlement in the Village. It appears more in the shape of a Coolie to remain in force till its purpose was attained than a sicca Sunnud, and I am of opinion that Petitioners' claim for Compensation on the strength of this document cannot be admitted, even though all suspicion of the interpolation above noticed be removed— The same document would exempt them from half all Sayer duties which they as well as others have invariably paid in full to the Government, and would also confer similar privileges on

on all other persons gaining a footing within the limits of the Village. Petitioners however are certainly exposed to some increased hardship in paying both house and loom Tax to Government in addition to heavy manaypagoody to the Pagoda and as the payment of loom tax has been demanded from them only since the orders of Government of the 14th March 1838 and the Pagoda Servants still claim from them their manapagoody according to the 4th Para of the Duffer Roka they produce, and as the sum thus realized is applied to the support of the Pagoda, it would seem advisable to direct the discontinuance of this Collection on the Pagoda's account and to grant Compensation to the Pagoda to the amount of the loss it would sustain.—

× Rs. a
120 — 8

I have to add that the Collection of manapagoody has been postponed since July 1248 and that it will

will be necessary should the Board approve of my suggestion to pay to the Pagoda the arrears since that period — As the sanction of Government has been given to a larger amount of Compensation than that now proposed, application for fresh sanction will thus be unnecessary —

156 Rs.

Tanjore, Vellum 9th December 1840

(Signed) H. C. Montgomery
Acting Principal Collector

A

Translate of a duftar Roka dated 1794 granted to Soobachetty of Paramacoody thro' whose medium the five Castes of Silkweavers of Paramacoody were to inhabit Terbavanum otherwise called Ameersenga Maharajapooram in order to establish looms, weave cloths, of the Paramacoody and other musters and to carry on trade there, shewing the privilege the Circar proposed to grant them. —

1 Thatched houses within the value of chaks 10 each to be built and given

given to the weavers that have come. An advance of Portonovo Pagodas 1500 in Cash and 1500 in Sumba Peshanum grain to be given from the Circar to enable them to carry on their trade.

2 This 3000 Pagodas is to be recovered from them without interest for the 1st year and if a further advance be made in the next, it is to be recovered with interest. The loom Tax is to be remitted for ever.

Supposed to have been interpolated

3 The Sayer duty is to be remitted for two years upon silk thread, Cotton, Goldwire, dying articles, Grain, Sundry articles, leaves, Vegetables, Oil, Ghee, and other articles of domestic Consumption that are brought by the weavers who shall have built houses. On the 3d year one-fourth of the duty to be collected upon them till the fourth year. From the 5th a moiety to be collected annually. A moniem of 2 out of

of 10 fanams of the amount of Sayer &c.
Collections to be granted to Soobachetty the
Nattamaygar who is the head of the
weavers and the remaining 8 fanams
to be collected on account of Circar—

4 The taxe leviable upon the
houses of weavers &c. is to be remitted
for two years. From the third year they
are to pay to the Pagoda of Tirbanasum
house taxe at 6 fanams per annum—

5 The Cavilgars are to
have no Concern in the cases of &c.
adultery that may occur among the &c.
people of the weaver Castes residing
in the said Village which they are
to punish themselves.—

6 Places to be allotted to the
Poorageduns and Punchangacars &c. &c.
Bramins and their dependants for building
10 houses—

"

This &c.

This is to be complied with
and no delay to be made on a plea that &c.
new documents should be drawn annually—
Copy of this is to be retained and the &c.
original returned to the said Chetty—
11th Jillge Month.

