

Local & Munl. (1895) Department

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1604/M

DATED 5th October 1895

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition.

Withholding, under the authority quoted, the----from
P.K. Chathu, late Hospital Assistant, Tellicherry, to the Right
Honourable the Secretary of State for India praying that he
may be reinstated to his former post.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

The humble memorial of P. H. Chathu
late hospital assistant Chali, Tellicherry.

sheweth, *Jan*

That the undersigned most respectfully
is upon the precious moments of your
cil with the following humble memorial
hope that his sad case will excite the
excellency in council and at last he
that justice which is the proverbial
ign British nation.

1. He was in charge of the Chali
the Tellicherry Municipality from 1891

2. The Civil Surgeon and the municipal
to as to the authority and supervision
branch hospital and from party feeling
n insisted upon your excellency's humb
omissal from municipal service. The
ted most emphatically against this,
terms. "The charges against the
ant are almost all malacious. He giv
faction in the discharge of his duty. He
him the attendance at the Chali
d not be so good as it is. I therefore
that I cannot consciously dismiss him
l service. I would not be doing
did so. (para 3 enclosure I)

dismissal from municipal employment
a sufficient punishment for the
the hospital asstt referred to.
he dismissed the amount provided
t for the payment of his salary
t of the budget."

der dated 6th April 1891 no. 50m.mio

excellency in council will be pleased
above extracts that the order of

excellency's humble memorialist
orman's, but emanated from the

ent and therefore to say that he
d by the chairman and therefore
are ferial in the case is a matter

to your excellency's poor memorialist.
therefore most respectfully ventures

he discretionary power claimed by
nment in withholding his

the India Government is not
he facts and circumstances of his

chairman in the case he most
was to point out was a most

in through whom the preemprory
ndras Government have simply

ted to him.
Is the details of the facts and
circumstances

P.H.C

P.H.C

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

From the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tellicherry de-
trusting that the Government and the Surgeon-General would
ant Chathan is suspended for 2 months and not to be so very s

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of
No. 228.

In returning the letter referred to me for remarks under
the 11th March 1891, I have the honour to state that the charges
than Menon of the Chali Branch Dispensary are by no means so
man Municipal Council Tellicherry. He has been found guilty
being insubordinate and insolent to the Acting Civil Surgeon,
and under these circumstances I regret I cannot advise Govern-
case.

(ENCLOSURE A)

Order dated 6th April 1891 No. 50

The Government agrees with the Surgeon-General in
immediate dismissal from Municipal employment can be admit-
the misbehaviour of the Hospital Assistant referred to.
amount provided in the budget for payment of his salary will
Chairman will report, without delay, what action he proposes to

(Signed) O. V. BADI
Under

(True copy)

A. GOV

ENCLOSURE B.

No. 139.

FROM

The Ag. Civil Surge

To

The b
Muni

SIR,

In taking over charge of the Civil Dispensary and the
No. 187 of the 19th instant was brought to my notice by Mr.
that I, as Civil Surgeon, have any authority over the Branch
honor to inform you that prior to this there has been a Bran-
which was placed under the control of the Civil Surgeon with
the name branch signifies, it is dependant on the Main Dispa
working of the Main Dispensary it follows that I must have s
2. I am responsible to the Surgeon-General for the
and I fail to see how a correct monthly return can be ma
Dispensary when they are kept in the way they are done now

MENT.

the following paper.

ed 14th February 1891 No. 967

Re be satisfied if the Hospital Assist-
vere as to dismiss him.

Madras dated 18th March 1891

your endorsement No. 147 dated
against Hospital Assistant Cha-

trifling as assumed by the Chair-
of falsifying Hospital books, of
as well as neglectful of his duties
ment to alter its decision in his

M. Mis.

considering that nothing short of
ted as a sufficient punishment for
Should he not be dismissed, the
be struck out of the budget. The
to take in this matter.

ELY, MAJOR. R. E.

Secretary, P. W. D.

for chief Secretary.

NDAN,

Chairman.

CIVIL DISPENSARY TELLICHERRY.
23rd June 1890.

eon,
acherry.

