

Local & Munl. (1895-) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 23792.

DATED 7th Decr. 1895.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Pétition.

Informing A. T. Venkataswami Nayudu, late sub-overseer, North Arcot district, that, under the authority quoted no appeal lies to Govt. in his case.

✓

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

[7]

Miscellaneous.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPT. G.O., DATED 7-12-95 No. 2379 R.
--

INDEXED.

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition

Confirming A.T. Venkata
 Swami Nayudu, late, sub
 receiver, N. Arcot. Dist.
 that under an authority
 granted, no appeal lies to
 Govt. in this case.

BACK PAPER, No.

FURTHER PAPER, No.

OF 189

Enclosures.

No. 289.

To

The District Board Engineer,

North Arcot,

Vellore.

HONORED SIR,

I most respectfully beg to inform your honor that all my subordinates are enemies to me on account of my strictness with their works, they do not obey and carry out my orders. I therefore request that your honor will be pleased to transfer me elsewhere in the District. If your honor be not kind to comply with my humble request there will be little or no chance of getting good work from me. I have no other help than your honour. Your honor will deeply consider over the petition sent against me before I joined my duty. I entirely depend upon your honor. If your honor do not grant my request I will be put to much danger and sometimes attacked in the way. So I need not say much to your honor.

I beg to remain,

Honored Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servt.,

(Signed.) A. T. Venkatasawmy,

L. F. Sub-Overseer.

No. 296.

To

The District Board Engineer,

North Arcot,

Vellore.

HONORED SIR,

In continuation of my letter No. 289 dated 13-9-94 I beg to inform your honor that no reply thereto has as yet been favoured. I am really sorry to go on circuit as I hear from different sources that my subordinates are making plot to have me attacked by coolies in the way. As I have money always with me and I have no help but myself I am afraid to go out. I therefore request that your honor will be pleased to transfer me soon to some other Taluqs as requested in the above. I have now to go to Punganur Sadum road for payment but I suspect to do so

Damalcheruvu,

Dated, 13-9-94.

Damalcheruvu.

Dated, 20-9-94.

AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
189- . No . MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

APERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.-

- A - Copy in full
- B - Not to be copied.
- P - Copy abstract only.
- Q - Copy heading only.

Copied by
Examined by

under the present aspect of affairs. If anything happens seriously in the way there will be no use of repenting afterwards. It is better for me to be on guard as the expression goes prevention is better than cure. Therefore your honor will be pleased to consider over the matter I place before your honor for early redress by transferring me.

I beg to remain,
Honored Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant.
(Signed.) A. T. Venkatasawmy,
L. F. Sub-Overseer.

No. A.

To
The District Board Engineer,
North Arcot,
Vellore.

HONORED SIR,

In continuation of my letter No. 289 & 296 respectively dated 13 & 20 September 1894, I beg to inform your honor clearly that my writer and lascar are at the bottom of all mischiefs and ring-leaders for all. They closely join with Pygusts and Contractors and go very often to them to make plot in hope that I should be attacked one day or other in the way. After having heard this, I suspected to go out. I also reported this fact to the Police Station House Officer of this place to watch and bear witness to this, if there be any occasion for such occurrence. Nevertheless this, not to delay payment of coolies I wanted to leave for Naidupet road on 20th Instant, and directed my bandyman to have bandy ready. When he went to have the bandy ready he found and said the yoke attached thereto was missing which was not at all the case at any time since I became an overseer. This mischief it is plain corroborates the above said facts. I therefore did not go on circuit for making payments as proposed, having thought that the said facts would come to realization. I have no help and am single-handed and if any thing happens in the way, there is none to prove the case. If my writer and Lascar should not be my assistants and act otherwise it is very difficult to bring the case home. I really do not know what step is to be taken with regard to this and how matters will go. I cannot trust these men because I am afraid that they sometimes do away with office records. Under these circumstances I request that your honor will be pleased to transfer me as early as practicable without detriment to the work or in case your honor wishes to retain me here only, their early transfer shall be ordered.