(Signed) Dupter Sheristadar,
Pelungamavis
Moordapasooth.—

(True Translation)
(Signed) H. C. Montgomery
Acting Principal Collector

41 . 42
Order thereon.
(Read again in Cons.
28th January)

Ordered to be sent again in Circulation

Read again letter from &c.
the Collector of Trichinopoly dated 28th
Ultimo and Entered in Cons. 17th Instant;

43
Proceedings thereon—

Mr. Onslow has been
already apprized of the disinclination of
the Board of Revenue and of Government
to resort to the extreme measure of a &c.
sale of defaulters' lands except &c.
when &c.

when recourse to such a measure is unavoidable, but under his assurance that in the cases now selected an example is required to prevent Ryots fraudulently withholding the Circar dues, they are pleased to sanction the sale proposed—

2 The Board observe that of the whole balance sought to be recovered by the present sale Rupees 4,249—3—10¾ Rupees 1,032—9— only accrued in Fusly 1239, and that in some instances no balance is due subsequent to Fusly 1213— The system of permitting arrears to accumulate in this way and finally to proceed to a sale of the defaulters lands is open to much objection— The demand of each year should be promptly enforced if properly demandable or written off in due course, if there was just cause

cause for remission—

Read the following letter—

To,

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

44

Sir

From the Collr. of Trichinopoly

Having mislaid the Copy I caused to be taken of the appeal petition forwarded with my letter of the 19th August I have the honor to request that you will

19357 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

will be good enough to furnish me with a Copy of the same at your earliest convenience.—

Trichinopoly, Collector's Cutcherry, 1st December 1840.

(Signed) A. P. Onslow.
Collector

Ordered &c

19358. Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Order thereon Read again 15th March

44-45

Ordered to be sent again in Circulation.

46

From the Collr of Trichinopoly — Reporting on petition 1273 of 1840. from the Zemindar of Yeroomayputty of the Salem District about the debt of Mouroo Sumberan of the Rock Pagoda.

To The Secretary to the Board of Revenue Fort St. George.

Sir,

Para 1. With reference to the Board's endorsement on petition No 1273 of 1840. from the Zemindar of Yeroomayputty in Salem, praying that measures may be taken to procure payment of a sum of Money due to her by the Sumberam of the Rock Pagoda at Trichinopoly. I have the honor to state that the petitioner has produced two bonds for Rupees 1,500 which was lent to the Sumberam by her late husband — and that Rupees 950-8-"— are due on the bond up to the 12th December 1840. as appears from the Accompanying Statement.

2. The debt is admitted by the Sumberam thro' his Vakeel of whose

(1359.) Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

whose / the Vakeels / deposition I send a Copy and a Translation and the Money is said to have been appropriated to the performance of Ceremonies in the Pagoda —

Under these circumstances I beg to be informed whether I am to pay the debt out of the surplus funds of the Pagoda or whether the Petitioner is to be referred to the Civil Courts. I am not aware of any objection to the payment being made as the surplus funds arise from lands of which no part of the proceeds would have been paid into the public treasury had the lands been under the management of the Sumberam instead of being under attachment. —

Tuchinopoly — — }
Collector's Cutcherry }
3d December 1840 }

/ Signed A. P. Onslow
Collector

Statement

(1360.) Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 1.

Statement shewing the amount borrowed by Sumberam of the Rock Pagoda situated in the Town of Tuchinopoly from Eriamapedoured zemindar of Yeroomapatty &c. of the Salem District.

	Principal amount.	amount of Interest calculated at 9 per Cent per annum	Total.
	Pr. A O	Pr. A O	Pr. A O
Amount borrowed on the 19th August 1831.	1,000 " "		
Interest from Do. to 12th Decr. 1840	" " "	840 " "	1840 " "
Amount borrowed on the 8th Augt. 1833	500 " "		
Interest from Do. to 12th Decr. 1840	" " "	322 8 "	822 8 "
	1500 " "	1162 8 "	2662 8 "

Deduct.

Amount repaid by the Sumberam to the above creditor from 12th Novr. 1831 to 12th December 1840 at different dates	1011 " "	
Counter Interest from Do. to Do.	" " "	698 " " 1709 " "
Balance due to the Creditor		953 8 "

/ Signed A. P. Onslow
Collr.

Translation

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 2.