Tell is Chairman,
ccipal Council,
Tellicherry.

station of Tellicherry, your letter
Cooper. In it you seem to doubt
Dispensary at Chali. I have the
ch Dispensary here (Tiruvangad)
out any question being raised. As
ary, and being responsible for the
supervision over the Branch.

correct submission of all returns,
de from the books of the Branch
I cannot see under what head

R.H.C

comparison" Which is clear
ant, Chathan, and pointed
the Hospital Assistant so
The books as directed

From the Surgeon-December, 1890, No. 832

With reference to the honor to report that from ever been employed in a letter from the President of Assistant Deputy Inspector at the Branch Dispensary and was treated, therapeutically in, April 1885, during which duty and insubordination a subordinate.

2. As regards the prescribed in the case seen from the enclosed was prescribed in another after inspection of both of Mr. Lafrenais are quite of Strychnine is an impression

The Surgeon-General the Hospital Assistant was to be found. I particularly wished to pal Council, Tellicherry with the Hospital Assistant, as he has already treated a case of Assistant, Chathan ought take the necessary precautions to prevent as far as possible the after a perusal of these its usual hot bed, Chali, but my visit was quite useless owing to Chathan's antecedents ordinate.

delay. The action taken within one month after

2. The Government the subject of my supervision and the extent of my control courteous and improper

3. His Excellency Surgeons in relation to Me as it should be. In order to requested to submit as early as approval of Government.

P. K. Chathu Menon e nation on the 26th May 1884 fair satisfaction; profession

September, 1890,

With reference to your the honor to state for the information books of the Chali-Branch Dispensary I find the following discrepancies

2. In the nominal Register in the prescription book this is attended the hospital for sometime

3. This patient is further entered as having attended 29th and 31st May 1890. The prescription book contradicts this on the 31st the hospital is declared to be closed and no prescription very serious falsification on the part of the hospital Assistant.

4. Another case, No. 129 is also entered as attended on the 30th

5. A third case, No. 157 is entered as attended on the 30th

prescription book fails to confirm. as stated by the Civil Surgeon.

6. Case No. 298 was entered frequently changed to Bronchitis when the error was exposed. Health Officer Municipal Council.

7. These errors and falsifications are very serious. I notice, but as the hospital Assistant has shewn himself insolent in attending hospital as pointed out by the Civil Surgeon and circumstances, I feel compelled to adhere to my former decision, and from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tellicherry, dated 533, stating that the Hospital Assistant, Chathan, was appointed Chali Dispensary and furnishing information as to his qualification

ENCLOSURE D.

From the Assistant Surgeon, C. A. Lafrenais, Ag. Civil Surgeon to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras dated, 8th

With reference to your docket No. 106, dated the 6th Instant have the honor to submit that the books of the Branch Dispensary 15th June, 1890, by Civil Apothecary W. J. Cooper, who was then

His notes taken at the Branch Dispensary on a slip of paper herewith forwarded for your information.

From these notes it is to be seen that the case of Encephalitis No. 139 of 23rd June 1890, was No. 350, in the nominal Register

On referring now to the nominal Register I find that Encephalitis changed into Eczema, but the treatment in the Prescription book by me except that Mag. Sulphas has been added to the 2nd prescription Liquor Strychninae.

The alteration is evident and even a partially successful attempt the mark made with red ink by Mr. Cooper in the margin of the No. 350.

I beg also to invite your attention to other corrections, namely those diseases which stood as "Cough" Nos. 343, and 382 have been and Bronchitis and No. 331 which stood as swelling of testicles

From the prescription that stands under No. 350 alone, it originally was not Eczema, as there is no external remedy prescribed Eczema, Nos. 361, 370, 384, 441 and 452 he has prescribed an Eczema Zinc ointment in addition to internal remedies.

I beg to state further that the Prescription book and Nominal Register for the month of June 1890 and No. 100 which was treated in the Prescription book and Nominal Register were not only examined Hospital Assistants and the clerk of this Hospital and as the concluding portion of the Nominal Register.

No. 139 of the 29th May 1890 has himself a series of Government Central Depot, native place on a month's leave, it his appointment.

Read the

7. He had two offers of appointment in the Government service at Ambathy and Berar, but was not able to accept them owing to private affairs.