I beg to remain,
Honored Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant.,
(Signed.) A. T. Venkatasawmy
L. F. Sub-Overseer.

Damalcheruvu,
10-10-94.

No. B.

To,
Coopoosawmy Iyer,
Police Inspector,
Chandragiri.

SIR,

I said to you many a time in person what had happened to me in this place. Besides them last night on my return from Chandragiri I found to my great surprise my bandy left in front of Grama Chavadi opposite my house stolen by somebody, which I reported both to Village Munisiff and the Police Station House Officer of this place. I do not know what else will befall me to day night. I therefore request that you will be so pleased as to call over here tomorrow for enquiry and to detect the case. Hoping you will kindly excuse me for the trouble I give you.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant,
(Signed.) A. T. Vencatasawmy,
L. F. Sub-Overseer.

No. C. dated 11-10-94.

To
The District Board Engineer,
North Arcot,
Vellore.

SIR,

I beg to bring the following facts to your honor's kind consideration for favourable disposal. On the 9th morning, first I went alone to Traveller's Bungalow to examine the tools. Afterwards my writer and Lascar came there and subsequently Appasawmy Reddy bosom friend of my writer and son of Ramasawmy Reddy present Village Munsiff of this place also came there, but he has no occasion whatever to do so. I think these three men have come proposed to assault me. As soon as the above said Appasawmy Reddy came there he questioned me why I should have written also his name in the Police for the loss of my yoke. Thereupon I said I have not written your name scarce before he heard my saying he began to abuse me very indecently which is not of his own accord but by their instigation. I kept quiet and came home direct thinking that if I said a word he would attack me. Availing myself $\frac{1}{2}$ a day leave pending your honor's sanction for the same I proceeded midday to Chendraghery to lodge a complaint on this account and returned home very night. On reaching home I found to my great surprise my bandy left in

4
front of Gramachavady opposite my house stolen by some body this I reported next morning both to the Police Station Officer and the Village Munisiff of this place. Under these circumstances I have no hesitation to say what will be fall me here afterwards. I having known what will come to pass from the state of affairs, I requested your honor in my letters Nos. ²⁸⁹₁₃₋₉₋₉₄, ^{296 & A}₂₀₋₉₋₉₄ 1-10-94 respectively to transfer me or my writer and lascar from here, but your honor did not like to comply with my humble request and expressed your honor's unwillingness regarding the same. From the foregoing facts I have least inclination to stay here any longer at this critical juncture. I therefore beg to inform your honor that I am determined to remove my head quarters to Pakala on the 14th Instant in anticipation of your sanction until my transfer is finally settled.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant
(Signed) A. T. Venkatasawmy,
L. F. Sub-Overseer.

No. E.

To

The President,
District Board, North Arcot,
Chittoor.

Pakala.
19-10-94.

MOST RESPECTED SIR,

I most humbly beg to bring the following facts with copies of correspondence that passed between myself and the District Board Engineer regarding the state of affairs in my Division to your honor's kind consideration of the redress of my grievances. I am a Sub-Overseer of Damalcheruvu sub-division for about 4 years. I was suspended from my duty and recommended for dismissal by the District Board Engineer in February 1893, on groundless charges, but on my appeal to the Board I was restored to my appointment in April 1894. A few days before my restoration Pygusts, contractors, writer and Lascar joining together presented a petition both to the President, and the District Board Engineer expressing their opinion that if I should come back to this Division they would not like to work under me. Then I inferred from this that they did not like me because I was strict with them and extracted good work from them. Had I not been strict, the roads would not have come to good condition. I need not say in what worst condition the roads were before I joined this division and the then President and the Engineer have known full well in what better state I brought the roads afterwards. The District Board Engineer having been prejudiced that I got the appointment in the appeal against his order for my suspension and recommendation for dismissal has been passing always bad remarks upon my work and trying to get me dismissed some how or other. My subordinates—Writer, Lascar and Pygusts—hearing this fact from the correspondence disobey me and do not carry out my orders. If they