Translations of a Bond executed by Mounatumberan Swamy Avergul Manager to Soymanswamy Pagoda to Yerrum Pedda-reddy residing at Yaroomayputty of the Salem District, on the 26th Auvanee year Vyah corresponding to 1833—

That it being necessary for me to borrow from you the sum of Rupees 150 besides the amount of Rupees 350 borrowed on the 15th Aunee last, which aggregates the sum of Rupees 500 for the performance of the Poonjah expense which I promise to pay the principal and Interest at 9 per Cent per Annum. I further bind to pay the amount at Rupees 100 per each Instalment from the Month of Aspey to Chitteray from the proceeds of the Custamputty Village after discharging the whole amount — I shall receive the remittance from them — —

I

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

executed this bond with my own Consent —

This bond drawn out by Palaniyandi Pillay of Malacoil —

Witnesses —
Signed Syemperumal Pillay —
" Cadderamien son of Venkatachellum Manager of Custamputty —
" Moossoomien Son of Do —
" Appavien —
" Venkatachellamien —

For this amount of 500 Rupees —

Signed Soymanswamy Pavagadien

Translation of a Bond executed by Mounatumberanswamy Avergul Manager to Soymanswamy Pagoda situated on the Rock at Trichinopoly to Yerrum Pedderedy residing at Yaroomayputty of the Salem District on the 5th Aunee year Khara Corresponding to 19th August 1831 —

That it being necessary for me to borrow from you the sum of Rupees 1,000 to defray the expense of Ashtabundanums and Coomba-bahabashanums to the above swamy — I bind myself to pay the principal, and

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

and Interest at 9 per Cent per annum, which I promise to discharge the whole sum by the Monthly Rists from the proceeds of the Cuttamputty Village situated in the Talook of Tonriore.—

I execute this bond with my free will and Consents.—

Witnesses.
(Signed) Venkatachellamien
" Appavien.
" Nullatumbiah pillay.

For the amount of 1000 Rupees.
This bond drawn out by me
Palaneeappen in presence of
the above witnesses.

(True translations.)
(Signed) A. P. Onslow
Collector.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 3.

Translate of a Deposition taken before A. P. Onslow Esqre. Collector of Trichinopoly from Paramasevum pillay Vakeel of Mouna Tumberan of Rock Pagoda on the 23d December 1840.

2. Hear the Petition now read to you which was presented to the Board of Revenue by Veerama[illegible] Zemindar of Yarroomapputty [illegible] attached to the Nambal Talook in the Salem district, stating that certain sums were due to her by Mounah Tumberan; and tell what you may have to state regarding it?—

A. I have heard the Petition read to me. It is true that the amount as mentioned in the Petition was borrowed, and that certain sums also were repaid in part of it,— but the balance still remaining to be due, and the proceeds of the interest on it, are to be paid after they have been ascertained by examining the accounts.

2. For what purpose was the amount borrowed?

A. Part of the amount was borrowed in the year 1831 for the expence of ashtabundanum which was performed in that year to Soymanaswamy of

1935. Fort St. George 24th December 1820.

of Rock Pagoda and parts was borrowed in the year 1833 for the expenses of daily poojah which was likely to be put off owing to the remittances from the Villages not having been received for some time.—

2d— Is the sum expended on account of each item distinctly entered in the accounts.—

A— The amounts borrowed is credited in the accounts— that sum together with the amount realized from the Villages was expended. The expenses are entered in detail in the accounts which will be found either among the Cudjans that were sealed and brought to the Hoogoor Cutchery or among those kept sealed in the Rock Pagoda.—

/Signed/ Paramaseran Pillay
Vakeel.

/A true translation/
/Signed/ A. P. Onslow
Coll.r

Ordered

1936. Fort St. George 24th December 1820.

Ordered to be brought forward at a future day.—

Read the following letter.

Order thereon—
(Read again in/d 11th January)

46-47

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George.

Sir,

From the Pl. Coll.r of Madura—:

48 In answer to your letter of the 23d ultimo, just received, I have the honor to inform you Mr. Irvines duties were confined to the Zemindary of Ramnad— and a small portion of the Shevagunga coast— his head Quarters were at Ramnad where there being no public buildings he is, under the rules in force, entitled to Mins. Con. 4th April 1836. Extra Tent allowance each day—

Madura,
2d December 1820.