Since 1885 he has been a private practitioner and he, having already established a name and won the confidence of the people, there is every reason to believe, he would do well in a branch Dispensary opened as an experimental measure.

8. I may add that it was inexpedient to wait till the District officer could spare a hand as Cholera was prevailing at Calicut and other places in the vicinity.

I have &c.
(Signed) A. GOVINDAN,
Chairman.

(True copy)

No. 967.

To

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
Tellicherry 14-2-91.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
Thro' the Sub-Collector of Malabar.

SIR,

In answer to Government order dated 17th January 1891 No. 58 M. Mis. I beg to submit that Hospital Assistant Chathoo has been suspended from the Municipal service until further orders from the 19th instant; but I am of opinion on very mature consideration that suspension of two months from the service would be quite a sufficient punishment for the errors he has committed and that dismissal would be too severe a step as it would tend to blast his future prospect entirely and that the errors he has committed are not so very great either in intention or in result on the ground, that although the diagnosis of "Encephalitis" was wrong the treatment for the disease the patient was suffering from was correct, because he was cured. There is a clerical error in the nominal register as compared with the prescription book—this is carelessness. It can be seen that even from the charges made out that the Hospital Assistant has injured no one, he has not actuated by any criminal or basemotive, he has done very good service here during the recent outbreak of cholera, he is very much liked by the Chali people, he has in his heart the good of mankind he is a good man and he is a God-fearing man, under these circumstances, the Government and the Surgeon-General I trust would be satisfied if he is suspended for two months and not be so very severe as to dismiss him.

Hoping that this would meet with the approval of Government.

I am &c.
(Signed) A. GOVINDAN,
Chairman.
10th September, 1891.
TELLICHERRY.

(ENCLOSURE G.)

TO

THE RIGHT HON'BLE SIR BEILBEY LAWLEY,
BARON WENLOCK OF WENLOCK,
Governor-in-Council of Fort St. George.

The most humble memorial of the
inhabitants of Chali and its vicinity,
situated within the Municipal limits
of Tellicherry.

SHEWETH,

That in humbly venturing to approach Your Excellency in Council through the medium of this memorial for an indulgent re-consideration of a recent G. O. No. 501 M. C. demanding the dismissal from service of the Hospital Assistant, Mr. P. K. Chathoo, attached to the Branch

P.M.C.

Dispensary at Chali, in Tellicherry, Memorialists beg leave to join a brief history of the circumstances under which the said dispensary was opened, and the good they have derived from it through the experience, patient and painstaking habits and kind, obliging manners of the unhappy Hospital Assistant now under the displeasure of Government.

1. Chali is a suburb of Tellicherry, thickly populated—chiefly by fishermen—and which, from the habits of its inhabitants and the nature of the trade carried on by them, as well as from the crowded and defective buildings and the general poverty pervading the place, has always been a hotbed of infectious diseases. In fact every outbreak of Cholera, Small-pox and other scourges that have from time to time visited Tellicherry may be said to have originated at Chali.

2. The want of a separate dispensary in the place was repeatedly urged by the inhabitants and at last with the accession to office, of the present kind Chairman, who is himself a medical man of repute, their request was granted, last 16th May 1890, and the said Mr. Chathoo was placed in charge. He was no stranger to them, as he had active private practice among them prior to the appointment; and that was very probably one reason why he was preferred.

3. Your Excellency's Memorialists had thus double reason to rejoice in the boon they at last secured; nor had they and the general public, to wait long before they knew the value of this boon.

There was a severe outbreak of Cholera in Tellicherry in 1890, and Chali, which on all previous occasions experienced its initial ravages, enjoyed exceptional immunity, thanks to the sensible preventive measures set on foot by Mr. Chathoo.

4. Patients began to flock in from all quarters, among whom were many who had long and unprofitably attended the Civil Dispensary at Tellicherry. To all these, Mr. Chathoo, with untiring patience and genial sympathy, afforded the best medical aid in his power, though without even a compounder to assist him or an adequate stock of medicines to select from. It soon became evident that the general public were beginning to prefer Mr. Chathoo, and to court his aid and advice to a large extent.