5
do not obey and carry out my orders how can I expect works turned out by them. To get rid of me from here they have also proposed to do me injury in the way while on circuit. I brought all these circumstances in my letters to the District Board Engineer and requested him therein to transfer me or my subordinates from this division but in reply thereto expressed his great unwillingness to do so. Having found no other alternative than appealing to your honor I beg to forward this petition for favourable consideration and disposal.

The cause for all these things is that last year during my suspension, one sub-overseer named Durmalinga Naicker was appointed to act for me. When he came and took charge he was mere a puppet in the hands of my clerk. The Clerk became an overseer and the overseer clerk *vice versa*, my clerk and Pygust and contractors joined together and plundered the Division as they please. Finding no such an opportunity to play tricks and plunder, after I joined and finding that the Engineer is prejudiced against me they tried to get rid of me from here by doing all sorts of mischief.

Under these circumstances I beg to request that your honor shall be pleased to consider at length all the facts stated above and direct the Engineer to transfer me or my subordinates to any Taluk in the sub-division. Begging that your honor shall be pleased to pass orders as early as practicable.

I beg to remain,
Most Respected Sir,
Your Most Obedient and Humble Servant,
(Signed.) A. T. Venkatasawmy,
L. F. Sub-Overseer.

Pakala,
16-10-94.

No. 328.

To,

The District Board Engineer,
North Arcot,
Vellore.

HONORED SIR,

In continuation of my letter No. C. dated 11-10-94, I beg to inform your honor that my bandy referred to therein has been stolen by somebody during night was found to be set on fire in jungle near 118th mile of Kurnool Trunk Road which I and the Police Station House Officer traced out. The Police are watchful to find out the culprit. As also I heard that I would be beaten, I removed my head quarters temporarily to Pakala subject to your honor's approval until my transfer is finally settled.

I beg to remain,
Honored Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant
(Sd.) A. T. Venkatasawmy,
L. F. Sub-Overseer.

24M
2/12

Local Government
CURRENT No. 3542

CHIEF SECRETARY
-2 DEC 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

To

His Excellency the Right Honourable
The Governor of Madras in Council,
Fort St. George.

The humble petition of A. T. Venkatasawmi
Naidu, late Sub-Overseer, Local Fund Department, *Salary Rs 25-35-
Damalcheruvu, North Arcot District,

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH.

That your Excellency's humble petitioner was a faithful and hard-working servant of the District Board of North-Arcot for nearly ten years, serving the Board in various Divisions as a sub-overseer; and that he was unjustly dismissed by the President on the 30th November 1894, at the instance of Mr. Vivian, the District Board Engineer, on charges of a very vague kind, viz., neglect of duty and insubordination—charges which, as will be shown below, are not supported by any specific facts.

2. That the circumstances which led to the unjust and unfortunate order of the President may be summarised as follows:—

The Petitioner was being incessantly worried, annoyed and obstructed in the discharge of his duties by his clerk and some other subordinates, who, taking advantage of the inimical attitude of the District Board Engineer towards the petitioner, continually plotted against the latter to involve him in irretrievable ruin. The Petitioner made several representations on the matter to the Engineer Mr. Vivian and earnestly implored him to transfer him to some other Division. The Engineer took no notice of these representations and when it became impossible to get on with his work any longer under such circumstances, the Petitioner urged by their necessity, appealed to the President for the redress of his grievances on the 19th October 1894. He submitted one copy of his petition to the President direct and another through the Engineer. This enraged Mr. Vivian very much, who thereupon formulated certain charges against the Petitioner and forwarded them to the President. The latter after taking personal explanation from the Petitioner, passed the order of dismissal on the 30th November 1894.