/Signed/ J.n Blackburne.
Principal Collector.

Under the explanation

Resolution thereon.

48-49 furnished in the foregoing letter, the Board

19307 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Board sanction the amount of Extra Sent allowance drawn by the Acting Head Assistant, Mr. Irvine, for 221 days during the past fasly 1249.—

Read again letter from the Acting Collector of Tinnevelly dated 30th Ultimo and entered in Consultation 17th Instant.—

(50)

Proceedings thereon.— The Board of Revenue, under the circumstances stated in the foregoing letter and with reference to the Original document therewith transmitted, do not see sufficient grounds for recommending to Government the continuance of the Salt Monium adverted to in this Correspondence in arrear to Shenbaga Cunno Pilley and Mootia Pilley.—

The Document forwarded by the Acting Collector is ordered to be returned.—

(51)

From the Pt. Coll. of Combatore.— Read letter submitting an

19308. Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

an application from the Sub Collector H. Bird requesting an extension of leave for 6 weeks to remain at the Presidency on private affairs.—

(51.- 52)

Order thereon.— Submitted for the favorable consideration of Government through the Civil auditor, with reference to the resolution of Government dated 30th November, published in the Fort St. George Gazette under date 1st December 1840.—

Read again letter from the Acting Principal Collector of Malabar dated 21st Ultimo and entered in Consultation 17th Instant.—

Ordered that the above mentioned letter be submitted together with the following address.—

(53)

To The Chief Secretary to Government. Fort St. George.

To the Chief Secy. to Government. Sir, Para 1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request that you will submit for the orders of

21st November inclt
17th December 1840.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

of Government the accompanying letter from the acting Principal Collector of Malabar, regarding an application for the grant of a Puttah for the land now held by Lord Elphinstone at Kaitee on the Neilgherry Hills.-

2. It will be observed from the Correspondence with Government noted in the Margin, which took place on the promulgation of Act No IV of 1837 - that its provisions were not considered to interfere with the existing rules for building leases on the Neilgherries, and in Contonments & elsewhere and as the lands at Kaitee now held by Lord Elphinstone are occupied by Buildings, the Board are of opinion that a lease on the usual terms should be obtained.-

To Govt 30th Oct 1837. Para 3- From Do 13th Nov inclt 16th Do Do.

3. With these observations the Board beg to submit the Case for the orders of Govt

Revenue Bd Office, Fort St. George, 24th December 1840. } Signed P. B. Smollett. Secretary.

Read.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Read the following letter

To The Secretary to the Board of Revenue Fort St. George.

(54)

From the Ag. Pl. Coll. of Malabar.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward Copy of a letter from Mr. Sub Collector Goodwyn proposing that lands in the Contonment of Ootacamund, for which there are more than one applicant be put up to public auction.-

The suggestion appears worthy of Consideration, and I beg to recommend it to the notice of Government.-

Malabar Pl. Collr. Office on Circuit, Nelumboor, 3d December 1840. } Signed H. V. Conolly. & Ag. Princ. Collector.

A

To The Acting Principal Collector of Malabar.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward two letters+ one from surveyor Williams and the second from Mr. Joachim, by which you will perceive that Messrs. Joachim and

+ to be returned.

*the alleged permission dates as far back as Coll. Crew's time-

and Burns each claim prior permission from the Officer Commanding on the Hills to occupy a certain spot of ground:-

It appears to me that the best way to settle such disputes would be to put up to auction the disputed ground. the highest bidder to become possessed of the same rights only as are possessed by persons having the permission of the Officers of Government to occupy the ground --

I would therefore suggest that the permission of the Board of Revenue be requested to put up to auction the right to occupy on the usual terms any land on the Hills that may be applied for by more applicants than one --

Malabar, Sub Collr's Office, Signed T. W. Goodwyn-
Tellicherry, 28th Novr 1840.- Sub Collector-

Order thereon-

Ordered to be brought forward at a future day --

Read again in Cons 11th Janry 1841

(54-55.)