5. But your humble Memorialists respectfully venture to shew that as an increase of practice to Mr. Chathoo meant a decrease of practice to those in the Tellicherry Civil Dispensary, these latter, out of spite at the preference shown by Mr. Chathoo to the Chemist's shop of Messrs. Macdonald and Co., instead of to the rival one in which a Hospital Assistant of the said dispensary has proprietary right, conspired to ruin him by every means, and the recent charges against him are the fruition of the conspiracy, but into the details of these, Memorialists are not in a position to enter.

6. In concluding, Your Excellency's humble Memorialists beg solemnly to declare that this memorial is the outcome of pure gratitude on their part, and that as such Your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to accord it a patient and favourable consideration, and to restore to Memorialists their benefactor and sympathizing friend, who now very probably repents, as the cause of his misfortune, the kind interest he was, out of humane considerations, induced to take in their sufferings.

Your humble Memorialists most humbly venture to hope that in a case like this of general sympathy and popular supplication, professional rivalry and disappointed expectations of gain, which gave birth to these charges will be defeated by considerations of justice and respect for popular opinion.

Your humble Memorialists, in concluding, humbly and earnestly entreat Your Excellency to give them back the Hospital Assistant who during his stay among them, proved a real blessing to them.

For this and gracious
justice, Excellency's humble
Memorialists shall,
as in duty bound,
EVER PRAY.

28/9/91.

P.M.C.

(ENCLOSURE H.)

To

MR. P. K. CHATHU
LATE HOSPITAL ASST. CHAL, *Tellicherry.*

DEAR SIR,

In forwarding for your information the enclosed reply from Government, on a Memorial (a printed copy also enclosed) submitted by us on your behalf signed by over 1200 persons we are very sorry that we were unable to enter fully into the details of your case which were inaccessible to us.

We have no doubt that a full and detailed account of your case will lead to a favourable reconsideration.

You are at liberty to make any use you like of these enclosures.

We are dear Sir,

Yours ever gratefully,

(Signed) 1. K. KUNHI KORAN.

(Signed) 2. K. KANNAN.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following petition from the inhabitants of Chali situated within the Municipal limits of Tellicherry dated 28th September 1891 stating that the recent charges against Chathu Hospital Assistant attached to the Branch Dispensary at Chali are the fruition of a conspiracy and praying that he may be restored to his appointment on a reconsideration of the order dismissing him from service.

Order dated 28th October 1891 No. 1871. M. Mis.

The Government declines to reconsider the orders already passed in this case.

(True extract)

(Signed) H. S. BRODIE,
Ag. Asst. Secretary.

To

The Petitioners.

P. K. Chathu

PAID JULY 26th JULY 1890.

To,

THE COLLECTOR OF MALABAR,
CALICUT.

SIR,

With reference to your endorsement No. 340, dated 21st Instant, on letter of the Surgeon General No. 4271, dated 16th Idem, I have the honor to state that I never intended to deny the right of the acting Civil Surgeon to have supervision over the Chalil Hospital, in fact I would solicit it, but I doubt if he can take the power on his own will without the sanction of the Council.

2. Mr. Cooper under any circumstance was not justified in taking the prescription books that were in the custody of the Hospital Assistant. If he wanted the books he should have taken them with the permission of the Hospital Assistant or he should have applied to me. His conduct is certainly an insult to me as I have the management of the said Hospital. His behaviour towards the poor patients that attended the Chalil Hospital was the most revolting to every human feeling as will be seen from the Hospital Assistant's letter of explanation.

3. The charges against the Hospital Assistant are almost all malicious. He gives me great satisfaction in the discharge of his duty. Had it not been for him the attendance in the Chalil Dispensary would not be so good as it is. I therefore am of opinion that I cannot conscientiously dismiss him from the Municipal service. I would not be doing my duty if I did so.

4. In conclusion I beg leave to observe that I fail to see any "breach of Official courtesy and decorum" in the style adopted by me in my correspondence with the acting Civil Surgeon and shall thank you to let me know in what sentence or words of mine such discourtesy has been observed.

5. The enclosures are herewith returned.

I have &c.,

(Signed.) A. GOVINDAN,
Chairman.

(True Copy)

(Signed)

T. K. RAMUNNI,
Chairman.

M.