3. That against this order of the President, the Petitioner submitted on the 23rd February 1895 to the District Board an appeal, setting forth in full his explanation against each of the charges and praying for the cancellation of the order. The Board in their proceedings dated 31st August 1895 confirmed the order of the President. Against this decision of the Board, the present appeal is submitted to Your Excellency.

1
3542 2495

4. That the charges framed against the Petitioner by the Engineer are enumerated as follows:—

Charge 1. "That, for months past, Venkatasami Naidu refused to measure up the contractor's work in the Division; for instance, in spite of the Engineer's personal orders, he refused to measure up the contractor's work on the Kurnool Trunk Road although from his journal for September it is observed that he went over that road on the 27th and 28th of that month."

Petitioner's answer.

This charge is quite unfounded. Petitioner never refused to measure up the contractor's work on Kurnool road and the petitioner never disobeyed the personal orders of the Engineer for measuring up the said work. The Engineer did not at all visit the Kurnool Road in the petitioner's Division during the year and he never gave any personal orders about it. As the works were incomplete on the date of the petitioner's visit, on the 27th and 28th September, the petitioner could not and did not measure up the contractor's work, but he had measured up the previous work done in that Road and submitted a bill for payment of the work done. He never refused to measure up any work done on the Road.

Charge 2. "That when the Engineer called upon him for explanation for having passed bad materials on the Naidupet Road, Venkatasawmy Naidu instead of obeying the order sent a circular order to all his contractors saying that as the Engineer has refused to pass the materials on the Naidupet Road it was useless for him to measure up their works."

Petitioner's answer.

This is a curious charge quite perverse. Naidupet Road extends over 9 miles. Materials were being supplied by the contractors when the Engineer visited the Road on the 27th September. They were very good materials but the Engineer out of prejudice and bias said that they were not good materials and that they should be rejected. Petitioner immediately communicated the Engineer's opinion to all the contractors warning them against bad materials and requiring them to supply good materials to the satisfaction of the Engineer.

Is this disobedience of orders?

Is this insubordination?

Again, when the petitioner explained to the Engineer that these materials were supplied from the same quarry for the last 4 years and that no such objection was ever raised before and that all the materials collected on the whole length of 9 miles of the road cannot be condemned as bad and that such a procedure is opposed to the previous experience and that they were not at all bad materials, the Engineer replied in a very strong tone in these terms "Don't you know that I am a District Board Engineer? Whatever I say will prevail. Who will contradict my word? If I say a thing bad, it is bad. If I say a thing good, it is good, no matter whether it is good or bad in fact. Who will question it? and who will contradict it whether it is reasonable or unreasonable?" He went on repeating the

above with great emphasis in the presence of the Chittore Overseer Jagannadha Mudaly and the Engineer's clerk in his camp at Puthalpet travellers' Bungalow. Thereupon, petitioner sent a circular communicating to the contractors the opinion of the Engineer and telling them to supply satisfactory materials.

Is the petitioner wrong in so doing? Is this a disobedience of orders?

Charge 3. "That the Sub-Overseer changed his head-quarters from Damalcheruvu to Pakala without leave and when ordered to go back to Damalcheruvu he refused to do so."

Petitioner's answer.

This charge throws sufficient light on the conduct and curious procedure of the Engineer and gives a clue to the true position of affairs and calls for serious notice of the Board in as much as it indicates how the Engineer is disposed towards the petitioner. Soon after the petitioner's restoration, the clerk, Pygust and other discontented persons who sent a protest to the Engineer against petitioner's returning to Damalcheruvu, formed a conspiracy against the petitioner and resolved to molest and seriously injure the petitioner in various ways. Petitioner reported to the Engineer the perilous position in which he was placed and applied for

immediate transfer (*vide* his report dated $\frac{13-9-94}{\text{No. 289}}$ copy enclosed.) Receiving no reply, he sent a second report explaining the urgency of his transfer in view of the untoward circumstances of his position (*vide* report dated $\frac{20-9-94}{\text{No. 296}}$ copy enclosed.)