Read the following letter

To

(56.)

From the Asst Collr of Madras - - - - - Para 1.

Reporting the result of an enquiry into the Statements of one Ponnapillay Containeg in his Petitions to the Bd and Govt wherein by it is shewn that he merely Complains of the acts of the Durmakurthas of the Town Pagoda Noorookistna Moodely and Sucheswaria Moodely and not of any of the Cutcherry Servants, and that he does not know how those petitions which are in English may have been written

Board's No 1572 dated 30th Decr 1840-

To, The Secretary to the Board of Revenue Fort St George.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter under date the 30th Ultimo, transmitting, by order of the Board of Revenue, a Petition from "Ponnapillay Cernum of the Town Pagoda of Madras" presented to Government, with its Enclosures. being Copies of his two Petitions to the Board, and calling upon me to report upon the Petitioner's Statements relative to that Pagoda, at the earliest opportunity; and to state what Proceedings I may have adopted in reference to the Board's Endorsement of 1st June last.

2. The letter under acknowledgment having reached this Office on the 3d Instant, a peon was dispatched immediately to require the petitioner to attend on the following day. He agreed, at first to do this, but on the 4th he said he could

could not attend before the J.d. Having accordingly appeared before me at that date, I interrogated him on the different points adverted to in his petition to Government, as well as in the one to the Board dated 11th September last, and I now submit a translation of his examination. It will be seen that he denies each of the several allegations contained in those Petitions respectively in respect to the Heads of this Department as he states that he simply complained of the acts of the Durmakarthas, Mooddookistnah Moodelly and Lutchmanah Moodelly and not of "any of the Cutcherry Servants" and that Mr. D'Vaz having spoken "something to himself in English" on seeing his petition bearing the Board's Endorsement of 1st June he "thought" that "he was angry" and "being Lutchoomanah Moodelly's Agent" he stated that "he used his best endeavours for him", but that he, the Petitioner himself "never" "spoke to / Mr. D'Vaz /, nor did he make use of any disgraceful language to / him /"

Encls. No. 1.

1st Head Clerk & Record Keeper.

as

as regards his Statement that Lutchoomanah Moodelly had committed certain embezzlements to which Mr. D'Vaz was accessory, he explains that he "merely stated in the petition that Mooddookistna Moodelly and Lutchoomanah Moodelly had committed frauds" and not that Mr. D'Vaz had "been accessory to them" adding that he "dictated in Tamil that Mooddookistnas Moodelly and Lutchoomanah Moodelly had committed frauds, as stated above. How the Petition may have been written in English / he does / not know"

3. He also admits that Mr. D'Vaz "did not intimidate, or say that he would ruin those that Petitioned against Mooddookistna Moodelly and Lutchoomanah Modelly neither did he give any orders to the Cutcherry Peons to prevent / his / approaching / me / with any petition"

4. As Mr. D'Vaz on reading the Petitioner's examination, told me that his Statement that he is now Lutchoomanah Moodelly's Agent was equally untrue with the rest, I wished to re-examine the Petitioner, but

but he left the Cutcherry the moment his previous examination was signed - although he was desired to wait until I permitted him to go away - on sending two peons to require him to appear before me again on the 8th Instant he declined to do so, and assured them that he had never preferred any complaint against Mr. D'Vaz or any of the other servants, that the several questions put to him on the previous day were quite foreign to the object and intention of his petitions to the Board and Government, and that his further attendance was, therefore unnecessary.

Vide Declarations given by peons Chenglerayen and Yakoob 11th Decr. 1840.

3rd. Although the Petitioners re-examination on the point referred to above is not of any great importance and there can, therefore, be little or no necessity for pursuing the enquiry further, still Mr. D'Vaz, has produced certain original letters of 1835 addressed to him by Mr. P. Cator, the then Registrar to the Supreme

Supreme Court, which shew clearly that the former ceased to be Agent for Lutchoomanah Moodelly and his Brothers in that year when the latter was appointed instead. I have since ascertained from Lutchoomanah Moodelly himself that their joint Power of Attorney to Mr. Cator is dated 14th August 1835, which is now with Mr. N. B. Acworth the present Registrar.