To The Petitioner,

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Read the following petition from P. K. Chathu, late Hospital Assistant, in charge of Chali Dispensary Tellicherry, dated 2nd January 1892 praying that the

P. K. Chathu

January 1882 No. 122
passed in the Petitioner's CENCI

8 the Govt. declines to re-consider the orders

CH
os

True Extract.

(Signed.)

N. S. BRODIE,

Acting under Secretary,

Local and Municipal.

N.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Read the following paper from the Private Secretary to the Right Honourable the Governor, dated 23rd August 1892 transferring a Petition from P. K. Chathu, late Hospital Assistant, Chali, praying that he may be reinstated.

Order dated 12th September 1892 No. 1478 M. Mis.—The Petitioner is referred to Govt. Order No. 122 M. dated 18th January 1892 with the intimation that no notice will be taken of further petitions from him.

True Extract.

(Signed.)

LEWIS,

Under Secretary,

for

Chief Secretary.

P. K. Chathu

From P. K. Chathu, late Hospital Assistant, Chali, praying to be reinstated in council, with arrears of pay & statement of his loss of pay & part from dismissed.

Read the following
Chathu, late Hospital
Chali Dispensary, Tel
ward the accompanying
to H. E. the Governor
soliciting to order his
with arrears of pay &
which he has been so
part from
dismissed.

Order 3rd of October 1891 No. 2 of

36 October 1891 No. 16

in G. O. of the force of law, the
which have been now preferred thus
order of dismissal (8) Section III of the
The appeal is in G. O. of 18th November
under clause 18, and is according
rules printed in the discretion of the
No. 931 of that rule.

(True extract)

By L. Davidson,
Asst. Secy.
For Chief Secretary

(True copy)
To the Petitioner

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable,
LORD WENLOCK, G. C. S. I.,
GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
FORT ST-GEORGE,
MADRAS.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That the undersigned most respectfully ventures to submit the following facts and circumstances for the kind and benign consideration of your Excellency in Council.

2. That your Lordship's humble Memorialist was in charge of the Branch Municipal Dispensary at Chali, a suburb of Tellicherry from 16th May 1890 to 24th April 1891, when he was served with a notice by the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tellicherry, dispensing with his services in obedience to G. O. No. 501 M. dated 6th April 1891 (Enclosure A.) which he humbly ventures to solicit your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to re-consider on the following grounds.

3. The charges that induced such a severe and painful G.O. against him may be classed under three heads: I Professional inefficiency. II Falsification of records, and III Insubordination, with a passing allusion to his antecedents. This apparently serious array of charges, your humble Memorialist hopes with your Lordship's gracious permission to be able to refute, one by one, and to prove that he has been the victim of a conspiracy that had its origin in professional jealousy and personal grudge.

I. Professional inefficiency

4. The charges under this head, though very serious if true, are fortunately for Memorialist, built upon too flimsy a foundation to stand scrutiny in the light of collateral evidence. The only ground upon which the hasty judgment of inefficiency was pronounced by the two acting Civil Surgeons and confirmed by the Surgeon-General, is that Memorialist prescribed Strychnia in a case of Encephalites, variously described by all these three officials. Mr. Lafranaise vaguely describes it as "one patient suffering from Encephalites", Letter to the Chairman No. 139 dated 23rd June 1890 para III. (Vide Enclosure B.). Mr. Cooper on the other hand, saw it distinctly figure as case No. 350; while in the Surgeon General's office it had mysteriously shifted to the position of case No. 101 Letter No. C/II dated 26th September 1890 para 2 (enclosure C) but strangely enough, in spite of these three different positions assigned to it, Encephalites stands in the Nominatorial Register as case No. 100.

5. Your Memorialist humbly hopes that this will give your Excellency in Council some idea of the care and patience with which his books seem to have been examined by his superior officers, upon the strength of whose opinions the above G. O. was passed, not only depriving him of his hard earned situation, but casting an indelible stigma upon his University Diploma.

14.6

6. As to the case its
begs to submit most respect
spuriously altered into *Ecce*
word has been so tampered
original *Encephalites*, as wou
2
f and the prescription laid to Memorialist's account, he
ully that to say *Encephalites* in case No. 350 has been
is just the reverse of fact, the truth being that the
with as to make believe that it is the altered form of an
ld amply appear from the following facts.