After sending up this report petitioner wanted to go to Naidupet road to make payment of the coolies and ordered his bandyman to get the bandy ready. The bandyman found the yoke of the bandy missing and reported the matter to the petitioner who immediately sent information to the Police and apprehended danger on the way and found it unsafe to venture out with a large amount of imprest money of about 300 Rs. As the writer and the lascars who were to follow the petitioner were the very persons who were plotting against him with Pygusts and coolies, the petitioner felt his awkward position and reported the matter to the Engineer with full explanation of the circumstances and pressing for his immediate transfer (*vide* report $\frac{1-10-94}{\text{No. A.}}$ copy enclosed). On the morning of the

9th October at about 8 o'clock petitioner went to Travellers' Bungalow to examine the tools and while there, the writer and the lascars accompanied by their friend one Appasamy Reddy who was a contractor in the previous year came and attempted to assault the petitioner and Appasamy Reddy opened the campaign by addressing the petitioner in a most insulting and abusive language and acted the part of a first aggressor. The petitioner, with prudence and care, quietly withdrew from the scene and happily escaped from further aggressions. Thereupon he went straight to the Police Station and learning that the Station House Officer had left for Chendragiri, the petitioner went to Chendragiri and reported the matter to the Inspector of Police and the Tahsildar and returned to Damalcheruvu by the night train with the Station House Officer and found his bandy missing and stolen away

84
Immediately a report was sent to the Inspector of Police (*vide* enclosed copy of report dated 10-10-94 No. B.)

Petitioner then addressed the Engineer begging him in most importunate terms to save him from further misfortunes and troubles by immediate transfer and intimating to him that he was obliged to quit Damalcheruvu in anticipation of his sanction for the adjoining station of Pakala within his division as the writer and the lascar and his party have conspired to turn him out by inducing his land-lord to peremptorily require the petitioner to vacate his house at once as per enclosed registered post card of notice to quit (*vide* report 11-10-94 No. C. copy enclosed).

Petitioner grieves to submit that no notice was taken of all the above representations by the Engineer who paid no heed to the alarming state of affairs. In the meanwhile the Police made enquiries of the missing bandy and found it burnt in a jungle near the 118th mile on the Kurnool Trunk Road and took the traces of the burnt bandy and filed them before the Sub-Magistrate with their occurrence report and petitioner thereupon made a report of the above circumstances and left on the 14th Damalcheruvu for Pakala temporarily, pending his transfer for which he implored the Engineer in piteous terms (*vide* report 16-10-94 No. 328 copy enclosed).

Petitioner grieves to submit that the Engineer slighted the matter altogether and refused to afford any redress to the petitioner and he therefore prays that the Board may be pleased to give him simple justice.

Charge 4. "That while the Sub-Overseer says that he could not go out and measure up materials because he was afraid that he would be beaten, his journal for September shews that he travelled 121 miles in that month; either his journal must be false or he deliberately disobeyed orders".

Petitioner's answer.

This alternative charge is groundless. There was neither disobedience of orders nor is the journal false. Up to the 12th September petitioner travelled about 84 miles by visiting Kurnool trunk Road, Naidupet Road, Mangalampet Railway feeder Road and Gathunki Road and inspected various works on those Roads and measured up the materials supplied by the contractors on those roads and recorded in his journal what all he had done. From the 13th to 23rd, petitioner did not go out on circuit and was attending to office work at Damalcheruvu. On the 13th he sent up his report to the Engineer about the plot and conspiracy of his subordinates to attack and way-lay him in his tour with impost money and from that day forward he took due care not to venture out with the money. From the 25th to 29th, petitioner travelled 37 miles and inspected the Kurnool road, Naidupet and Gadanki road and met the Engineer at Puthalpet and stayed with him on the 27th and 28th and returned to Damalcheruvu on the 29th by the Kurnool road. On the 24th, petitioner received an order from the Engineer stating