From M. Lutchoomanah Moodelly 12th Decr. 1840.

The above is, I think a complete refutation of the whole of the charges against the Cutcherry Servants: and in further proof of it, I beg reference to my letter of date the 25th August last. No. 78 from which it will be seen that, instead of the "appointment" of Lutchoomanah Moodelly being "recommended" as stated by the Petitioner in his Petition to Government, I submitted that his request to be appointed Dummakurtha "was inadmissible," in consequence of his Brother Mooddookristna Moodelly having assumed the management of the Town Pagoda under a Decree of the

Fort St George 24th December 1840

the Supreme Court which provides "that it be referred to the Master to enquire and report who is or are the proper person or persons, from time to time to have the Management" thereof due regard being had to the fact of it's having been founded by "Manally Mooddookistna Moodelly the Grand father of the Complainant" the late Acting Durmakurtha "out of his own private Monies" and that further "without prejudice to such enquiry as aforesaid, the said Complainant, Manaly Mooddookistna Moodelly, as the eldest son of the eldest branch of the family of Manally Mooddookistna Moodely deceased, be at liberty, in the mean time, and until the Master shall have made his report to exercise the functions of Durmakurtha or warden." Having obtained correct information that the Master's report and the final Decree of the Supreme Court had not yet been procured. I suggested that this Office could not "interfere in any way in the

Selection

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Selection or appointment of a Durmakurtha"

7. With respect to the arrears of the Maganiah allowance to the Pagoda up to the date of the late Acting D'hurmakurtha's death which the Petitioner in his Petition to Government stated were "recommended" to be paid to Lutchoomanah Modelly, it will be observed from my letter of the 25th August, that I stated that "I shall have to submit a separate report after a careful examination of the Pagoda accounts &c" "delivered in some time ago." The Board informed me in reply, that they would pass orders in the matters of the Arrears when the report referred to in Para 4 of the letter under acknowledgment was before them." This report I have not yet submitted, and the arrears in question continue therefore continue still in deposit in this Office.

8. But it is not perhaps out of place to observe here that it is obvious from the result of the recent enquiry, that the Petitioner has been the ignorant and

mere

mere passive tool of one or more of the dissatisfied parties referred to in Para 6 of his Petition to Government, namely Apparow Moodelly Rungasawmy Moddelly and Rajah Gopaul Moodelly, the first of whom is employed by the Collector of Rajahmundry and the third is a Writer in the Government Office and the whole of whom are more immediately interested in the management of the Pagoda affairs. My conjecture would seem to receive confirmation from the Statement in Para 5 of the Petition to the Board dated 11th September, that "Apparow Moodelly "as the elder of the family of the founder "of the Pagodas is entitled to the Wardenship"

9 If I could have succeeded in eliciting positive or sufficient proof of the gross and unfounded allegations in the Petitions under consideration having originated with the individuals named above who are brothers. I shall have suggested some serious notice being taken of their conduct.

conduct, but the Petitioner who is himself a very insignificant man not only denies all Knowledge of what may have been written by way of complaint against the heads of this Office in his English Petitions to the Board and Government, but refuses to point out the writer thereof on the plea that he does not know where to find him. He states that he is "the Meerasy Curnum" of the Town Pagoda, and as such bound to keep the accounts as clear and harmless as possible." This is not true as Lutchoomana Moodelly has informed† me that the Curnumship alluded to is not a Meerasy Office, it having been bestowed by the Dummakarthas from time to time on persons of different families and Casts, that the Petitioner having been appointed by the late Tombeasepah was on a former occasion dismissed by himself and having been reinstated, he considered it advisable to throw up his situation long prior to

† From M. Lutchoomanah Moodelly 12th Dec. 1840.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

to Moddokistna Moodelly's death, on being depri-
ved of the joint situation of "Purveyor" for certain
frauds committed by himself and his son.