7. Mr. Lafranais himself says, in his letter No. 139 dated 23rd June 1890 para III (Enclosure B) "one patient is entered as suffering from Encephalites &c", and it is therefore clearly impossible that there could have been two such cases within the date of the said letter. For, the words used are expressly "One patient" and not "A patient", and it cannot be presumed for a moment that a man of Mr. Lafranais' position and attainments is not familiar with the distinction obtaining between these two simple words. This 'one patient' could be no other than No. 100, as the genuineness of the entries in that case has never been doubted. It was under this supposition that your Memorialist submitted his explanation to the Chairman upon the above letter, and the Chairman passed the remarks quoted by Mr. Lafranais in his letter to the Surgeon General. Letter No. 303 dated 8th December 1890 (Enclosure D). If therefore the genuineness of No. 100 is admitted, as it has all along been, it is impossible there could have been a second case of Encephalites under No. 350, as asserted by Mr. Lafranais upon the strength of a small 'slip of paper' left by Mr. Cooper as the sole record of his condemnation of your Memorialist's efficiency, upon which so much correspondence has already passed. It would thus appear there was no necessity whatever so far, for the Memorialist to have tampered with the entries in No. 350; moreover, it is quite improbable that he would have resorted to the foolish and tell-tale method of erasing the word *Encephalites* and writing over it the word *Eczema*, when it was so open to him without any fear of detection, to have changed the page altogether out of the stitched Nominal Register, as Mr. Cooper had not taken the precaution of affixing any distinctive mark, either to the entry or any where else on the page, to render such a step by any means difficult or dangerous. It therefore follows that the only reasonable alternative is that this transparent interpolation must have been the work of your Memorialist's enemies in the hospital, when the books were so informally detained there by Mr. Cooper, and subsequent to Memorialist's explanation to the Chairman upon the said gentleman's report, charging him with having prescribed Strychnia in a case of Encephalites. That explanation, awakening them most painfully to the groundless nature of their charge, inasmuch as no Strychnia could be found on the said prescription, their disappointed expectations would not allow them to admit the error, but prompted them to attempt to substantiate it by hook or by crook. Hence, they seemed to have searched for a case where Strychnia was actually prescribed, and having alighted on No. 350 which answered their purpose, it is plain only evident they altered *Eczema* in the Nominal Register so as to give it the appearance of having been written over a partially erased *Encephalites*. In connection with this, your Memorialist would humbly point out a significant fact for the kind consideration of your Excellency in Council. The prescription No. 350 is identical with those in other cases of *Eczema* treated by him, for instance, Numbers 26, 36, 99, 101, 218, 228, and 350, while in the real case of Encephalites (Case No. 100) Strychnia is altogether absent. It does not therefore stand to reason that a man who could correctly prescribe for a disease in one case should be suddenly seized with a strange forgetfulness when an exactly similar case is presented to him a few days later. As to the absence of external remedy in No.

35
bec
Zin
the
un
En
cri

ma
ple

cas
ma
ori
inc
of t
Me
Reg
pos
ed
the
ma
Coc
few
The
dow
con
pro
tam
cati
are

tion
it.
thor
crib
that
form
used
the
hosp
spite
to e

noti
Tho

[illegible]

12. As to the subornment of partners in the Chemists' office and by Memorialist's refusal to believe that it could have to call Raman, Compounder, whether former came to Memorialist he 1382 from "swelling of testing a Chemist's shop at Tet and "Bronchitis" respectively but as Memorialist had sorbout this charge against him may the request. A second time had ill-will to distort the most direct his prescriptions to positive. He admits these corrections had already established defendant that had he omitted to do was unable to satisfy him die named against him and cited as he took charge of Chali, named in errors, even after they same discouraging reply. In to He was the Hospital Assistant he has put his threat into subsequent hurry and press of upon kept to the strict scientific directions are made in such a

13. Memorialist by my ultimatum

13. Memorialist has any ulterior motive on the part of tamperings with the entries and the corrections entered under dates the 25th, 27th, & attempt to conceal the alterations paras 4 and 5 of the Surge Order, but sympathetic examination of these latter entries are already made by Your Excellency in Council the Nominal Register, and *Register and the Prescription book*, the prescription book and *Prescription book*, Your Excellency in Council *Prescription book*, one thousand four hundred charges under this head, Nominal Register, not more than 1000, and to state that even Government different from Memorialist's statement, 7th January 1891 (Enclosure and curiously enough the statement before case No. 100 and a