5
that he was returning from Chendragiri to Puthalpet and that the petitioner should meet him at Puthalpet. Petitioner waited accordingly for the Engineer on the Naidupet road on the 26th and as the Engineer did not turn up on that day, petitioner returned to Damalcheruvu and went back to Naidupet road on the next day and met the Engineer there. If the petitioner obeyed the orders of the Engineer to meet him on his circuit, it is asked how is it that the petitioner moved about on his travel when he was afraid that he would be beaten on the way. The answer is simple in that the visit of his superior within his division operated as a bar to his fear and to the apprehension of danger. Is this not natural? Moreover he did not travel then with any money in his possession. Would it be consistent with reason to suppose that the petitioner should have stopped away at Damalcheruvu without meeting the Engineer as required by him. Now he is blamed for having obeyed orders and an argument is advanced against him on that score. This is indeed a difficult ordeal. Where is the disobedience of orders?

Charge 5. "That out of an allotment of Rs. 10,190 for Damalcheruvu Division only Rs. 1,231 have been spent up to the date of the Engineer's report and the Sub-Overseer has not answered as many as 28 references even after repeated reminders."

Petitioner's answer.

The opposition and obstruction to the discharge of the petitioner's duty by his subordinates and the Engineer's disinclination to take proper measures for carrying on the petitioner's work operated, as a matter of course, as a stumbling block to the progress of work. What could the petitioner do under such circumstances? Both his superior and subordinates were opposing and obstructing him in every way. They refused to do any work as already avowed by them in their protest of Mahazar (enclosed herewith) sent by them soon after they heard of the petitioner's restoration and were leaving the place frequently for Chittoor and other places without petitioner's permission and the petitioner's reports thereon were left unheeded and uncared for by the Engineer with a vengeance.

Petitioner had served in various Divisions and done his best in doing his duty in spending the whole allotment in all his Divisions every year without fail and his record of service for the last 10 years will show clearly that there was no instance of any year's allotment having remained unspent during the whole period of his service in any Taluq. The inspection remarks of the President, Vice-President and the Engineer passed upon the petitioner's work from time to time during these 10 years will amply testify to the petitioner's assiduous and zealous discharge of his duty. The Zemindar of Punganoor and Poliegar of Kallur, and the Superintendent of Police who have observed the petitioner's work have expressed themselves highly satisfied with it. The Engineer's present attempt to blacken the petitioner by painting him in very dark colours as if he were an odious being is purely out of prejudice and bias. His remarks are unjustifiable, uncharitable and not based upon facts.

The Petitioner's explanation, with reference to these charges, is contained in his appeal to the Board, to which your Excellency's kind attention is invited. On

6
perusal of this, Your Excellency will be convinced that your humble Petitioner was subjected to great persecution and annoyance in consequence of the inimical attitude of the Engineer towards him; and that the charges are more or less the results of facts misrepresented and conduct uncharitably interpreted. The Petitioner. Your Excellency will be pleased to observe, was made to work in a division where his own subordinates were avowedly and uncompromisingly in opposition to him and his repeated entreaties and implorations for a transfer evoked no response whatever, nor was any attempt made to put down with a strong hand the rampant spirit of disobedience which completely demoralised the subordinate staff, thereby rendering any efficient work hopelessly impossible. The miserable plight of the Petitioner in these circumstances could better be imagined than described. The reason why his subordinates were against him is that the Petitioner was very strict and honest in the performance of his duties.