10. The Statement in the Petition to
the Board bearing their Endorsement of 1st
June last being merely a repetition of what
was represented in the Petitions previously de-
livered into this Office, as to Moodookistna
Moodelly not having credited certain sums of
Money in the Pagoda accounts, and the matter
being at the date of its receipt, under investiga-
tion, I could not dispose of it immediately.
There is not any evidence beyond the Petitioners
assertion that that Petition in which there is
not a word about himself, went into the
hands of Mr. Diaz before its delivery to Coulatty
Pillay the Translator who is in exclusive
charge of all papers connected with the
case, and who does not recollect at
this remote period, through whom it
was handed over to him.

The

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

The Petition under report is re-
11. turned herewith.

/ Signed / I. A. Huddleston.
Actg Collector

Madras, 12th December 1840.

A

Translation of the Examination of Ponnah Pillay as taken before I. A. Huddleston Esqre Acting Collector of Madras on the 7th December 1840.

You have presented a Petition to Government stating that some of the heads of this Office, taking advantage of Mr. Roberts's absence, have done something wrong respecting the Town Pagoda accounts. State now the particulars of your charges against those heads, and tell me who they are.?

In the Petetion presented to Government I merely stated that the Durmakurthas of the Town Pagoda Moodokistna Moodelly and Putchoomana Moodelly have done wrong respecting the Pagoda accounts, and not that any of the Cutcherry servants did so.

you say that your Petition of April last to the Board of Revenue referred to me by endorsement has displeased Mr D'Vaz where is this Petition, to whom did you deliver it, and how do you know that it has displeased Mr D'Vaz.

I delivered to you the Petition endorsed by the Board which you saw and sent me along with it in charge of a Peon to Mr D'Vaz. He on seeing the Petition spoke something to himself in English and sent it angrily to Cattely Pillay.

you say that Mr D'Vaz used all his endeavours to see Lutchmana Moodelly appointed Dirmakurtha. How do you know this? what do you mean by stating that he has treated you in a manner which modesty does not permit you to describe? Did you ever speak to Mr.

Mr D'Vaz being Lutchoomanah Moodelly's agent. I stated that he used his best endeavours for him. I thought that on reading the Petition, from the manner in which he was speaking to

Mr D'Vaz? If so tell me in whose presence you did so, and in whose presence did he make use of any disgraceful language to me like as your witnesses?

You say that Lutchmanah Moodelly has committed certain embezzlements to which Mr D'Vaz was accessary, you are now required to prove this charge against Mr D'Vaz.

I merely stated in the petition that Moodelly and Lutchoomanah Moodelly had committed frauds, and not that Mr D'Vaz had been accessary to them.

I dictated in Tamil that Mookdookistna Moodelly and Lutchoomanah Moodelly had committed frauds as stated above. How the Petition may have been written in English I dont know.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

You say that Mr. D'Vaz is Lutchoomanah Mooddelly's agent. Is he so now? Prove this by the Documentary evidence you speak of.

You say in your Petition to the Board dated 11th Septem= ber last that Mr. D'Vaz threat= ened to ruin such persons as were to complain against Mooddookistna Moodelly and Lutchmana Moodelly, and to prevent my obeying the Board's orders. You also say that he ordered the Peons round the Cutcherry not to let you approach me with your Statement. You are now required to prove all this and to name or point out the peons who received the orders you allude to?

I can prove by Documents.

When I was sent to Mr. D'Vaz with the Petition endors= ed by the Board I thought within myself that he was angry from his speak= ing to himself. He ded not intimidate or say that he would ruin those that Petitioned a= gainst Mooddookist= =nah Moodelly and Lutchoomanah Moo= =delly, neither did he give any orders to the Cutcherry Peons to prevent my approaching you with any Petition.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Do you actually know the Contents of this Petition to Government with Copies of the two Petitions to the Board therein enclosed?

I know nothing except that I wished to complain against Mooddookistna Moo= =delly and Lutchooma= =nah Moodelly and to say that Mr. D'Vaz was their agent.

Who has written these Petitions in En= =glish. Can you point out the Writer.