P.H.C

P.M.C

E) "that at present the position of Civil Surgeon in relation to Municipal Hospitals and Dispensaries is by no means as clearly defined as it ought to be", and under such an undefined state of superiority and subordination, Your Memorialist humbly submits that it is logically impossible that he should have been guilty of *insubordination to the Civil Surgeon* and in the face of the conflicting orders he received from the Chairman and the Civil Surgeon, it would have been unwise on his part to have implicitly submitted to the disputed authority of the Civil Surgeon in opposition to the orders of the Chairman, his admitted superior. But without pressing the point further, he submits that in the heat of the moment, under the excitement of the malicious charges brought against him by the Civil Surgeon, mainly at the instigation of his enemies in the Hospital, if he had been guilty of any intemperate language or improper tone in the course of his explanations or correspondence, he begs to tender an unreserved apology for the same and to ask for pardon, and prays that Your Excellency in Council will be pleased to take a lenient view of this fault (which is at most an error of judgment) in case it should still be deemed a fault.

17. As to his antecedents, Memorialist begs to submit that the most serious charge under this head has been ingeniously writ in vague terms, as "having pecuniary transactions with a subordinate Officer. This doubtless has been done with the special object of conveying to any reader unacquainted with the full particulars of the case, an idea that the Memorialist has been guilty of receiving bribes or deriving unlawful gain from those under him. But the fact, he humbly submits, is that he obtained leave of absence for three months in 1884 to return to Tellicherry, his native place, for the purpose of celebrating his marriage. The month being far advanced and the Memorialist being in want of money, he was compelled before leaving Madras, to sign a receipt for his pay of the month, and obtain it through the medium of one of his subordinates in Madras. This simple circumstance, so commonly resorted to by officers in Memorialist's position, has been so ambiguously related, as to suggest that Memorialist committed some really grave sin.

18. The second is that he has been constantly reported for gross neglect of duty and insubordination", and your Memorialist ventures to invite the attention of Your Excellency in Council to the fact that a man's being simply reported for any irregularity does not necessarily imply that the charges have been brought home to him; and your Memorialist begs leave to state that at this distance of date he is unable to recall to mind the exact circumstances under which these 'constant reports' might have been made, but he might be allowed to point out that had these charges been in any way serious or well founded, there would not have been occasion for them to be so often repeated as to become constant; for, with the first well-established charge of a serious nature, dismissal or some equally severe punishment would have effectually checked this tendency to irregularity and left no room for a repetition of complaints against him. But as it is, he begs to admit, that some trifling irregularities might have been imputed to him, but his explanations about them were so satisfactory that no further action was taken on them by his superior authorities, except in a solitary instance, when not only he, but every hospital Assistant attached to the depôt was fined Rs. 2, for being late one morning. With this single exception, he submits that his career in the Vaccine Depôt has been free from all blame, so much so, that even when he was on leave as stated above, he was considered eligible for promotion and a telegram was received to that effect from Dr. King, the then Health

Officer of the Madras Municipality, but being detained here by circumstances over which he had no control, he was unable to join his appointment within the term of his leave and a telegram despatched for extension having been delayed, he was entered as dismissed. This is the true account of his connection with the Vaccine Depôt at Madras (as will be clearly established by the original certificate from Dr. Stuart Davis, herein enclosed (Enclosure F) which has been so diligently unearthed to lend a colouring of probability to the charges now brought against him. Memorialist might perhaps be allowed to state that it is injustice to drag a man's past life after him; but since it has been considered admissible in his case, he might in justice be permitted to allude to the more highly objectionable antecedents of Mr. Cooper, who has been notorious for provoking quarrels wherever he has been stationed.

In conclusion, your humble Memorialist begs respectfully to add a brief resume of the charges preferred against him and his explanations on them.