5. That the Petitioner begs to invite Your Excellency's kind attention to the significant fact that the charges were framed against him only after the submission of his appeal to the President for redress of unendurable grievances which it was beyond all hope for him to obtain from the hands of his immediate superior, the Engineer. If the Petitioner had really been guilty of insubordination or neglect of duty, the Engineer should at once and independently have taken steps to bring home the blame to him. But the fact that he did not do so and that he preferred the charges only after a higher authority had been appealed to against him clearly indicates that they were merely an after-thought and that they were urged simply to get rid of an inconvenient subordinate who ventured to raise his voice against intolerable sufferings before a superior tribunal. That the President should have joined the Engineer in this matter is a thing most deplorable to the Petitioner. The District Board does not generally question official opinion, but in this instance, there were seven members in favor of the Petitioner against eight. Against the combination of the President and the Engineer nothing can stand and the fate of the poor subordinate is sealed.

6. That the Petitioner begs to submit that previous to his entertainment in the Local Fund Department, he was in the service of the D. P. W. for nearly ten years as an Anicut Superintendent and Imperial Maistry, and during that period he rendered very good service to the satisfaction of such able officers as Col. John Pennicquik and others. It was the Petitioner who completed the Seesamangalam project which, on its completion, was inspected by Col. Pennicquik with very good remarks. He was thrown out on the reduction of establishment with a gratuity and he joined the Local Fund Department in 1881. For nearly 10 years after that date he did very good work under the Board which was duly appreciated both by the President and the Engineer. The Punganur Satham road was, for instance, once in a wretched condition and it was so strongly animadverted upon by the then President Mr. Le Fanu that the Government's attention was drawn to it. The Petitioner was thereupon placed in charge of the road and in the course of a year he brought it to an efficient condition to the complete satisfaction of Mr. Le Fanu. Thus during a course of nearly twenty years of his public service, neither the Petitioner's competency nor his integrity was ever in question, but on the other hand, there is ample testimony on record that good work was

7
done by him and appreciated by his then superiors. After such a career of public usefulness the Petitioner is now sent out with the stigma of dismissal on his face, brought about by the machinations of his scheming subordinates who rushed with hostility against him, because they could not earn any thing by dishonest means under his supervision. The Engineer's prejudice also has contributed not a little to this misfortune. Thus the Petitioner having been denied justice by the President and District Board he now flees to Your Excellency as the prime fountain of justice and mercy in this land and humbly and fervently prays that with your characteristic sense of duty Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to accord due consideration to this case and direct that justice be done to him by his reinstatement in the position from which he has been unjustly dismissed.

The Petitioner begs to remain

Your Excellency's Most

Obedient Servant,

A. Venkataswamy
Late L. F. Sub-Overseer.

PAKALA, NORTH ARCOT DISTRICT.

29th November/95

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Local and Municipal Department.
35422

From

A. J. Venkataswami Nayudu
late Sub. member
L-7 Deptt, Pakhalu.
N. Anant D-

No.

Dated 29/11
Received 2/12
Enclosures 1

SUBJECT.

Prayer for restoration to his
former post.

[25]

Local and Municipal Department.



PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

A. J. Venkataswami Nayudu, late Sub. member, et al. Dist. Dist. Dist.
from

No. dated

ORDER— No. 2379 of 7-12-95

The petitioner is informed that under Local Fund rule No. 72, which is extracted below,

no appeal lies to Government in his case.
no appeal at present lies to Government in his case.
his appeal is barred by lapse of time.

VR
1/12/95

True Extract.)

Assistant Secretary.

"72. Subject to the provisions of section 42 (3) of the Act, the President of a Local Board shall have power to fine, suspend or dismiss any servant of such Board. But an appeal shall lie to the President of the District Board in the case of all servants of Taluk Boards fined in sums exceeding one rupee, suspended, or dismissed by the President of the Taluk Board; an appeal shall also lie to the District Board in the case of all servants of the District Board, and of all servants of a Taluk Board on Rs 50 and upwards, against suspension or dismissal inflicted or confirmed by the President of the District Board; and a further appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council against dismissal in the case of all servants, whose appointment requires the sanction of Government."

"73. No appeal under the foregoing rule will be entertained unless preferred within three months from the date of the order appealed against."

To the petitioner
9/12/95