I will enquire and shew him if found.

/Signed/ Ponnah Pillay.

Before me 7th Dec. 1840.

/Signed/ J. A. Hudleston.
Ag. Collector.

†Note. The alleged Documents as to Mr. D'Vaz being the agent of Lutchoomanah Moodelly could not have been produced by Ponna Pillay as he said they were left in his House.

/Signed/ J. A. Hudleston.
Acting Collector

Ordered

Order thereon. Ordered to be sent again
/Read again in Cons. 11th Inst./ on Circulation.

54 - 57

Resolved that the following
letter be despatched together with a Copy
of the correspondence therein referred to

To The Principal Collector of
Nellore
Sir

58

To the Pr. Coll.r of Nellore
In Cons. 17th Aug.t 1840.

With reference to an Extract
from the Minutes of Consultation of the 30.th July
last, regarding a supply of white Kurkutch
Salt for export to Chittagong. Copy of which
was forwarded to you under date the
17th Instant, I am directed by the Board
of Revenue to transmit for your information
the accompanying transcript of a corres-
pondence received from Government with
Copy of their reply of date the 17th Instant.

11th Cons. 17th Dec.r 1840.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George, - - - - - - -
24th December 1840. - - -

/Signed/ P. B. Smollett.
Secretary

Resolved that the follow-
ing letters be despatched.

To

To The Acting Collector of
Tinnevelly

59

To the Ag. Coll.r of Tinnevelly

15711 of 1840.

Sir. I am directed by the Board
of Revenue to transmit for your early
enquiry and report, the accompanying Petition
from certain merasidars of the Village
of Parevelly Cattay in your District.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George, - - -
24th December 1840.

/Signed/ P. B. Smollett
Secretary.

To The Accountant General.
Acting Civil Auditor.
and
Sub Treasurer.
Committee for passing
contingent Charges.

60.

To the Acct. Genl.
Ag. Civil Auditor, &
Sub Treasurer -
Committee for
passing contin-
gent charges -

Gentlemen. With reference to the orders
of Government of the 5th August 1840. pub-
lished in the Fort St. George Gazette of the
28th of that Month, I am directed by the
Board

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Board of Revenue to forward the accompanying Bills of Contingent Charges incurred in this Office for the Month of November last, amounting to Rupees 18-15-11 and to request that they may be passed and returned to them.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
24th December 1840.

/ Signed / P. B. Scallett.
Secretary

Received the undermentioned Miscellaneous letters and Statements

61 From the Pl. Collector in the Nn. Dn. of Arcot. Abstract of Demand, Collection and Balance for the Month of November last.

62 From the Collr. of Chingleput. Abstract of Demand, Collection and Balance for the Month of November last.

63 From the Pl. Collector of Salem. Abstract of Demand, Collection and Balance for the Month of November last.

64 From the Pl. Collr. in the Nn. Dn. of Arcot. Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of November last.

From

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

From the Collr. of Chingleput. Statement shewing

65 the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of November last.

From the Pl. Collr. of Madura. Statement shewing

66. the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of November last.

From the Acting Collr. of Madras. Statement shewing

67 the Average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of Novr. last.

From the Pl. Collr. of Salem. Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain

68 and Salt for the Month of November last.

From the Collr. of Guntoor. Stating that the returns of Persons Charged with offences

69. and of Persons convicted and in confinement under Regulation IX of 1822 for the Month of November last are not sent, there being no entry to make.

From the Pl. Collr. of Nellore. Statement shewing

70 the Quantity of Salt in Store and ready for exportation on account of Chittagong

Indent

19391 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Indent of 1839/40 from 9th to 15th December 1840.

71 From the Pr. Coll. in the Nn. Dn. of Arcot. Requesting a supply of 1500 Salt Rowannahs.

72 From the Acting Pr. Coll. of Malabar. Requesting a supply of 2000 Salt Rowannahs for the use of his District.

71 - 73 Order on the two Abovementioned letters. Ordered to be supplied accordingly.

" Grant

" Walter Elliot

"