A kind persual of the above facts and circumstances, together with the enclosures herewith submitted, will, he humbly ventures to hope, convince Your Excellency in Council, that Mr. Cooper, burning with resentment at what he was led to believe, were instances of want of regard on the part of Memorialist for his (Mr. Cooper's) interests and contempt for his official authority in obeying the Chairman's orders in opposition to his, was ever on the alert for a suitable opportunity to work out the ruin and disgrace of your Memorialist. With this object in view, he was in the habit of minutely watching the proceedings of the Memorialist and examining his books item by item in the most critical manner. In the course of which, case No. 100 must have struck him as the one in which Memorialist was very likely to be caught, as the disease Encephalites is not easy to diagnose and difficult to treat. In the excitement natural at the prospect of a long cherished wish being gratified, he must have turned to the prescription book and hastily mistaking 101 for 100, in which he saw Strychnia prescribed, lost no time in making a report to the Chairman condemning the professional efficiency of the Memorialist in very strong terms, but meanwhile Mr. Cooper was transferred from the station, it having become a party question as to the superiority of the authority of the Chairman and the Civil Surgeon over the Municipal Dispensary. Mr. Lafrancis who succeeded was induced to espouse the cause out of an *esprit de corps* simply on the representation of Mr. Cooper and without proper examination on his own part, as is evident from the tone and wording of his letter, No. 139 dated 23rd June 1890 (Enclosure B), in which he but vaguely refers to the case as one patient entered as suffering from Encephalites. He says in his letter to the Surgeon General (Enclosure B) that he saw distinctly Encephalites in the Nominal Register and your Memorialist is not prepared to contradict him; but must have been No. 100 and not 350 as has been afterwards made out. Memorialist's enemies in the Tellicherry hospital who were at the bottom of the whole affair must have meanwhile come to learn from his explanation submitted to the Chairman that they had simply been preferring an imaginary charge against Memorialist, as no Strychnia whatever could be found in the prescription, No. 100, on careful examination.

The tampering with case 350 and the interpolation of the 'S's must have been the outcome of the afterthoughts to make good the false position. This, your humble Memorialist submits, is the nearest approach possible to the true origin of

M.C.

M.C.

11. SEP 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

8

the charges of inefficiency and falsification of records that have resulted in such a severe and painful G. O. against him, without allowing him an opportunity to speak in his own defence.

Even granting for the moment that he was really in error in the diagnosis and prescription of case No. 320, it will be remembered that this is the one solitary instance out of no less than 1,500 cases where the conjoined scrutiny and care of the two Civil Surgeons, and the Surgeon General have succeeded in showing him at fault. He humbly leaves it to Your Excellency in Council to decide if the solitary instance is sufficient to outweigh the testimony to the contrary afforded by his University Diploma and the certificates of efficiency as to his past services. The charges of insubordination and unsatisfactory antecedents have been sufficiently refuted above; it is needless to repeat them here. He begs respectfully to conclude this memorial with the fervent and humble prayer that your Excellency in Council will be most graciously pleased to cancel the above G. O. and order his reinstatement ^{with arrears of pay} to the office from which he has been so cruelly ousted, for which act of kindness and British Justice he shall, as in duty bound,

EVER PRAY,

P. K. CHATHU,

Late Hospital Assistant in charge of Chali Dispensary.

TELLICHERRY.

P. S.

Memorialist regrets that owing to the delay that occurred in obtaining from the Municipal Office, the certified copies of the records in his case, as also to a long illness of his, this humble memorial has not been submitted earlier. And he begs the delay on his part will be graciously forgiven.

When this Memorial was in the Press, Your humble Memorialist received Enclosures G. and H. from Messrs. Kunhi Koren and K. Kannen, the first two signatories of G. Memorialist humbly asks that Enclosure A. might be considered side by side with his own humble representation.

P. K. CHATHU.

P. K. Chathu

6 "September 1895"
Tellierry.

5
2840 m/95

[9]

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

Local & Municipal Department

CURRENT No. 234

From

P. K. Chathu.

*Late Hospital Assistant,
Tellierry*

No.

Dated 6-9-95

Received 14-9-95

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

*Submitting a memorial to the
Right Hon'ble the Secretary of State
for India, praying that he may
be reinstated with arrears of
pay to his former post of Hospital
Asst. in Charge of Chali Dispensary,
Tellierry.*

Copied by

Examined by *Rh*